

**Note for Board:**

*With reference to ISA 200, ISA 240 and ISA 330, the full standards in this Agenda Item have been presented for context. However, the paragraphs that may not be directly relevant to a proposed conforming change have been greyed, and it is intended that no further changes to these paragraphs will be proposed.*

## **INTERNATIONAL STANDARD ON AUDITING 200**

### **OVERALL OBJECTIVES OF THE INDEPENDENT AUDITOR AND THE CONDUCT OF AN AUDIT IN ACCORDANCE WITH INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS ON AUDITING**

**Scope of this ISA**

1. This International Standard on Auditing (ISA) deals with the independent auditor's overall responsibilities when conducting an audit of financial statements in accordance with ISAs. Specifically, it sets out the overall objectives of the independent auditor, and explains the nature and scope of an audit designed to enable the independent auditor to meet those objectives. It also explains the scope, authority and structure of the ISAs, and includes requirements establishing the general responsibilities of the independent auditor applicable in all audits, including the obligation to comply with the ISAs. The independent auditor is referred to as "the auditor" hereafter.
2. ISAs are written in the context of an audit of financial statements by an auditor. They are to be adapted as necessary in the circumstances when applied to audits of other historical financial information. ISAs do not address the responsibilities of the auditor that may exist in legislation, regulation or otherwise in connection with, for example, the offering of securities to the public. Such responsibilities may differ from those established in the ISAs. Accordingly, while the auditor may find aspects of the ISAs helpful in such circumstances, it is the responsibility of the auditor to ensure compliance with all relevant legal, regulatory or professional obligations.

**An Audit of Financial Statements**

3. The purpose of an audit is to enhance the degree of confidence of intended users in the financial statements. This is achieved by the expression of an opinion by the auditor on whether the financial statements are prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with an applicable financial reporting framework. In the case of most general purpose frameworks, that opinion is on whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, or give a true and fair view in accordance with the framework. An audit conducted in accordance with ISAs and relevant ethical requirements enables the auditor to form that opinion. (Ref: Para. A1)
4. The financial statements subject to audit are those of the entity, prepared by management of the entity with oversight from those charged with governance. ISAs do not impose responsibilities on management or those charged with governance and do not override laws and regulations that govern their responsibilities. However, an audit in accordance with ISAs is conducted on the premise that management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance have acknowledged certain

responsibilities that are fundamental to the conduct of the audit. The audit of the financial statements does not relieve management or those charged with governance of their responsibilities. (Ref: Para. A2–A11)

5. As the basis for the auditor’s opinion, ISAs require the auditor to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error. Reasonable assurance is a high level of assurance. It is obtained when the auditor has obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to reduce audit risk (that is, the risk that the auditor expresses an inappropriate opinion when the financial statements are materially misstated) to an acceptably low level. However, reasonable assurance is not an absolute level of assurance, because there are inherent limitations of an audit which result in most of the audit evidence on which the auditor draws conclusions and bases the auditor’s opinion being persuasive rather than conclusive. (Ref: Para. A30–A54)
6. The concept of materiality is applied by the auditor both in planning and performing the audit, and in evaluating the effect of identified misstatements on the audit and of uncorrected misstatements, if any, on the financial statements.<sup>1</sup> In general, misstatements, including omissions, are considered to be material if, individually or in the aggregate, they could reasonably be expected to influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial statements. Judgments about materiality are made in the light of surrounding circumstances, and are affected by the auditor’s perception of the financial information needs of users of the financial statements, and by the size or nature of a misstatement, or a combination of both. The auditor’s opinion deals with the financial statements as a whole and therefore the auditor is not responsible for the detection of misstatements that are not material to the financial statements as a whole.
7. The ISAs contain objectives, requirements and application and other explanatory material that are designed to support the auditor in obtaining reasonable assurance. The ISAs require that the auditor exercise professional judgment and maintain professional skepticism throughout the planning and performance of the audit and, among other things:
  - Identify and assess risks of material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, based on an understanding of the entity and its environment, the applicable financial reporting framework and including the entity’s system of internal control.
  - Obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence about whether material misstatements exist, through designing and implementing appropriate responses to the assessed risks.
  - Form an opinion on the financial statements based on conclusions drawn from the audit evidence obtained.
8. The form of opinion expressed by the auditor will depend upon the applicable financial reporting framework and any applicable law or regulation. (Ref: Para. A12–A13)
9. The auditor may also have certain other communication and reporting responsibilities to users, management, those charged with governance, or parties outside the entity, in relation to matters arising from the audit. These may be established by the ISAs or by applicable law or regulation.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> ISA 320, *Materiality in Planning and Performing an Audit* and ISA 450, *Evaluation of Misstatements Identified during the Audit*

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, ISA 260 (Revised), *Communication with Those Charged with Governance*; and ISA 240, *The Auditor’s Responsibilities Relating to Fraud in an Audit of Financial Statements*, paragraph 43.

## Effective Date

10. This ISA is effective for audits of financial statements for periods beginning on or after December 15, 2009.

## Overall Objectives of the Auditor

11. In conducting an audit of financial statements, the overall objectives of the auditor are:
- (a) To obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, thereby enabling the auditor to express an opinion on whether the financial statements are prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with an applicable financial reporting framework; and
  - (b) To report on the financial statements, and communicate as required by the ISAs, in accordance with the auditor's findings.
12. In all cases when reasonable assurance cannot be obtained and a qualified opinion in the auditor's report is insufficient in the circumstances for purposes of reporting to the intended users of the financial statements, the ISAs require that the auditor disclaim an opinion or withdraw (or resign)<sup>3</sup> from the engagement, where withdrawal is possible under applicable law or regulation.

## Definitions

13. For purposes of the ISAs, the following terms have the meanings attributed below:
- (a) **Applicable financial reporting framework** – The financial reporting framework adopted by management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance in the preparation of the financial statements that is acceptable in view of the nature of the entity and the objective of the financial statements, or that is required by law or regulation.  
  
The term “fair presentation framework” is used to refer to a financial reporting framework that requires compliance with the requirements of the framework and:
    - (i) Acknowledges explicitly or implicitly that, to achieve fair presentation of the financial statements, it may be necessary for management to provide disclosures beyond those specifically required by the framework; or
    - (ii) Acknowledges explicitly that it may be necessary for management to depart from a requirement of the framework to achieve fair presentation of the financial statements. Such departures are expected to be necessary only in extremely rare circumstances.  
The term “compliance framework” is used to refer to a financial reporting framework that requires compliance with the requirements of the framework, but does not contain the acknowledgements in (i) or (ii) above.
  - (b) **Audit evidence** – Information used by the auditor in arriving at the conclusions on which the auditor's opinion is based. Audit evidence includes both information contained in the accounting records underlying the financial statements and other information. For purposes of the ISAs:

<sup>3</sup> In the ISAs, only the term “withdrawal” is used.

- (i) Sufficiency of audit evidence is the measure of the quantity of audit evidence. The quantity of the audit evidence needed is affected by the auditor's assessment of the risks of material misstatement and also by the quality of such audit evidence.
  - (ii) Appropriateness of audit evidence is the measure of the quality of audit evidence; that is, its relevance and its reliability in providing support for the conclusions on which the auditor's opinion is based.
- (c) Audit risk – The risk that the auditor expresses an inappropriate audit opinion when the financial statements are materially misstated. Audit risk is a function of the risks of material misstatement and detection risk.
- (d) Auditor – The person or persons conducting the audit, usually the engagement partner or other members of the engagement team, or, as applicable, the firm. Where an ISA expressly intends that a requirement or responsibility be fulfilled by the engagement partner, the term “engagement partner” rather than “auditor” is used. “Engagement partner” and “firm” are to be read as referring to their public sector equivalents where relevant.
- (e) Detection risk – The risk that the procedures performed by the auditor to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level will not detect a misstatement that exists and that could be material, either individually or when aggregated with other misstatements.
- (f) Financial statements – A structured representation of historical financial information, including disclosures, intended to communicate an entity's economic resources or obligations at a point in time, or the changes therein for a period of time, in accordance with a financial reporting framework. The term “financial statements” ordinarily refers to a complete set of financial statements as determined by the requirements of the applicable financial reporting framework, but can also refer to a single financial statement. Disclosures comprise explanatory or descriptive information, set out as required, expressly permitted or otherwise allowed by the applicable financial reporting framework, on the face of a financial statement, or in the notes, or incorporated therein by cross-reference. (Ref: Para. A14–A15)
- (g) Historical financial information – Information expressed in financial terms in relation to a particular entity, derived primarily from that entity's accounting system, about economic events occurring in past time periods or about economic conditions or circumstances at points in time in the past.
- (h) Management – The person(s) with executive responsibility for the conduct of the entity's operations. For some entities in some jurisdictions, management includes some or all of those charged with governance, for example, executive members of a governance board, or an owner-manager.
- (i) Misstatement – A difference between the amount, classification, presentation, or disclosure of a reported financial statement item and the amount, classification, presentation, or disclosure that is required for the item to be in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. Misstatements can arise from error or fraud.

Where the auditor expresses an opinion on whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, or give a true and fair view, misstatements also include those adjustments of amounts, classifications, presentation, or disclosures that, in the auditor's judgment, are necessary for the financial statements to be presented fairly, in all material respects, or to give a true and fair view.

- (j) Premise, relating to the responsibilities of management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance, on which an audit is conducted – That management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance have acknowledged and understand that they have the following responsibilities that are fundamental to the conduct of an audit in accordance with ISAs. That is, responsibility:
- (i) For the preparation of the financial statements in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework, including, where relevant, their fair presentation;
  - (ii) For such internal control as management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance determine is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error; and
  - (iii) To provide the auditor with:
    - a. Access to all information of which management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance are aware that is relevant to the preparation of the financial statements such as records, documentation and other matters;
    - b. Additional information that the auditor may request from management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance for the purpose of the audit; and
    - c. Unrestricted access to persons within the entity from whom the auditor determines it necessary to obtain audit evidence.

In the case of a fair presentation framework, (i) above may be restated as “for the preparation and *fair* presentation of the financial statements in accordance with the financial reporting framework,” or “for the preparation of financial statements *that give a true and fair view* in accordance with the financial reporting framework.”

The “premise, relating to the responsibilities of management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance, on which an audit is conducted” may also be referred to as the “premise.”

- (k) Professional judgment – The application of relevant training, knowledge and experience, within the context provided by auditing, accounting and ethical standards, in making informed decisions about the courses of action that are appropriate in the circumstances of the audit engagement.
- (l) Professional skepticism – An attitude that includes a questioning mind, being alert to conditions which may indicate possible misstatement due to error or fraud, and a critical assessment of audit evidence.
- (m) Reasonable assurance – In the context of an audit of financial statements, a high, but not absolute, level of assurance.
- (n) Risk of material misstatement – The risk that the financial statements are materially misstated prior to audit. This consists of two components, described as follows at the assertion level:
- (i) Inherent risk – The susceptibility of an assertion about a class of transaction, account balance or disclosure to a misstatement that could be material, either individually or when aggregated with other misstatements, before consideration of any related controls.

- (ii) Control risk – The risk that a misstatement that could occur in an assertion about a class of transaction, account balance or disclosure 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 controls.
- (o) Those charged with governance – The person(s) or organization(s) (for example, a corporate trustee) with responsibility for overseeing the strategic direction of the entity and obligations related to the accountability of the entity. This includes overseeing the financial reporting process. For some entities in some jurisdictions, those charged with governance may include management personnel, for example, executive members of a governance board of a private or public sector entity, or an owner-manager.

## Requirements

### Ethical Requirements Relating to an Audit of Financial Statements

- 14. The auditor shall comply with relevant ethical requirements, including those pertaining to independence, relating to financial statement audit engagements. (Ref: Para. A16–A19)

### Professional Skepticism

- 15. The auditor shall plan and perform an audit with professional skepticism recognizing that circumstances may exist that cause the financial statements to be materially misstated. (Ref: Para. A20–A24)

### Professional Judgment

- 16. The auditor shall exercise professional judgment in planning and performing an audit of financial statements. (Ref: Para. A25–A29)

### Sufficient Appropriate Audit Evidence and Audit Risk

- 17. To obtain reasonable assurance, the auditor shall obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level and thereby enable the auditor to draw reasonable conclusions on which to base the auditor's opinion. (Ref: Para. A30–A54)

### Conduct of an Audit in Accordance with ISAs

#### Complying with ISAs Relevant to the Audit

- 18. The auditor shall comply with all ISAs relevant to the audit. An ISA is relevant to the audit when the ISA is in effect and the circumstances addressed by the ISA exist. (Ref: Para. A55–A59)
- 19. The auditor shall have an understanding of the entire text of an ISA, including its application and other explanatory material, to understand its objectives and to apply its requirements properly. (Ref: Para. A60–A68)
- 20. The auditor shall not represent compliance with ISAs in the auditor's report unless the auditor has complied with the requirements of this ISA and all other ISAs relevant to the audit.

### *Objectives Stated in Individual ISAs*

21. To achieve the overall objectives of the auditor, the auditor shall use the objectives stated in relevant ISAs in planning and performing the audit, having regard to the interrelationships among the ISAs, to: (Ref: Para. A69–A71)
- (a) Determine whether any audit procedures in addition to those required by the ISAs are necessary in pursuance of the objectives stated in the ISAs; and (Ref: Para. A72)
  - (b) Evaluate whether sufficient appropriate audit evidence has been obtained. (Ref: Para. A73)

### *Complying with Relevant Requirements*

22. Subject to paragraph 23, the auditor shall comply with each requirement of an ISA unless, in the circumstances of the audit:
- (a) The entire ISA is not relevant; or
  - (b) The requirement is not relevant because it is conditional and the condition does not exist. (Ref: Para. A74–A75)
23. In exceptional circumstances, the auditor may judge it necessary to depart from a relevant requirement in an ISA. In such circumstances, the auditor shall perform alternative audit procedures to achieve the aim of that requirement. The need for the auditor to depart from a relevant requirement is expected to arise only where the requirement is for a specific procedure to be performed and, in the specific circumstances of the audit, that procedure would be ineffective in achieving the aim of the requirement. (Ref: Para. A76)

### *Failure to Achieve an Objective*

24. If an objective in a relevant ISA cannot be achieved, the auditor shall evaluate whether this prevents the auditor from achieving the overall objectives of the auditor and thereby requires the auditor, in accordance with the ISAs, to modify the auditor's opinion or withdraw from the engagement (where withdrawal is possible under applicable law or regulation). Failure to achieve an objective represents a significant matter requiring documentation in accordance with ISA 230.<sup>4</sup> (Ref: Para. A77–A78)

## **Application and Other Explanatory Material**

### **An Audit of Financial Statements**

#### *Scope of the Audit* (Ref: Para. 3)

- A1. The auditor's opinion on the financial statements deals with whether the financial statements are prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. Such an opinion is common to all audits of financial statements. The auditor's opinion therefore does not assure, for example, the future viability of the entity nor the efficiency or effectiveness with which management has conducted the affairs of the entity. In some jurisdictions, however, applicable law or regulation may require auditors to provide opinions on other specific matters, such as the effectiveness of internal control, or the consistency of a separate management report with the financial statements. While the ISAs include requirements and guidance in relation to such matters

---

<sup>4</sup> ISA 230, *Audit Documentation*, paragraph 8(c)

to the extent that they are relevant to forming an opinion on the financial statements, the auditor would be required to undertake further work if the auditor had additional responsibilities to provide such opinions.

*Preparation of the Financial Statements* (Ref: Para. 4)

A2. Law or regulation may establish the responsibilities of management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance in relation to financial reporting. However, the extent of these responsibilities, or the way in which they are described, may differ across jurisdictions. Despite these differences, an audit in accordance with ISAs is conducted on the premise that management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance have acknowledged and understand that they have responsibility:

- (a) For the preparation of the financial statements in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework, including, where relevant, their fair presentation;
- (b) For such internal control as management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance determine is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error; and
- (c) To provide the auditor with:
  - (i) Access to all information of which management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance are aware that is relevant to the preparation of the financial statements such as records, documentation and other matters;
  - (ii) Additional information that the auditor may request from management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance for the purpose of the audit; and
  - (iii) Unrestricted access to persons within the entity from whom the auditor determines it necessary to obtain audit evidence.

A3. The preparation of the financial statements by management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance requires:

- The identification of the applicable financial reporting framework, in the context of any relevant laws or regulations.
- The preparation of the financial statements in accordance with that framework.
- The inclusion of an adequate description of that framework in the financial statements.

The preparation of the financial statements requires management to exercise judgment in making accounting estimates that are reasonable in the circumstances, as well as to select and apply appropriate accounting policies. These judgments are made in the context of the applicable financial reporting framework.

A4. The financial statements may be prepared in accordance with a financial reporting framework designed to meet:

- The common financial information needs of a wide range of users (that is, “general purpose financial statements”); or

- The financial information needs of specific users (that is, “special purpose financial statements”).

A5. The applicable financial reporting framework often encompasses financial reporting standards established by an authorized or recognized standards setting organization, or legislative or regulatory requirements. In some cases, the financial reporting framework may encompass both financial reporting standards established by an authorized or recognized standards setting organization and legislative or regulatory requirements. Other sources may provide direction on the application of the applicable financial reporting framework. In some cases, the applicable financial reporting framework may encompass such other sources, or may even consist only of such sources. Such other sources may include:

- The legal and ethical environment, including statutes, regulations, court decisions, and professional ethical obligations in relation to accounting matters;
- Published accounting interpretations of varying authority issued by standards setting, professional or regulatory organizations;
- Published views of varying authority on emerging accounting issues issued by standards setting, professional or regulatory organizations;
- General and industry practices widely recognized and prevalent; and
- Accounting literature.

Where conflicts exist between the financial reporting framework and the sources from which direction on its application may be obtained, or among the sources that encompass the financial reporting framework, the source with the highest authority prevails.

A6. The requirements of the applicable financial reporting framework determine the form and content of the financial statements. Although the framework may not specify how to account for or disclose all transactions or events, it ordinarily embodies sufficient broad principles that can serve as a basis for developing and applying accounting policies that are consistent with the concepts underlying the requirements of the framework.

A7. Some financial reporting frameworks are fair presentation frameworks, while others are compliance frameworks. Financial reporting frameworks that encompass primarily the financial reporting standards established by an organization that is authorized or recognized to promulgate standards to be used by entities for preparing general purpose financial statements are often designed to achieve fair presentation, for example, International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRSs) issued by the International Accounting Standards Board (IASB).

A8. The requirements of the applicable financial reporting framework also determine what constitutes a complete set of financial statements. In the case of many frameworks, financial statements are intended to provide information about the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of an entity. For such frameworks, a complete set of financial statements would include a balance sheet; an income statement; a statement of changes in equity; a cash flow statement; and related notes. For some other financial reporting frameworks, a single financial statement and the related notes might constitute a complete set of financial statements:

- For example, the International Public Sector Accounting Standard (IPSAS), *Financial Reporting under the Cash Basis of Accounting*, issued by the International Public Sector Accounting Standards Board states that the primary financial statement is a statement of cash

receipts and payments when a public sector entity prepares its financial statements in accordance with that IPSAS.

- Other examples of a single financial statement, each of which would include related notes, are:
  - Balance sheet.
  - Statement of income or statement of operations.
  - Statement of retained earnings.
  - Statement of cash flows.
  - Statement of assets and liabilities that does not include owner's equity.
  - Statement of changes in owners' equity.
  - Statement of revenue and expenses.
  - Statement of operations by product lines.

A9. ISA 210 establishes requirements and provides guidance on determining the acceptability of the applicable financial reporting framework.<sup>5</sup> ISA 800 (Revised) deals with special considerations when financial statements are prepared in accordance with a special purpose framework.<sup>6</sup>

A10. Because of the significance of the premise to the conduct of an audit, the auditor is required to obtain the agreement of management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance that they acknowledge and understand that they have the responsibilities set out in paragraph A2 as a precondition for accepting the audit engagement.<sup>7</sup>

#### Considerations Specific to Audits in the Public Sector

A11. The mandates for audits of the financial statements of public sector entities may be broader than those of other entities. As a result, the premise, relating to management's responsibilities, on which an audit of the financial statements of a public sector entity is conducted may include additional responsibilities, such as the responsibility for the execution of transactions and events in accordance with law, regulation or other authority.<sup>8</sup>

#### *Form of the Auditor's Opinion* (Ref: Para. 8)

A12. The opinion expressed by the auditor is on whether the financial statements are prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. The form of the auditor's opinion, however, will depend upon the applicable financial reporting framework and any applicable law or regulation. Most financial reporting frameworks include requirements relating to the presentation of the financial statements; for such frameworks, *preparation* of the financial statements in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework includes *presentation*.

<sup>5</sup> ISA 210, *Agreeing the Terms of Audit Engagements*, paragraph 6(a)

<sup>6</sup> ISA 800 (Revised), *Special Considerations—Audits of Financial Statements Prepared in Accordance with Special Purpose Frameworks*, paragraph 8

<sup>7</sup> ISA 210, paragraph 6(b)

<sup>8</sup> See paragraph A59.

A13. Where the financial reporting framework is a fair presentation framework, as is generally the case for general purpose financial statements, the opinion required by the ISAs is on whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, or give a true and fair view. Where the financial reporting framework is a compliance framework, the opinion required is on whether the financial statements are prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with the framework. Unless specifically stated otherwise, references in the ISAs to the auditor’s opinion cover both forms of opinion.

## Definitions

### *Financial Statements* (Ref: Para. 13(f))

A14. Some financial reporting frameworks may refer to an entity’s economic resources or obligations in other terms. For example, these may be referred to as the entity’s assets and liabilities, and the residual difference between them may be referred to as equity or equity interests.

A15. Explanatory or descriptive information required to be included in the financial statements by the applicable financial reporting framework may be incorporated therein by cross-reference to information in another document, such as a management report or a risk report. “Incorporated therein by cross-reference” means cross-referenced from the financial statements to the other document, but not from the other document to the financial statements. Where the applicable financial reporting framework does not expressly prohibit the cross-referencing of where explanatory or descriptive information may be found, and the information has been appropriately cross-referenced, the information will form part of the financial statements.

### **Ethical Requirements Relating to an Audit of Financial Statements** (Ref: Para. 14)

A16. The auditor is subject to relevant ethical requirements, including those pertaining to independence, relating to financial statement audit engagements. Relevant ethical requirements ordinarily comprise Parts A and B of the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants’ *Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants* (IESBA Code) related to an audit of financial statements together with national requirements that are more restrictive.

A17. Part A of the IESBA Code establishes the fundamental principles of professional ethics relevant to the auditor when conducting an audit of financial statements and provides a conceptual framework for applying those principles. The fundamental principles with which the auditor is required to comply by the IESBA Code are:

- (a) Integrity;
- (b) Objectivity;
- (c) Professional competence and due care;
- (d) Confidentiality; and
- (e) Professional behavior.

Part B of the IESBA Code illustrates how the conceptual framework is to be applied in specific situations.

- A18. In the case of an audit engagement it is in the public interest and, therefore, required by the IESBA Code, that the auditor be independent of the entity subject to the audit. The IESBA Code describes independence as comprising both independence of mind and independence in appearance. The auditor's independence from the entity safeguards the auditor's ability to form an audit opinion without being affected by influences that might compromise that opinion. Independence enhances the auditor's ability to act with integrity, to be objective and to maintain an attitude of professional skepticism.
- A19. International Standard on Quality Control (ISQC) 1,<sup>9</sup> or national requirements that are at least as demanding,<sup>10</sup> deal with the firm's responsibilities to establish and maintain its system of quality control for audit engagements. ISQC 1 sets out the responsibilities of the firm for establishing policies and procedures designed to provide it with reasonable assurance that the firm and its personnel comply with relevant ethical requirements, including those pertaining to independence.<sup>11</sup> ISA 220 sets out the engagement partner's responsibilities with respect to relevant ethical requirements. These include remaining alert, through observation and making inquiries as necessary, for evidence of non-compliance with relevant ethical requirements by members of the engagement team, determining the appropriate action if matters come to the engagement partner's attention that indicate that members of the engagement team have not complied with relevant ethical requirements, and forming a conclusion on compliance with independence requirements that apply to the audit engagement.<sup>12</sup> ISA 220 recognizes that the engagement team is entitled to rely on a firm's system of quality control in meeting its responsibilities with respect to quality control procedures applicable to the individual audit engagement, unless information provided by the firm or other parties suggests otherwise.

**Professional Skepticism (Ref: Para. 15)**

- A20. Professional skepticism includes being alert to, for example:
- Audit evidence that contradicts other audit evidence obtained.
  - Information that brings into question the reliability of documents and responses to inquiries to be used as audit evidence.
  - Conditions that may indicate possible fraud.
  - Circumstances that suggest the need for audit procedures in addition to those required by the ISAs.
- A21. Maintaining professional skepticism throughout the audit is necessary if the auditor is, for example, to reduce the risks of:
- Overlooking unusual circumstances.
  - Over generalizing when drawing conclusions from audit observations.
  - Using inappropriate assumptions in determining the nature, timing and extent of the audit procedures and evaluating the results thereof.

<sup>9</sup> ISQC 1, *Quality Control for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Statements, and Other Assurance and Related Services Engagements*

<sup>10</sup> ISA 220, *Quality Control for an Audit of Financial Statements*, paragraph 2

<sup>11</sup> ISQC 1, paragraphs 20–25

<sup>12</sup> ISA 220, paragraphs 9–12

- A22. Professional skepticism is necessary to the critical assessment of audit evidence. This includes questioning contradictory audit evidence and the reliability of documents and responses to inquiries and other information obtained from management and those charged with governance. It also includes consideration of the sufficiency and appropriateness of audit evidence obtained in the light of the circumstances, for example, in the case where fraud risk factors exist and a single document, of a nature that is susceptible to fraud, is the sole supporting evidence for a material financial statement amount.
- A23. The auditor may accept records and documents as genuine unless the auditor has reason to believe the contrary. Nevertheless, the auditor is required to consider the reliability of information to be used as audit evidence.<sup>13</sup> In cases of doubt about the reliability of information or indications of possible fraud (for example, if conditions identified during the audit cause the auditor to believe that a document may not be authentic or that terms in a document may have been falsified), the ISAs require that the auditor investigate further and determine what modifications or additions to audit procedures are necessary to resolve the matter.<sup>14</sup>
- A24. The auditor cannot be expected to disregard past experience of the honesty and integrity of the entity's management and those charged with governance. Nevertheless, a belief that management and those charged with governance are honest and have integrity does not relieve the auditor of the need to maintain professional skepticism or allow the auditor to be satisfied with less than persuasive audit evidence when obtaining reasonable assurance.

**Professional Judgment (Ref: Para. 16)**

- A25. Professional judgment is essential to the proper conduct of an audit. This is because interpretation of relevant ethical requirements and the ISAs and the informed decisions required throughout the audit cannot be made without the application of relevant knowledge and experience to the facts and circumstances. Professional judgment is necessary in particular regarding decisions about:
- Materiality and audit risk.
  - The nature, timing and extent of audit procedures used to meet the requirements of the ISAs and gather audit evidence.
  - Evaluating whether sufficient appropriate audit evidence has been obtained, and whether more needs to be done to achieve the objectives of the ISAs and thereby, the overall objectives of the auditor.
  - The evaluation of management's judgments in applying the entity's applicable financial reporting framework.
  - The drawing of conclusions based on the audit evidence obtained, for example, assessing the reasonableness of the estimates made by management in preparing the financial statements.
- A26. The distinguishing feature of the professional judgment expected of an auditor is that it is exercised by an auditor whose training, knowledge and experience have assisted in developing the necessary competencies to achieve reasonable judgments.

<sup>13</sup> ISA 500, *Audit Evidence*, paragraphs 7–9

<sup>14</sup> ISA 240, paragraph 13; ISA 500, paragraph 11; ISA 505, *External Confirmations*, paragraphs 10–11, and 16

- A27. The exercise of professional judgment in any particular case is based on the facts and circumstances that are known by the auditor. Consultation on difficult or contentious matters during the course of the audit, both within the engagement team and between the engagement team and others at the appropriate level within or outside the firm, such as that required by ISA 220,<sup>15</sup> assist the auditor in making informed and reasonable judgments.
- A28. Professional judgment can be evaluated based on whether the judgment reached reflects a competent application of auditing and accounting principles and is appropriate in the light of, and consistent with, the facts and circumstances that were known to the auditor up to the date of the auditor's report.
- A29. Professional judgment needs to be exercised throughout the audit. It also needs to be appropriately documented. In this regard, the auditor is required to prepare audit documentation sufficient to enable an experienced auditor, having no previous connection with the audit, to understand the significant professional judgments made in reaching conclusions on significant matters arising during the audit.<sup>16</sup> Professional judgment is not to be used as the justification for decisions that are not otherwise supported by the facts and circumstances of the engagement or sufficient appropriate audit evidence.

### **Sufficient Appropriate Audit Evidence and Audit Risk (Ref: Para. 5 and 17)**

#### *Sufficiency and Appropriateness of Audit Evidence*

- A30. Audit evidence is necessary to support the auditor's opinion and report. It is cumulative in nature and is primarily obtained from audit procedures performed during the course of the audit. It may, however, also include information obtained from other sources such as previous audits (provided the auditor has determined whether changes have occurred since the previous audit that may affect its relevance to the current audit<sup>17</sup>) or a firm's quality control procedures for client acceptance and continuance. In addition to other sources inside and outside the entity, the entity's accounting records are an important source of audit evidence. Also, information that may be used as audit evidence may have been prepared by an expert employed or engaged by the entity. Audit evidence comprises both information that supports and corroborates management's assertions, and any information that contradicts such assertions. In addition, in some cases, the absence of information (for example, management's refusal to provide a requested representation) is used by the auditor, and therefore, also constitutes audit evidence. Most of the auditor's work in forming the auditor's opinion consists of obtaining and evaluating audit evidence.
- A31. The sufficiency and appropriateness of audit evidence are interrelated. Sufficiency is the measure of the quantity of audit evidence. The quantity of audit evidence needed is affected by the auditor's assessment of the risks of misstatement (the higher the assessed risks, the more audit evidence is likely to be required) and also by the quality of such audit evidence (the higher the quality, the less may be required). Obtaining more audit evidence, however, may not compensate for its poor quality.
- A32. Appropriateness is the measure of the quality of audit evidence; that is, its relevance and its reliability in providing support for the conclusions on which the auditor's opinion is based. The reliability of evidence is influenced by its source and by its nature, and is dependent on the individual circumstances under which it is obtained.

---

<sup>15</sup> ISA 220, paragraph 18

<sup>16</sup> ISA 230, paragraph 8

<sup>17</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), *Identifying and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement through Understanding the Entity and Its Environment*, paragraph 9

A33. Whether sufficient appropriate audit evidence has been obtained to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level, and thereby enable the auditor to draw reasonable conclusions on which to base the auditor's opinion, is a matter of professional judgment. ISA 500 and other relevant ISAs establish additional requirements and provide further guidance applicable throughout the audit regarding the auditor's considerations in obtaining sufficient appropriate audit evidence.

#### *Audit Risk*

A34. Audit risk is a function of the risks of material misstatement and detection risk. The assessment of risks is based on audit procedures to obtain information necessary for that purpose and evidence obtained throughout the audit. The assessment of risks is a matter of professional judgment, rather than a matter capable of precise measurement.

A35. For purposes of the ISAs, audit risk does not include the risk that the auditor might express an opinion that the financial statements are materially misstated when they are not. This risk is ordinarily insignificant. Further, audit risk is a technical term related to the process of auditing; it does not refer to the auditor's business risks such as loss from litigation, adverse publicity, or other events arising in connection with the audit of financial statements.

#### *Risks of Material Misstatement*

A36. The risks of material misstatement may exist at two levels:

- The overall financial statement level; and
- The assertion level for classes of transactions, account balances, and disclosures.

A37. Risks of material misstatement at the overall financial statement level refer to risks of material misstatement that relate pervasively to the financial statements as a whole and potentially affect many assertions.

A38. Risks of material misstatement at the assertion level are assessed in order to determine the nature, timing and extent of further audit procedures necessary to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence. This evidence enables the auditor to express an opinion on the financial statements at an acceptably low level of audit risk. Auditors use various approaches to accomplish the objective of assessing the risks of material misstatement. For example, 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 acceptable level of detection risk. Some auditors find such a model to be useful when planning audit procedures.

A39. The risks of material misstatement at the assertion level consist of two components: inherent risk and control risk. Inherent risk and control risk are the entity's risks; they exist independently of the audit of the financial statements.

A40. Inherent risk is influenced by the characteristics of events or conditions that affect the susceptibility to misstatement of an higher for some assertions about a and related classes of transactions, account balances, or and disclosures than for others, before consideration of controls (i.e. inherent risk factors). Depending on the extent to which the assertion is subject to, or affected by, such inherent risk factors, the level of inherent risk varies along the spectrum of inherent risk. The auditor determines significant classes of transactions, account balances and disclosures, and their relevant assertions, as part of the process of identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement. For example, it may be higher for complex calculations or for accounts balances consisting of amounts derived from

accounting estimates that are subject to significant estimation uncertainty may be identified as significant account balances, and the auditor's assessment of inherent risk for the related risks at the assertion level may be higher because of the high estimation uncertainty. 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. Factors in the entity and its environment that relate to several or all of the classes of transactions, account balances, or disclosures may also influence the inherent risk related to a specific assertion. Such factors may include, for example, a lack of sufficient working capital to continue operations or a declining industry characterized by a large number of business failures.

- A41. Control risk is a function of the effectiveness of the design, implementation and maintenance of ~~internal controls~~ by management to address identified risks that threaten the achievement of the entity's objectives relevant to preparation of the entity's financial statements. However, internal control, no matter how well designed and operated, can only reduce, but not eliminate, risks of material misstatement in the financial statements, because of the inherent limitations of ~~internal controls~~. These include, for example, the possibility of human errors or mistakes, or of controls being circumvented by collusion or inappropriate management override. Accordingly, some control risk will always exist. The ISAs provide the conditions under which the auditor is required to, or may choose to, test the operating effectiveness of controls in determining the nature, timing and extent of substantive procedures to be performed.<sup>18</sup>

**Note for Board:**

Paragraph A42 forms part of the conforming amendments in the project to revise ISA 540. This paragraph will be further considered as part of the Task Force's considerations about conforming amendments relating to ISA 540 (Revised), and accordingly no changes have been presented to this paragraph for the this Board meeting.

- A42. The ISAs do not ordinarily refer to inherent risk and control risk separately, but rather to a combined assessment of the "risks of material misstatement." However, 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 risks of material misstatement may be expressed in quantitative terms, such as in percentages, or in non-quantitative terms. 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.

- A43. ISA 315 (Revised) establishes requirements and provides guidance on identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement at the financial statement and assertion levels.

A43a. Risks of material misstatement are assessed at the assertion level in order to determine the nature, timing and extent of further audit procedures necessary to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> ISA 330, *The Auditor's Responses to Assessed Risks*, paragraphs 7–17

<sup>19</sup> ISA 330, paragraph 6

## Detection Risk

- A44. For a given level of audit risk, the acceptable level of detection risk bears an inverse relationship to the assessed risks of material misstatement at the assertion level. For example, the greater the risks of material misstatement the auditor believes exists, the less the detection risk that can be accepted and, accordingly, the more persuasive the audit evidence required by the auditor.
- A45. 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. It is therefore a function of the effectiveness of an audit procedure and of its application by the auditor. Matters such as:
- adequate planning;
  - proper assignment of personnel to the engagement team;
  - the application of professional skepticism; and
  - supervision and review of the audit work performed,
- assist to enhance the effectiveness of an audit procedure and of its application and reduce the possibility that an auditor might select an inappropriate audit procedure, misapply an appropriate audit procedure, or misinterpret the audit results.
- A46. ISA 300<sup>20</sup> and ISA 330 establish requirements and provide guidance on planning an audit of financial statements and the auditor's responses to assessed risks. Detection risk, however, can only be reduced, not eliminated, because of the inherent limitations of an audit. Accordingly, some detection risk will always exist.

## *Inherent Limitations of an Audit*

- A47. The auditor is not expected to, and cannot, reduce audit risk to zero and cannot therefore obtain absolute assurance that the financial statements are free from material misstatement due to fraud or error. This is because there are inherent limitations of an audit, which result in most of the audit evidence on which the auditor draws conclusions and bases the auditor's opinion being persuasive rather than conclusive. The inherent limitations of an audit arise from:
- The nature of financial reporting;
  - The nature of audit procedures; and
  - The need for the audit to be conducted within a reasonable period of time and at a reasonable cost.

## The Nature of Financial Reporting

- A48. The preparation of financial statements involves judgment by management in applying the requirements of the entity's applicable financial reporting framework to the facts and circumstances of the entity. In addition, many financial statement items involve subjective decisions or assessments or a degree of uncertainty, and there may be a range of acceptable interpretations or judgments that may be made. Consequently, some financial statement items are subject to an inherent level of variability which cannot be eliminated by the application of additional auditing procedures. For example, this is often the case

---

<sup>20</sup> ISA 300, *Planning an Audit of Financial Statements*

with respect to certain accounting estimates. Nevertheless, the ISAs require the auditor to give specific consideration to whether accounting estimates are reasonable in the context of the applicable financial reporting framework and related disclosures, and to the qualitative aspects of the entity's accounting practices, including indicators of possible bias in management's judgments.<sup>21</sup>

#### The Nature of Audit Procedures

A49. There are practical and legal limitations on the auditor's ability to obtain audit evidence. For example:

- There is the possibility that management or others may not provide, intentionally or unintentionally, the complete information that is relevant to the preparation of the financial statements or that has been requested by the auditor. Accordingly, the auditor cannot be certain of the completeness of information, even though the auditor has performed audit procedures to obtain assurance that all relevant information has been obtained.
- Fraud may involve sophisticated and carefully organized schemes designed to conceal it. Therefore, audit procedures used to gather audit evidence may be ineffective for detecting an intentional misstatement that involves, for example, collusion to falsify documentation which may cause the auditor to believe that audit evidence is valid when it is not. The auditor is neither trained as nor expected to be an expert in the authentication of documents.
- An audit is not an official investigation into alleged wrongdoing. Accordingly, the auditor is not given specific legal powers, such as the power of search, which may be necessary for such an investigation.

#### Timeliness of Financial Reporting and the Balance between Benefit and Cost

A50. The matter of difficulty, time, or cost involved is not in itself a valid basis for the auditor to omit an audit procedure for which there is no alternative or to be satisfied with audit evidence that is less than persuasive. Appropriate planning assists in making sufficient time and resources available for the conduct of the audit. Notwithstanding this, the relevance of information, and thereby its value, tends to diminish over time, and there is a balance to be struck between the reliability of information and its cost. This is recognized in certain financial reporting frameworks (see, for example, the IASB's *Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements*). Therefore, there is an expectation by users of financial statements that the auditor will form an opinion on the financial statements within a reasonable period of time and at a reasonable cost, recognizing that it is impracticable to address all information that may exist or to pursue every matter exhaustively on the assumption that information is in error or fraudulent until proved otherwise.

A51. Consequently, it is necessary for the auditor to:

- Plan the audit so that it will be performed in an effective manner;
- Direct audit effort to areas most expected to contain risks of material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error, with correspondingly less effort directed at other areas; and
- Use testing and other means of examining populations for misstatements.

---

<sup>21</sup> ISA 540, *Auditing Accounting Estimates, Including Fair Value Accounting Estimates, and Related Disclosures*, and ISA 700 (Revised), *Forming an Opinion and Reporting on Financial Statements*, paragraph 12

A52. In light of the approaches described in paragraph A51, the ISAs contain requirements for the planning and performance of the audit and require the auditor, among other things, to:

- Have a basis for the identification and assessment of risks of material misstatement at the financial statement and assertion levels by performing risk assessment procedures and related activities;<sup>22</sup> and
- Use testing and other means of examining populations in a manner that provides a reasonable basis for the auditor to draw conclusions about the population.<sup>23</sup>

#### Other Matters that Affect the Inherent Limitations of an Audit

A53. In the case of certain assertions or subject matters, the potential effects of the inherent limitations on the auditor's ability to detect material misstatements are particularly significant. Such assertions or subject matters include:

- Fraud, particularly fraud involving senior management or collusion. See ISA 240 for further discussion.
- The existence and completeness of related party relationships and transactions. See ISA 550<sup>24</sup> for further discussion.
- The occurrence of non-compliance with laws and regulations. See ISA 250<sup>25</sup> for further discussion.
- Future events or conditions that may cause an entity to cease to continue as a going concern. See ISA 570 (Revised)<sup>26</sup> for further discussion.

Relevant ISAs identify specific audit procedures to assist in mitigating the effect of the inherent limitations.

A54. Because of the inherent limitations of an audit, there is an unavoidable risk that some material misstatements of the financial statements may not be detected, even though the audit is properly planned and performed in accordance with ISAs. Accordingly, the subsequent discovery of a material misstatement of the financial statements resulting from fraud or error does not by itself indicate a failure to conduct an audit in accordance with ISAs. However, the inherent limitations of an audit are not a justification for the auditor to be satisfied with less than persuasive audit evidence. Whether the auditor has performed an audit in accordance with ISAs is determined by the audit procedures performed in the circumstances, the sufficiency and appropriateness of the audit evidence obtained as a result thereof and the suitability of the auditor's report based on an evaluation of that evidence in light of the overall objectives of the auditor.

---

<sup>22</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraphs 5–10

<sup>23</sup> ISA 330; ISA 500; ISA 520, *Analytical Procedures*; ISA 530, *Audit Sampling*

<sup>24</sup> ISA 550, *Related Parties*

<sup>25</sup> ISA 250, *Consideration of Laws and Regulations in an Audit of Financial Statements*

<sup>26</sup> ISA 570 (Revised), *Going Concern*

## Conduct of an Audit in Accordance with ISAs

### *Nature of the ISAs* (Ref: Para. 18)

- A55. The ISAs, taken together, provide the standards for the auditor's work in fulfilling the overall objectives of the auditor. The ISAs deal with the general responsibilities of the auditor, as well as the auditor's further considerations relevant to the application of those responsibilities to specific topics.
- A56. The scope, effective date and any specific limitation of the applicability of a specific ISA is made clear in the ISA. Unless otherwise stated in the ISA, the auditor is permitted to apply an ISA before the effective date specified therein.
- A57. In performing an audit, the auditor may be required to comply with legal or regulatory requirements in addition to the ISAs. The ISAs do not override law or regulation that governs an audit of financial statements. In the event that such law or regulation differs from the ISAs, an audit conducted only in accordance with law or regulation will not automatically comply with ISAs.
- A58. The auditor may also conduct the audit in accordance with both ISAs and auditing standards of a specific jurisdiction or country. In such cases, in addition to complying with each of the ISAs relevant to the audit, it may be necessary for the auditor to perform additional audit procedures in order to comply with the relevant standards of that jurisdiction or country.

### *Considerations Specific to Audits in the Public Sector*

- A59. The ISAs are relevant to engagements in the public sector. The public sector auditor's responsibilities, however, may be affected by the audit mandate, or by obligations on public sector entities arising from law, regulation or other authority (such as ministerial directives, government policy requirements, or resolutions of the legislature), which may encompass a broader scope than an audit of financial statements in accordance with the ISAs. These additional responsibilities are not dealt with in the ISAs. They may be dealt with in the pronouncements of the International Organization of Supreme Audit Institutions or national standard setters, or in guidance developed by government audit agencies.

### *Contents of the ISAs* (Ref: Para. 19)

- A60. In addition to objectives and requirements (requirements are expressed in the ISAs using "shall"), an ISA contains related guidance in the form of application and other explanatory material. It may also contain introductory material that provides context relevant to a proper understanding of the ISA, and definitions. The entire text of an ISA, therefore, is relevant to an understanding of the objectives stated in an ISA and the proper application of the requirements of an ISA.
- A61. Where necessary, the application and other explanatory material provides further explanation of the requirements of an ISA and guidance for carrying them out. In particular, it may:
- Explain more precisely what a requirement means or is intended to cover.
  - Include examples of procedures that may be appropriate in the circumstances.

While such guidance does not in itself impose a requirement, it is relevant to the proper application of the requirements of an ISA. The application and other explanatory material may also provide background information on matters addressed in an ISA.

- A62. Appendices form part of the application and other explanatory material. The purpose and intended use of an appendix are explained in the body of the related ISAs or within the title and introduction of the appendix itself.
- A63. Introductory material may include, as needed, such matters as explanation of:
- The purpose and scope of the ISA, including how the ISA relates to other ISAs.
  - The subject matter of the ISA.
  - The respective responsibilities of the auditor and others in relation to the subject matter of the ISA.
  - The context in which the ISA is set.
- A64. An ISA may include, in a separate section under the heading “Definitions,” a description of the meanings attributed to certain terms for purposes of the ISAs. These are provided to assist in the consistent application and interpretation of the ISAs, and are not intended to override definitions that may be established for other purposes, whether in law, regulation or otherwise. Unless otherwise indicated, those terms will carry the same meanings throughout the ISAs. The Glossary of Terms relating to International Standards issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board in the *Handbook of International Quality Control, Auditing, Review, Other Assurance, and Related Services Pronouncements* published by IFAC contains a complete listing of terms defined in the ISAs. It also includes descriptions of other terms found in ISAs to assist in common and consistent interpretation and translation.
- A65. When appropriate, additional considerations specific to audits of smaller entities and public sector entities are included within the application and other explanatory material of an ISA. These additional considerations assist in the application of the requirements of the ISA in the audit of such entities. They do not, however, limit or reduce the responsibility of the auditor to apply and comply with the requirements of the ISAs.

#### Considerations Specific to Smaller Entities

- A66. For purposes of specifying additional considerations to audits of smaller entities, a “smaller entity” refers to an entity which typically possesses qualitative characteristics such as:
- (a) Concentration of ownership and management in a small number of individuals (often a single individual – either a natural person or another enterprise that owns the entity provided the owner exhibits the relevant qualitative characteristics); and
  - (b) One or more of the following:
    - (i) Straightforward or uncomplicated transactions;
    - (ii) Simple record-keeping;
    - (iii) Few lines of business and few products within business lines;
    - (iv) Simpler systems of ~~Few~~ internal controls;
    - (v) Few levels of management with responsibility for a broad range of controls; or
    - (vi) Few personnel, many having a wide range of duties.

These qualitative characteristics are not exhaustive, they are not exclusive to smaller entities, and smaller entities do not necessarily display all of these characteristics.

A67. The considerations specific to smaller entities included in the ISAs have been developed primarily with unlisted entities in mind. Some of the considerations, however, may be helpful in audits of smaller listed entities.

A68. The ISAs refer to the proprietor of a smaller entity who is involved in running the entity on a day-to-day basis as the “owner-manager.”

#### *Objectives Stated in Individual ISAs (Ref: Para. 21)*

A69. Each ISA contains one or more objectives which provide a link between the requirements and the overall objectives of the auditor. The objectives in individual ISAs serve to focus the auditor on the desired outcome of the ISAs while being specific enough to assist the auditor in:

- Understanding what needs to be accomplished and, where necessary, the appropriate means of doing so; and
- Deciding whether more needs to be done to achieve them in the particular circumstances of the audit.

A70. Objectives are to be understood in the context of the overall objectives of the auditor stated in paragraph 11 of this ISA. As with the overall objectives of the auditor, the ability to achieve an individual objective is equally subject to the inherent limitations of an audit.

A71. In using the objectives, the auditor is required to have regard to the interrelationships among the ISAs. This is because, as indicated in paragraph A55, the ISAs deal in some cases with general responsibilities and in others with the application of those responsibilities to specific topics. For example, this ISA requires the auditor to adopt an attitude of professional skepticism; this is necessary in all aspects of planning and performing an audit but is not repeated as a requirement of each ISA. At a more detailed level, ISA 315 (Revised) and ISA 330 contain, among other things, objectives and requirements that deal with the auditor’s responsibilities to identify and assess the risks of material misstatement and to design and perform further audit procedures to respond to those assessed risks, respectively; these objectives and requirements apply throughout the audit. An ISA dealing with specific aspects of the audit (for example, ISA 540) may expand on how the objectives and requirements of such ISAs as ISA 315 (Revised) and ISA 330 are to be applied in relation to the subject of the ISA but does not repeat them. Thus, in achieving the objective stated in ISA 540, the auditor has regard to the objectives and requirements of other relevant ISAs.

#### *Use of Objectives to Determine Need for Additional Audit Procedures (Ref: Para. 21(a))*

A72. The requirements of the ISAs are designed to enable the auditor to achieve the objectives specified in the ISAs, and thereby the overall objectives of the auditor. The proper application of the requirements of the ISAs by the auditor is therefore expected to provide a sufficient basis for the auditor’s achievement of the objectives. However, because the circumstances of audit engagements vary widely and all such circumstances cannot be anticipated in the ISAs, the auditor is responsible for determining the audit procedures necessary to fulfill the requirements of the ISAs and to achieve the objectives. In the circumstances of an engagement, there may be particular matters that require

the auditor to perform audit procedures in addition to those required by the ISAs to meet the objectives specified in the ISAs.

#### Use of Objectives to Evaluate Whether Sufficient Appropriate Audit Evidence Has Been Obtained (Ref: Para. 21(b))

A73. The auditor is required to use the objectives to evaluate whether sufficient appropriate audit evidence has been obtained in the context of the overall objectives of the auditor. If as a result the auditor concludes that the audit evidence is not sufficient and appropriate, then the auditor may follow one or more of the following approaches to meeting the requirement of paragraph 21(b):

- Evaluate whether further relevant audit evidence has been, or will be, obtained as a result of complying with other ISAs;
- Extend the work performed in applying one or more requirements; or
- Perform other procedures judged by the auditor to be necessary in the circumstances.

Where none of the above is expected to be practical or possible in the circumstances, the auditor will not be able to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence and is required by the ISAs to determine the effect on the auditor's report or on the auditor's ability to complete the engagement.

#### Complying with Relevant Requirements

##### Relevant Requirements (Ref: Para. 22)

A74. In some cases, an ISA (and therefore all of its requirements) may not be relevant in the circumstances. For example, if an entity does not have an internal audit function, nothing in ISA 610 (Revised 2013)<sup>27</sup> is relevant.

A75. Within a relevant ISA, there may be conditional requirements. Such a requirement is relevant when the circumstances envisioned in the requirement apply and the condition exists. In general, the conditionality of a requirement will either be explicit or implicit, for example:

- The requirement to modify the auditor's opinion if there is a limitation of scope<sup>28</sup> represents an explicit conditional requirement.
- The requirement to communicate significant deficiencies in internal control identified during the audit to those charged with governance,<sup>29</sup> which depends on the existence of such identified significant deficiencies; and the requirement to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence regarding the presentation and disclosure of segment information in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework,<sup>30</sup> which depends on that framework requiring or permitting such disclosure, represent implicit conditional requirements.

In some cases, a requirement may be expressed as being conditional on applicable law or regulation. For example, the auditor may be required to withdraw from the audit engagement, *where withdrawal is possible under applicable law or regulation*, or the auditor may be required to do something, *unless*

<sup>27</sup> ISA 610 (Revised 2013), *Using the Work of Internal Auditors*, paragraph 2

<sup>28</sup> ISA 705, *Modifications to the Opinion in the Independent Auditor's Report*, paragraph 13

<sup>29</sup> ISA 265, *Communicating Deficiencies in Internal Control to Those Charged with Governance and Management*, paragraph 9

<sup>30</sup> ISA 501, *Audit Evidence—Specific Considerations for Selected Items*, paragraph 13

*prohibited by law or regulation.* Depending on the jurisdiction, the legal or regulatory permission or prohibition may be explicit or implicit.

Departure from a Requirement (Ref: Para. 23)

A76. ISA 230 establishes documentation requirements in those exceptional circumstances where the auditor departs from a relevant requirement.<sup>31</sup> The ISAs do not call for compliance with a requirement that is not relevant in the circumstances of the audit.

*Failure to Achieve an Objective* (Ref: Para. 24)

A77. Whether an objective has been achieved is a matter for the auditor's professional judgment. That judgment takes account of the results of audit procedures performed in complying with the requirements of the ISAs, and the auditor's evaluation of whether sufficient appropriate audit evidence has been obtained and whether more needs to be done in the particular circumstances of the audit to achieve the objectives stated in the ISAs. Accordingly, circumstances that may give rise to a failure to achieve an objective include those that:

- Prevent the auditor from complying with the relevant requirements of an ISA.
- Result in its not being practicable or possible for the auditor to carry out the additional audit procedures or obtain further audit evidence as determined necessary from the use of the objectives in accordance with paragraph 21, for example, due to a limitation in the available audit evidence.

A78. Audit documentation that meets the requirements of ISA 230 and the specific documentation requirements of other relevant ISAs provides evidence of the auditor's basis for a conclusion about the achievement of the overall objectives of the auditor. While it is unnecessary for the auditor to document separately (as in a checklist, for example) that individual objectives have been achieved, the documentation of a failure to achieve an objective assists the auditor's evaluation of whether such a failure has prevented the auditor from achieving the overall objectives of the auditor.

---

<sup>31</sup> ISA 230, paragraph 12

## INTERNATIONAL STANDARD ON AUDITING 240

### THE AUDITOR'S RESPONSIBILITIES RELATING TO FRAUD IN AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

#### Introduction

##### Scope of this ISA

1. This International Standard on Auditing (ISA) deals with the auditor's responsibilities relating to fraud in an audit of financial statements. Specifically, it expands on how ISA 315 (Revised)<sup>32</sup> and ISA 330<sup>33</sup> are to be applied in relation to risks of material misstatement due to fraud.

##### Characteristics of Fraud

2. Misstatements in the financial statements can arise from either fraud or error. The distinguishing factor between fraud and error is whether the underlying action that results in the misstatement of the financial statements is intentional or unintentional.
3. Although fraud is a broad legal concept, for the purposes of the ISAs, the auditor is concerned with fraud that causes a material misstatement in the financial statements. Two types of intentional misstatements are relevant to the auditor – misstatements resulting from fraudulent financial reporting and misstatements resulting from misappropriation of assets. Although the auditor may suspect or, in rare cases, identify the occurrence of fraud, the auditor does not make legal determinations of whether fraud has actually occurred. (Ref: Para. A1–A6)

##### Responsibility for the Prevention and Detection of Fraud

4. The primary responsibility for the prevention and detection of fraud rests with both those charged with governance of the entity and management. It is important that management, with the oversight of those charged with governance, place a strong emphasis on fraud prevention, which may reduce opportunities for fraud to take place, and fraud deterrence, which could persuade individuals not to commit fraud because of the likelihood of detection and punishment. This involves a commitment to creating a culture of honesty and ethical behavior which can be reinforced by an active oversight by those charged with governance. Oversight by those charged with governance includes considering the potential for override of controls or other inappropriate influence over the financial reporting process, such as efforts by management to manage earnings in order to influence the perceptions of analysts as to the entity's performance and profitability.

##### Responsibilities of the Auditor

5. An auditor conducting an audit in accordance with ISAs is responsible for obtaining reasonable assurance that the financial statements taken as a whole are free from material misstatement, whether caused by fraud or error. Owing to the inherent limitations of an audit, there is an unavoidable risk that

---

<sup>32</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), *Identifying and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement through Understanding the Entity and Its Environment*

<sup>33</sup> ISA 330, *The Auditor's Responses to Assessed Risks*

some material misstatements of the financial statements may not be detected, even though the audit is properly planned and performed in accordance with the ISAs.<sup>34</sup>

6. As described in ISA 200,<sup>35</sup> the potential effects of inherent limitations are particularly significant in the case of misstatement resulting from fraud. The risk of not detecting a material misstatement resulting from fraud is higher than the risk of not detecting one resulting from error. This is because fraud may involve sophisticated and carefully organized schemes designed to conceal it, such as forgery, deliberate failure to record transactions, or intentional misrepresentations being made to the auditor. Such attempts at concealment may be even more difficult to detect when accompanied by collusion. Collusion may cause the auditor to believe that audit evidence is persuasive when it is, in fact, false. The auditor's ability to detect a fraud depends on factors such as the skillfulness of the perpetrator, the frequency and extent of manipulation, the degree of collusion involved, the relative size of individual amounts manipulated, and the seniority of those individuals involved. While the auditor may be able to identify potential opportunities for fraud to be perpetrated, it is difficult for the auditor to determine whether misstatements in judgment areas such as accounting estimates are caused by fraud or error.
7. Furthermore, the risk of the auditor not detecting a material misstatement resulting from management fraud is greater than for employee fraud, because management is frequently in a position to directly or indirectly manipulate accounting records, present fraudulent financial information or override controls ~~procedures~~ designed to prevent similar frauds by other employees.
8. When obtaining reasonable assurance, the auditor is responsible for maintaining professional skepticism throughout the audit, considering the potential for management override of controls and recognizing the fact that audit procedures that are effective for detecting error may not be effective in detecting fraud. The requirements in this ISA are designed to assist the auditor in identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement due to fraud and in designing procedures to detect such misstatement.

#### **Effective Date**

9. This ISA is effective for audits of financial statements for periods beginning on or after December 15, 2009.\*

#### **Objectives**

10. The objectives of the auditor are:
  - (a) To identify and assess the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements due to fraud;
  - (b) To obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence regarding the assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud, through designing and implementing appropriate responses; and
  - (c) To respond appropriately to fraud or suspected fraud identified during the audit.

---

<sup>34</sup> ISA 200, *Overall Objectives of the Independent Auditor and the Conduct of an Audit in Accordance with International Standards on Auditing*, paragraphs A53–A54

<sup>35</sup> ISA 200, paragraph A53

## Definitions

11. For purposes of the ISAs, the following terms have the meanings attributed below:

- (a) Fraud – An intentional act by one or more individuals among management, those charged with governance, employees, or third parties, involving the use of deception to obtain an unjust or illegal advantage.
- (b) Fraud risk factors – Events or conditions that indicate an incentive or pressure to commit fraud or provide an opportunity to commit fraud.

## Requirements

### Professional Skepticism

- 12. In accordance with ISA 200<sup>36</sup>, the auditor shall maintain professional skepticism throughout the audit, recognizing the possibility that a material misstatement due to fraud could exist, notwithstanding the auditor's past experience of the honesty and integrity of the entity's management and those charged with governance. (Ref: Para. A7–A8)
- 13. Unless the auditor has reason to believe the contrary, the auditor may accept records and documents as genuine. If conditions identified during the audit cause the auditor to believe that a document may not be authentic or that terms in a document have been modified but not disclosed to the auditor, the auditor shall investigate further. (Ref: Para. A9)
- 14. Where responses to inquiries of management or those charged with governance are inconsistent, the auditor shall investigate the inconsistencies.

### Discussion among the Engagement Team

- 15. ISA 315 (Revised) requires a discussion among the engagement team members and a determination by the engagement partner of which matters are to be communicated to those team members not involved in the discussion.<sup>37</sup> This discussion shall place particular emphasis on how and where the entity's financial statements may be susceptible to material misstatement due to fraud, including how fraud might occur. The discussion shall occur setting aside beliefs that the engagement team members may have that management and those charged with governance are honest and have integrity. (Ref: Para. A10–A11)

### Risk Assessment Procedures and Related Activities

- 16. When performing risk assessment procedures and related activities to obtain an understanding of the entity and its environment, ~~the applicable financial reporting framework and including~~ the entity's system of internal control, required by ISA 315 (Revised),<sup>38</sup> the auditor shall perform the procedures in paragraphs ~~1147–21D24~~ to obtain information for use in identifying the risks of material misstatement due to fraud.

---

<sup>36</sup> ISA 200, paragraph 15

<sup>37</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraph 10

<sup>38</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraphs 5–24

### **Management and Others within the Entity**

17. The auditor shall make inquiries of management regarding:
- (a) Management's assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated due to fraud, including the nature, extent and frequency of such assessments; (Ref: Para. A12–A13)
  - (b) Management's process for identifying and responding to the risks of fraud in the entity, including any specific risks of fraud that management has identified or that have been brought to its attention, or classes of transactions, account balances, or disclosures for which a risk of fraud is likely to exist; (Ref: Para. A14)
  - (c) Management's communication, if any, to those charged with governance regarding its processes for identifying and responding to the risks of fraud in the entity; and
  - (d) Management's communication, if any, to employees regarding its views on business practices and ethical behavior.
18. The auditor shall make inquiries of management, and others within the entity as appropriate, to determine whether they have knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity. (Ref: Para. A15–A17)
19. For those entities that have an internal audit function, the auditor shall make inquiries of appropriate individuals within the function to determine whether they have knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity, and to obtain its views about the risks of fraud. (Ref: Para. A18)

### **Those Charged with Governance**

20. Unless all of those charged with governance are involved in managing the entity,<sup>39</sup> the auditor shall obtain an understanding of how those charged with governance exercise oversight of management's processes for identifying and responding to the risks of fraud in the entity and the ~~internal controls~~ that management has established to mitigate these risks. (Ref: Para. A19–A21)
21. Unless all of those charged with governance are involved in managing the entity, the auditor shall make inquiries of those charged with governance to determine whether they have knowledge of any actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity. These inquiries are made in part to corroborate the responses to the inquiries of management.

### **Unusual or Unexpected Relationships Identified**

22. The auditor shall evaluate whether unusual or unexpected relationships that have been identified in performing analytical procedures, including those related to revenue accounts, may indicate risks of material misstatement due to fraud.

### **Other Information**

23. The auditor shall consider whether other information obtained by the auditor indicates risks of material misstatement due to fraud. (Ref: Para. A22)

---

<sup>39</sup> ISA 260 (Revised), *Communication with Those Charged with Governance*, paragraph 13

### **Evaluation of Fraud Risk Factors**

24. The auditor shall evaluate whether the information obtained from the other risk assessment procedures and related activities performed indicates that one or more fraud risk factors are present. While fraud risk factors may not necessarily indicate the existence of fraud, they have often been present in circumstances where frauds have occurred and therefore may indicate risks of material misstatement due to fraud. (Ref: Para. A23–A27)

### **Identification and Assessment of the Risks of Material Misstatement Due to Fraud**

25. In accordance with ISA 315 (Revised), the auditor shall identify and assess the risks of material misstatement due to fraud at the financial statement level, and at the assertion level for classes of transactions, account balances and disclosures.<sup>40</sup>
26. When identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement due to fraud, the auditor shall, based on a presumption that there are risks of fraud in revenue recognition, evaluate which types of revenue, revenue transactions or assertions give rise to such risks. Paragraph 47 specifies the documentation required where the auditor concludes that the presumption is not applicable in the circumstances of the engagement and, accordingly, has not identified revenue recognition as a risk of material misstatement due to fraud. (Ref: Para. A28–A30)
27. The auditor shall treat those assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud as significant risks and accordingly, to the extent not already done so, the auditor shall ~~obtain an understanding of the entity's related~~ identify the entity's controls, including control activities, relevant to that address such risks as controls relevant to the audit, and evaluate their design and determine whether they have been implemented.<sup>41</sup> (Ref: Para. A31–A32)

### **Responses to the Assessed Risks of Material Misstatement Due to Fraud**

#### **Overall Responses**

28. In accordance with ISA 330, the auditor shall determine overall responses to address the assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud at the financial statement level.<sup>42</sup> (Ref: Para. A33)
29. In determining overall responses to address the assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud at the financial statement level, the auditor shall:
- (a) Assign and supervise personnel taking account of the knowledge, skill and ability of the individuals to be given significant engagement responsibilities and the auditor's assessment of the risks of material misstatement due to fraud for the engagement; (Ref: Para. A34–A35)
  - (b) Evaluate whether the selection and application of accounting policies by the entity, particularly those related to subjective measurements and complex transactions, may be indicative of fraudulent financial reporting resulting from management's effort to manage earnings; and
  - (c) Incorporate an element of unpredictability in the selection of the nature, timing and extent of audit procedures. (Ref: Para. A36)

<sup>40</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraphs 25, 25A(a) and 26

<sup>41</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraph 20(b) and 21B

<sup>42</sup> ISA 330, paragraph 5

***Audit Procedures Responsive to Assessed Risks of Material Misstatement Due to Fraud at the Assertion Level***

30. In accordance with ISA 330, the auditor shall design and perform further audit procedures whose nature, timing and extent are responsive to the assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud at the assertion level.<sup>43</sup> (Ref: Para. A37–A40)

***Audit Procedures Responsive to Risks Related to Management Override of Controls***

31. Management is in a unique position to perpetrate fraud because of management's ability to manipulate accounting records and prepare fraudulent financial statements by overriding controls that otherwise appear to be operating effectively. Although the level of risk of management override of controls will vary from entity to entity, the risk is nevertheless present in all entities. Due to the unpredictable way in which such override could occur, it is a risk of material misstatement due to fraud and thus a significant risk.
32. Irrespective of the auditor's assessment of the risks of management override of controls, the auditor shall design and perform audit procedures to:
- (a) Test the appropriateness of journal entries recorded in the general ledger and other adjustments made in the preparation of the financial statements. In designing and performing audit procedures for such tests, the auditor shall:
    - (i) Make inquiries of individuals involved in the financial reporting process about inappropriate or unusual activity relating to the processing of journal entries and other adjustments;
    - (ii) Select journal entries and other adjustments made at the end of a reporting period; and
    - (iii) Consider the need to test journal entries and other adjustments throughout the period. (Ref: Para. A41–A44)
  - (b) Review accounting estimates for biases and evaluate whether the circumstances producing the bias, if any, represent a risk of material misstatement due to fraud. In performing this review, the auditor shall:
    - (i) Evaluate whether the judgments and decisions made by management in making the accounting estimates included in the financial statements, even if they are individually reasonable, indicate a possible bias on the part of the entity's management that may represent a risk of material misstatement due to fraud. If so, the auditor shall reevaluate the accounting estimates taken as a whole; and
    - (ii) Perform a retrospective review of management judgments and assumptions related to significant accounting estimates reflected in the financial statements of the prior year. (Ref: Para. A45–A47)
  - (c) For significant transactions that are outside the normal course of business for the entity, or that otherwise appear to be unusual given the auditor's understanding of the entity and its environment and other information obtained during the audit, the auditor shall evaluate whether the business rationale (or the lack thereof) of the transactions suggests that they may have

---

<sup>43</sup> ISA 330, paragraph 6

been entered into to engage in fraudulent financial reporting or to conceal misappropriation of assets. (Ref: Para. A48)

33. The auditor shall determine whether, in order to respond to the identified risks of management override of controls, the auditor needs to perform other audit procedures in addition to those specifically referred to above (that is, where there are specific additional risks of management override that are not covered as part of the procedures performed to address the requirements in paragraph 32).

#### **Evaluation of Audit Evidence** (Ref: Para. A49)

34. The auditor shall evaluate whether analytical procedures that are performed near the end of the audit, when forming an overall conclusion as to whether the financial statements are consistent with the auditor's understanding of the entity, indicate a previously unrecognized risk of material misstatement due to fraud. (Ref: Para. A50)
35. If the auditor identifies a misstatement, the auditor shall evaluate whether such a misstatement is indicative of fraud. If there is such an indication, the auditor shall evaluate the implications of the misstatement in relation to other aspects of the audit, particularly the reliability of management representations, recognizing that an instance of fraud is unlikely to be an isolated occurrence. (Ref: Para. A51)
36. If the auditor identifies a misstatement, whether material or not, and the auditor has reason to believe that it is or may be the result of fraud and that management (in particular, senior management) is involved, the auditor shall reevaluate the assessment of the risks of material misstatement due to fraud and its resulting impact on the nature, timing and extent of audit procedures to respond to the assessed risks. The auditor shall also consider whether circumstances or conditions indicate possible collusion involving employees, management or third parties when reconsidering the reliability of evidence previously obtained. (Ref: Para. A52)
37. If the auditor confirms that, or is unable to conclude whether, the financial statements are materially misstated as a result of fraud the auditor shall evaluate the implications for the audit. (Ref: Para. A53)

#### **Auditor Unable to Continue the Engagement**

38. If, as a result of a misstatement resulting from fraud or suspected fraud, the auditor encounters exceptional circumstances that bring into question the auditor's ability to continue performing the audit, the auditor shall:
- (a) Determine the professional and legal responsibilities applicable in the circumstances, including whether there is a requirement for the auditor to report to the person or persons who made the audit appointment or, in some cases, to regulatory authorities;
  - (b) Consider whether it is appropriate to withdraw from the engagement, where withdrawal is possible under applicable law or regulation; and
  - (c) If the auditor withdraws:
    - (i) Discuss with the appropriate level of management and those charged with governance the auditor's withdrawal from the engagement and the reasons for the withdrawal; and

- (ii) Determine whether there is a professional or legal requirement to report to the person or persons who made the audit appointment or, in some cases, to regulatory authorities, the auditor's withdrawal from the engagement and the reasons for the withdrawal. (Ref: Para. A54–A57)

### Written Representations

39. The auditor shall obtain written representations from management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance that:
- (a) They acknowledge their responsibility for the design, implementation and maintenance of internal control to prevent and detect fraud;
  - (b) They have disclosed to the auditor the results of management's assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud;
  - (c) They have disclosed to the auditor their knowledge of fraud, or suspected fraud, affecting the entity involving:
    - (i) Management;
    - (ii) Employees who have significant roles in internal control; or
    - (iii) Others where the fraud could have a material effect on the financial statements; and
  - (d) They have disclosed to the auditor their knowledge of any allegations of fraud, or suspected fraud, affecting the entity's financial statements communicated by employees, former employees, analysts, regulators or others. (Ref: Para. A58–A59)

### Communications to Management and with Those Charged with Governance

40. If the auditor has identified a fraud or has obtained information that indicates that a fraud may exist, the auditor shall communicate these matters on a timely basis to the appropriate level of management in order to inform those with primary responsibility for the prevention and detection of fraud of matters relevant to their responsibilities. (Ref: Para. A60)
41. Unless all of those charged with governance are involved in managing the entity, if the auditor has identified or suspects fraud involving:
- (a) management;
  - (b) employees who have significant roles in internal control; or
  - (c) others where the fraud results in a material misstatement in the financial statements,
- the auditor shall communicate these matters to those charged with governance on a timely basis. If the auditor suspects fraud involving management, the auditor shall communicate these suspicions to those charged with governance and discuss with them the nature, timing and extent of audit procedures necessary to complete the audit. (Ref: Para. A61–A63)
42. The auditor shall communicate with those charged with governance any other matters related to fraud that are, in the auditor's judgment, relevant to their responsibilities. (Ref: Para. A64)

## Communications to Regulatory and Enforcement Authorities

43. If the auditor has identified or suspects a fraud, the auditor shall determine whether there is a responsibility to report the occurrence or suspicion to a party outside the entity. Although the auditor's professional duty to maintain the confidentiality of client information may preclude such reporting, the auditor's legal responsibilities may override the duty of confidentiality in some circumstances. (Ref: Para. A65–A67)

## Documentation

44. The auditor shall include the following in the audit documentation<sup>44</sup> ~~of the auditor's understanding of the entity and its environment and of the identification and the assessment of the risks of material misstatement required by ISA 315 (Revised):~~<sup>45</sup>
- (a) The significant decisions reached during the discussion among the engagement team regarding the susceptibility of the entity's financial statements to material misstatement due to fraud; ~~and~~
  - (b) The identified and assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud at the financial statement level and at the assertion level; ~~and~~
  - (c) Controls identified to be relevant to the audit because they address assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud.
45. The auditor shall include the following in the audit documentation of the auditor's responses to the assessed risks of material misstatement required by ISA 330:<sup>46</sup>
- (a) The overall responses to the assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud at the financial statement level and the nature, timing and extent of audit procedures, and the linkage of those procedures with the assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud at the assertion level; ~~and~~
  - (b) The results of the audit procedures, including those designed to address the risk of management override of controls.
46. The auditor shall include in the audit documentation communications about fraud made to management, those charged with governance, regulators and others.
47. If the auditor has concluded that the presumption that there is a risk of material misstatement due to fraud related to revenue recognition is not applicable in the circumstances of the engagement, the auditor shall include in the audit documentation the reasons for that conclusion.

---

<sup>44</sup> ISA 230, *Audit Documentation*, paragraphs 8–11, and paragraph A6

<sup>45</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraph 32

<sup>46</sup> ISA 330, paragraph 28

## Application and Other Explanatory Material

### Characteristics of Fraud (Ref: Para. 3)

- A1. Fraud, whether fraudulent financial reporting or misappropriation of assets, involves incentive or pressure to commit fraud, a perceived opportunity to do so and some rationalization of the act. For example:
- Incentive or pressure to commit fraudulent financial reporting may exist when management is under pressure, from sources outside or inside the entity, to achieve an expected (and perhaps unrealistic) earnings target or financial outcome – particularly since the consequences to management for failing to meet financial goals can be significant. Similarly, individuals may have an incentive to misappropriate assets, for example, because the individuals are living beyond their means.
  - A perceived opportunity to commit fraud may exist when an individual believes internal controls can be overridden, for example, because the individual is in a position of trust or has knowledge of specific deficiencies in internal control.
  - Individuals may be able to rationalize committing a fraudulent act. Some individuals possess an attitude, character or set of ethical values that allow them knowingly and intentionally to commit a dishonest act. However, even otherwise honest individuals can commit fraud in an environment that imposes sufficient pressure on them.
- A2. Fraudulent financial reporting involves intentional misstatements including omissions of amounts or disclosures in financial statements to deceive financial statement users. It can be caused by the efforts of management to manage earnings in order to deceive financial statement users by influencing their perceptions as to the entity's performance and profitability. Such earnings management may start out with small actions or inappropriate adjustment of assumptions and changes in judgments by management. Pressures and incentives may lead these actions to increase to the extent that they result in fraudulent financial reporting. Such a situation could occur when, due to pressures to meet market expectations or a desire to maximize compensation based on performance, management intentionally takes positions that lead to fraudulent financial reporting by materially misstating the financial statements. In some entities, management may be motivated to reduce earnings by a material amount to minimize tax or to inflate earnings to secure bank financing.
- A3. Fraudulent financial reporting may be accomplished by the following:
- Manipulation, falsification (including forgery), or alteration of accounting records or supporting documentation from which the financial statements are prepared.
  - Misrepresentation in, or intentional omission from, the financial statements of events, transactions or other significant information.
  - Intentional misapplication of accounting principles relating to amounts, classification, manner of presentation, or disclosure.

A4. Fraudulent financial reporting often involves management override of controls that otherwise may appear to be operating effectively. Fraud can be committed by management overriding controls using such techniques as intentionally:

- Recording fictitious journal entries, particularly close to the end of an accounting period, to manipulate operating results or achieve other objectives.
- Inappropriately adjusting assumptions and changing judgments used to estimate account balances.
- Omitting, advancing or delaying recognition in the financial statements of events and transactions that have occurred during the reporting period.
- Omitting, obscuring or misstating disclosures required by the applicable financial reporting framework, or disclosures that are necessary to achieve fair presentation.
- Concealing facts that could affect the amounts recorded in the financial statements.
- Engaging in complex transactions that are structured to misrepresent the financial position or financial performance of the entity.
- Altering records and terms related to significant and unusual transactions.

A5. Misappropriation of assets involves the theft of an entity's assets and is often perpetrated by employees in relatively small and immaterial amounts. However, it can also involve management who are usually more able to disguise or conceal misappropriations in ways that are difficult to detect. Misappropriation of assets can be accomplished in a variety of ways including:

- Embezzling receipts (for example, misappropriating collections on accounts receivable or diverting receipts in respect of written-off accounts to personal bank accounts).
- Stealing physical assets or intellectual property (for example, stealing inventory for personal use or for sale, stealing scrap for resale, colluding with a competitor by disclosing technological data in return for payment).
- Causing an entity to pay for goods and services not received (for example, payments to fictitious vendors, kickbacks paid by vendors to the entity's purchasing agents in return for inflating prices, payments to fictitious employees).
- Using an entity's assets for personal use (for example, using the entity's assets as collateral for a personal loan or a loan to a related party).

Misappropriation of assets is often accompanied by false or misleading records or documents in order to conceal the fact that the assets are missing or have been pledged without proper authorization.

### **Considerations Specific to Public Sector Entities**

A6. The public sector auditor's responsibilities relating to fraud may be a result of law, regulation or other authority applicable to public sector entities or separately covered by the auditor's mandate. Consequently, the public sector auditor's responsibilities may not be limited to consideration of risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, but may also include a broader responsibility to consider risks of fraud.

**Professional Skepticism** (Ref: Para. 12–14)

- A7. Maintaining professional skepticism requires an ongoing questioning of whether the information and audit evidence obtained suggests that a material misstatement due to fraud may exist. It includes considering the reliability of the information to be used as audit evidence and the controls over its preparation and maintenance ~~where~~ when such controls are identified to be controls relevant to the audit. Due to the characteristics of fraud, the auditor's professional skepticism is particularly important when considering the risks of material misstatement due to fraud.
- A8. Although the auditor cannot be expected to disregard past experience of the honesty and integrity of the entity's management and those charged with governance, the auditor's professional skepticism is particularly important in considering the risks of material misstatement due to fraud because there may have been changes in circumstances.
- A9. An audit performed in accordance with ISAs rarely involves the authentication of documents, nor is the auditor trained as or expected to be an expert in such authentication.<sup>47</sup> However, when the auditor identifies conditions that cause the auditor to believe that a document may not be authentic or that terms in a document have been modified but not disclosed to the auditor, possible procedures to investigate further may include:
- Confirming directly with the third party.
  - Using the work of an expert to assess the document's authenticity.

**Discussion Among the Engagement Team** (Ref: Para. 15)

- A10. Discussing the susceptibility of the entity's financial statements to material misstatement due to fraud with the engagement team:
- Provides an opportunity for more experienced engagement team members to share their insights about how and where the financial statements may be susceptible to material misstatement due to fraud.
  - Enables the auditor to consider an appropriate response to such susceptibility and to determine which members of the engagement team will conduct certain audit procedures.
  - Permits the auditor to determine how the results of audit procedures will be shared among the engagement team and how to deal with any allegations of fraud that may come to the auditor's attention.
- A11. The discussion may include such matters as:
- An exchange of ideas among engagement team members about how and where they believe the entity's financial statements (including the individual statements and the disclosures) may be susceptible to material misstatement due to fraud, how management could perpetrate and conceal fraudulent financial reporting, and how assets of the entity could be misappropriated.
  - A consideration of circumstances that might be indicative of earnings management and the practices that might be followed by management to manage earnings that could lead to fraudulent financial reporting.

---

<sup>47</sup> ISA 200, paragraph A49

- A consideration of the risk that management may attempt to present disclosures in a manner that may obscure a proper understanding of the matters disclosed (for example, by including too much immaterial information or by using unclear or ambiguous language).
- A consideration of the known external and internal factors affecting the entity that may create an incentive or pressure for management or others to commit fraud, provide the opportunity for fraud to be perpetrated, and indicate a culture or environment that enables management or others to rationalize committing fraud.
- A consideration of management's involvement in overseeing employees with access to cash or other assets susceptible to misappropriation.
- A consideration of any unusual or unexplained changes in behavior or lifestyle of management or employees which have come to the attention of the engagement team.
- An emphasis on the importance of maintaining a proper state of mind throughout the audit regarding the potential for material misstatement due to fraud.
- A consideration of the types of circumstances that, if encountered, might indicate the possibility of fraud.
- A consideration of how an element of unpredictability will be incorporated into the nature, timing and extent of the audit procedures to be performed.
- A consideration of the audit procedures that might be selected to respond to the susceptibility of the entity's financial statement to material misstatement due to fraud and whether certain types of audit procedures are more effective than others.
- A consideration of any allegations of fraud that have come to the auditor's attention.
- A consideration of the risk of management override of controls.

## **Risk Assessment Procedures and Related Activities**

### *Inquiries of Management*

#### Management's Assessment of the Risk of Material Misstatement Due to Fraud (Ref: Para. 17(a))

A12. Management accepts responsibility for the entity's internal control and for the preparation of the entity's financial statements. Accordingly, it is appropriate for the auditor to make inquiries of management regarding management's own assessment of the risk of fraud and the controls in place to prevent and detect it. The nature, extent and frequency of management's assessment of such risk and controls may vary from entity to entity. In some entities, management may make detailed assessments on an annual basis or as part of continuous monitoring. In other entities, management's assessment may be less structured and less frequent. The nature, extent and frequency of management's assessment are relevant to the auditor's understanding of the entity's control environment. For example, the fact that management has not made an assessment of the risk of fraud may in some circumstances be indicative of the lack of importance that management places on internal control.

#### Considerations specific to smaller entities

A13. In some entities, particularly smaller entities, the focus of management's assessment may be on the risks of employee fraud or misappropriation of assets.

#### Management's Process for Identifying and Responding to the Risks of Fraud (Ref: Para. 17(b))

A14. In the case of entities with multiple locations management's processes may include different levels of monitoring of operating locations, or business segments. Management may also have identified particular operating locations or business segments for which a risk of fraud may be more likely to exist.

#### Inquiry of Management and Others within the Entity (Ref: Para. 18)

A15. The auditor's inquiries of management may provide useful information concerning the risks of material misstatements in the financial statements resulting from employee fraud. However, such inquiries are unlikely to provide useful information regarding the risks of material misstatement in the financial statements resulting from management fraud. Making inquiries of others within the entity may provide individuals with an opportunity to convey information to the auditor that may not otherwise be communicated.

A16. Examples of others within the entity to whom the auditor may direct inquiries about the existence or suspicion of fraud include:

- Operating personnel not directly involved in the financial reporting process.
- Employees with different levels of authority.
- Employees involved in initiating, processing or recording complex or unusual transactions and those who supervise or monitor such employees.
- In-house legal counsel.
- Chief ethics officer or equivalent person.
- The person or persons charged with dealing with allegations of fraud.

A17. Management is often in the best position to perpetrate fraud. Accordingly, when evaluating management's responses to inquiries with an attitude of professional skepticism, the auditor may judge it necessary to corroborate responses to inquiries with other information.

#### Inquiry of Internal Audit (Ref: Para. 19)

A18. ISA 315 (Revised) and ISA 610 (Revised 2013) establish requirements and provide guidance relevant to audits of those entities that have an internal audit function.<sup>48</sup> In carrying out the requirements of those ISAs in the context of fraud, the auditor may inquire about specific activities of the function including, for example:

- The procedures performed, if any, by the internal auditor function during the year to detect fraud.

---

<sup>48</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraphs 6(a) and 17C23, and ISA 610 (Revised 2013), *Using the Work of Internal Auditors*

- Whether management has satisfactorily responded to any findings resulting from those procedures.

*Obtaining an Understanding of Oversight Exercised by Those Charged with Governance* (Ref: Para. 20)

- A19. Those charged with governance of an entity oversee the entity's systems for monitoring risk, financial control and compliance with the law. In many countries, corporate governance practices are well developed and those charged with governance play an active role in oversight of the entity's assessment of the risks of fraud and ~~of the relevant internal control~~ the controls that address such risks. Since the responsibilities of those charged with governance and management may vary by entity and by country, it is important that the auditor understands their respective responsibilities to enable the auditor to obtain an understanding of the oversight exercised by the appropriate individuals.<sup>49</sup>
- A20. An understanding of the oversight exercised by those charged with governance may provide insights regarding the susceptibility of the entity to management fraud, the adequacy of ~~internal controls that address~~ internal controls that address risks of fraud, and the competency and integrity of management. The auditor may obtain this understanding in a number of ways, such as by attending meetings where such discussions take place, reading the minutes from such meetings or making inquiries of those charged with governance.

*Considerations Specific to Smaller Entities*

- A21. In some cases, all of those charged with governance are involved in managing the entity. This may be the case in a small entity where a single owner manages the entity and no one else has a governance role. In these cases, there is ordinarily no action on the part of the auditor because there is no oversight separate from management.

*Consideration of Other Information* (Ref: Para. 23)

- A22. In addition to information obtained from applying analytical procedures, other information obtained about the entity and its environment, the applicable financial reporting framework and the entity's system of internal control may be helpful in identifying the risks of material misstatement due to fraud. The discussion among team members may provide information that is helpful in identifying such risks. In addition, information obtained from the auditor's client acceptance and retention processes, and experience gained on other engagements performed for the entity, for example, engagements to review interim financial information, may be relevant in the identification of the risks of material misstatement due to fraud.

*Evaluation of Fraud Risk Factors* (Ref: Para. 24)

- A23. The fact that fraud is usually concealed can make it very difficult to detect. Nevertheless, the auditor may identify events or conditions that indicate an incentive or pressure to commit fraud or provide an opportunity to commit fraud (fraud risk factors). For example:
- The need to meet expectations of third parties to obtain additional equity financing may create pressure to commit fraud;

---

<sup>49</sup> ISA 260 (Revised), paragraphs A1–A8, discuss with whom the auditor communicates when the entity's governance structure is not well defined.

- The granting of significant bonuses if unrealistic profit targets are met may create an incentive to commit fraud; and
- A control environment that is not effective may create an opportunity to commit fraud.

A24. Fraud risk factors cannot easily be ranked in order of importance. The significance of fraud risk factors varies widely. Some of these factors will be present in entities where the specific conditions do not present risks of material misstatement. Accordingly, the determination of whether a fraud risk factor is present and whether it is to be considered in assessing the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements due to fraud requires the exercise of professional judgment.

A25. Examples of fraud risk factors related to fraudulent financial reporting and misappropriation of assets are presented in Appendix 1. These illustrative risk factors are classified based on the three conditions that are generally present when fraud exists:

- An incentive or pressure to commit fraud;
- A perceived opportunity to commit fraud; and
- An ability to rationalize the fraudulent action.

Fraud risk factors related to incentives, pressures or opportunities may arise from conditions that create susceptibility to misstatements due to management bias or fraud (which is an inherent risk factor).<sup>50</sup> Alternatively, fraud risk factors may relate to conditions within the entity's internal control that provide opportunity to commit fraud or that may affect management's attitude or ability to rationalize fraudulent actions. Risk factors reflective of an attitude that permits rationalization of the fraudulent action may not be susceptible to observation by the auditor. Nevertheless, the auditor may become aware of the existence of such information through, for example, the required understanding of the entity's control environment.<sup>51</sup> Although the fraud risk factors described in Appendix 1 cover a broad range of situations that may be faced by auditors, they are only examples and other risk factors may exist.

A26. The size, complexity, and ownership characteristics of the entity have a significant influence on the consideration of relevant fraud risk factors. For example, in the case of a large entity, there may be factors that generally constrain improper conduct by management, such as:

- Effective oversight by those charged with governance.
- An effective internal audit function.
- The existence and enforcement of a written code of conduct.

Furthermore, fraud risk factors considered at a business segment operating level may provide different insights when compared with those obtained when considered at an entity-wide level.

#### Considerations Specific to Smaller Entities

A27. In the case of a small entity, some or all of these considerations may be inapplicable or less relevant. For example, a smaller entity may not have a written code of conduct but, instead, may have developed a culture that emphasizes the importance of integrity and ethical behavior through oral

<sup>50</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraph 4(cb)

<sup>51</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraphs 14–14A

communication and by management example. Domination of management by a single individual in a small entity does not generally, in and of itself, indicate a failure by management to display and communicate an appropriate attitude regarding internal control, including and the financial reporting process. In some entities, the need for management authorization can compensate for otherwise deficient controls and reduce the risk of employee fraud. However, domination of management by a single individual can be a potential deficiency in internal control since there is an opportunity for management override of controls.

## Identification and Assessment of the Risks of Material Misstatement Due to Fraud

### *Risks of Fraud in Revenue Recognition* (Ref: Para. 26)

- A28. Material misstatement due to fraudulent financial reporting relating to revenue recognition often results from an overstatement of revenues through, for example, premature revenue recognition or recording fictitious revenues. It may result also from an understatement of revenues through, for example, improperly shifting revenues to a later period.
- A29. The risks of fraud in revenue recognition may be greater in some entities than others. For example, there may be pressures or incentives on management to commit fraudulent financial reporting through inappropriate revenue recognition in the case of listed entities when, for example, performance is measured in terms of year over year revenue growth or profit. Similarly, for example, there may be greater risks of fraud in revenue recognition in the case of entities that generate a substantial portion of revenues through cash sales.
- A30. The presumption that there are risks of fraud in revenue recognition may be rebutted. For example, the auditor may conclude that there is no risk of material misstatement due to fraud relating to revenue recognition in the case where there is a single type of simple revenue transaction, for example, leasehold revenue from a single unit rental property.

### *Identifying and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement Due to Fraud and Understanding the Entity's Related Controls* (Ref: Para. 27)

- A31. Management may make judgments on the nature and extent of the controls it chooses to implement, and the nature and extent of the risks it chooses to assume. In determining which controls to implement to prevent and detect fraud, management considers the risks that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud. As part of this consideration, management may conclude that it is not cost effective to implement and maintain a particular control in relation to the reduction in the risks of material misstatement due to fraud to be achieved.
- A32. It is therefore important for the auditor to obtain an understanding of the controls that management has designed, implemented and maintained to prevent and detect fraud. ~~In doing so, In identifying the controls relevant to the audit that address the risks of material misstatement due to fraud,~~ the auditor may learn, for example, that management has consciously chosen to accept the risks associated with a lack of segregation of duties. Information from ~~obtaining this understanding identifying these controls, and evaluating their design and determining whether they have been implemented,~~ may also be useful in identifying fraud risks factors that may affect the auditor's assessment of the risks that the financial statements may contain material misstatement due to fraud.

## Responses to the Assessed Risks of Material Misstatement Due to Fraud

### *Overall Responses (Ref: Para. 28)*

A33. Determining overall responses to address the assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud generally includes the consideration of how the overall conduct of the audit can reflect increased professional skepticism, for example, through:

- Increased sensitivity in the selection of the nature and extent of documentation to be examined in support of material transactions.
- Increased recognition of the need to corroborate management explanations or representations concerning material matters.

It also involves more general considerations apart from the specific procedures otherwise planned; these considerations include the matters listed in paragraph 29, which are discussed below.

### *Assignment and Supervision of Personnel (Ref: Para. 29(a))*

A34. The auditor may respond to identified risks of material misstatement due to fraud by, for example, assigning additional individuals with specialized skill and knowledge, such as forensic and IT experts, or by assigning more experienced individuals to the engagement.

A35. The extent of supervision reflects the auditor's assessment of risks of material misstatement due to fraud and the competencies of the engagement team members performing the work.

### *Unpredictability in the Selection of Audit Procedures (Ref: Para. 29(c))*

A36. Incorporating an element of unpredictability in the selection of the nature, timing and extent of audit procedures to be performed is important as individuals within the entity who are familiar with the audit procedures normally performed on engagements may be more able to conceal fraudulent financial reporting. This can be achieved by, for example:

- Performing substantive procedures on selected account balances and assertions not otherwise tested due to their materiality or risk.
- Adjusting the timing of audit procedures from that otherwise expected.
- Using different sampling methods.
- Performing audit procedures at different locations or at locations on an unannounced basis.

### *Audit Procedures Responsive to Assessed Risks of Material Misstatement Due to Fraud at the Assertion Level (Ref: Para. 30)*

A37. The auditor's responses to address the assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud at the assertion level may include changing the nature, timing and extent of audit procedures in the following ways:

- The nature of audit procedures to be performed may need to be changed to obtain audit evidence that is more reliable and relevant or to obtain additional corroborative information. This may affect both the type of audit procedures to be performed and their combination. For example:

- Physical observation or inspection of certain assets may become more important or the auditor may choose to use computer-assisted audit techniques to gather more evidence about data contained in significant accounts or electronic transaction files.
  - The auditor may design procedures to obtain additional corroborative information. For example, if the auditor identifies that management is under pressure to meet earnings expectations, there may be a related risk that management is inflating sales by entering into sales agreements that include terms that preclude revenue recognition or by invoicing sales before delivery. In these circumstances, the auditor may, for example, design external confirmations not only to confirm outstanding amounts, but also to confirm the details of the sales agreements, including date, any rights of return and delivery terms. In addition, the auditor might find it effective to supplement such external confirmations with inquiries of non-financial personnel in the entity regarding any changes in sales agreements and delivery terms.
  - The timing of substantive procedures may need to be modified. The auditor may conclude that performing substantive testing at or near the period end better addresses an assessed risk of material misstatement due to fraud. The auditor may conclude that, given the assessed risks of intentional misstatement or manipulation, audit procedures to extend audit conclusions from an interim date to the period end would not be effective. In contrast, because an intentional misstatement – for example, a misstatement involving improper revenue recognition – may have been initiated in an interim period, the auditor may elect to apply substantive procedures to transactions occurring earlier in or throughout the reporting period.
  - The extent of the procedures applied reflects the assessment of the risks of material misstatement due to fraud. For example, increasing sample sizes or performing analytical procedures at a more detailed level may be appropriate. Also, computer-assisted audit techniques may enable more extensive testing of electronic transactions and account files. Such techniques can be used to select sample transactions from key electronic files, to sort transactions with specific characteristics, or to test an entire population instead of a sample.
- A38. If the auditor identifies a risk of material misstatement due to fraud that affects inventory quantities, examining the entity's inventory records may help to identify locations or items that require specific attention during or after the physical inventory count. Such a review may lead to a decision to observe inventory counts at certain locations on an unannounced basis or to conduct inventory counts at all locations on the same date.
- A39. The auditor may identify a risk of material misstatement due to fraud affecting a number of accounts and assertions. These may include asset valuation, estimates relating to specific transactions (such as acquisitions, restructurings, or disposals of a segment of the business), and other significant accrued liabilities (such as pension and other post-employment benefit obligations, or environmental remediation liabilities). The risk may also relate to significant changes in assumptions relating to recurring estimates. Information gathered through obtaining an understanding of the entity and its environment may assist the auditor in evaluating the reasonableness of such management estimates and underlying judgments and assumptions. A retrospective review of similar management judgments and assumptions applied in prior periods may also provide insight about the reasonableness of judgments and assumptions supporting management estimates.

A40. Examples of possible audit procedures to address the assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud, including those that illustrate the incorporation of an element of unpredictability, are presented in Appendix 2. The appendix includes examples of responses to the auditor's assessment of the risks of material misstatement resulting from both fraudulent financial reporting, including fraudulent financial reporting resulting from revenue recognition, and misappropriation of assets.

#### Audit Procedures Responsive to Risks Related to Management Override of Controls

##### Journal Entries and Other Adjustments (Ref: Para. 32(a))

A41. Material misstatement of financial statements due to fraud often involve the manipulation of the financial reporting process by recording inappropriate or unauthorized journal entries. This may occur throughout the year or at period end, or by management making adjustments to amounts reported in the financial statements that are not reflected in journal entries, such as through consolidating adjustments and reclassifications.

A42. Further, the auditor's consideration of the risks of material misstatement associated with inappropriate override of controls over journal entries<sup>52</sup> is important since automated processes and controls may reduce the risk of inadvertent error but do not overcome the risk that individuals may inappropriately override such automated processes, for example, by changing the amounts being automatically passed to the general ledger or to the financial reporting system. Furthermore, where IT is used to transfer information automatically, there may be little or no visible evidence of such intervention in the information systems.

A43. When identifying and selecting journal entries and other adjustments for testing and determining the appropriate method of examining the underlying support for the items selected, the following matters are of relevance:

- *The identification and assessment of the risks of material misstatement due to fraud – the presence of fraud risk factors and other information obtained during the auditor's identification and assessment of the risks of material misstatement due to fraud may assist the auditor to identify specific classes of journal entries and other adjustments for testing.*
- *Controls that have been implemented over journal entries and other adjustments – effective controls over the preparation and posting of journal entries and other adjustments may reduce the extent of substantive testing necessary, provided that the auditor has tested the operating effectiveness of the controls.*
- *The entity's financial reporting process and the nature of evidence that can be obtained – for many entities routine processing of transactions involves a combination of manual and automated ~~steps and procedures controls~~. Similarly, the processing of journal entries and other adjustments may involve both manual and automated ~~procedures and controls~~. Where information technology is used in the financial reporting process, journal entries and other adjustments may exist only in electronic form.*
- *The characteristics of fraudulent journal entries or other adjustments – inappropriate journal entries or other adjustments often have unique identifying characteristics. Such characteristics may include entries (a) made to unrelated, unusual, or seldom-used accounts, (b) made by*

---

<sup>52</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraph 20(c)

individuals who typically do not make journal entries, (c) recorded at the end of the period or as post-closing entries that have little or no explanation or description, (d) made either before or during the preparation of the financial statements that do not have account numbers, or (e) containing round numbers or consistent ending numbers.

- *The nature and complexity of the accounts* – inappropriate journal entries or adjustments may be applied to accounts that (a) contain transactions that are complex or unusual in nature, (b) contain significant estimates and period-end adjustments, (c) have been prone to misstatements in the past, (d) have not been reconciled on a timely basis or contain unreconciled differences, (e) contain inter-company transactions, or (f) are otherwise associated with an identified risk of material misstatement due to fraud. In audits of entities that have several locations or components, consideration is given to the need to select journal entries from multiple locations.
- *Journal entries or other adjustments processed outside the normal course of business* – non standard journal entries may not be subject to the same ~~level of internal~~ level of internal nature and extent of controls as those journal entries used on a recurring basis to record transactions such as monthly sales, purchases and cash disbursements.

A44. The auditor uses professional judgment in determining the nature, timing and extent of testing of journal entries and other adjustments. However, because fraudulent journal entries and other adjustments are often made at the end of a reporting period, paragraph 32(a)(ii) requires the auditor to select the journal entries and other adjustments made at that time. Further, because material misstatements in financial statements due to fraud can occur throughout the period and may involve extensive efforts to conceal how the fraud is accomplished, paragraph 32(a)(iii) requires the auditor to consider whether there is also a need to test journal entries and other adjustments throughout the period.

#### Accounting Estimates (Ref: Para. 32(b))

A45. The preparation of the financial statements requires management to make a number of judgments or assumptions that affect significant accounting estimates and to monitor the reasonableness of such estimates on an ongoing basis. Fraudulent financial reporting is often accomplished through intentional misstatement of accounting estimates. This may be achieved by, for example, understating or overstating all provisions or reserves in the same fashion so as to be designed either to smooth earnings over two or more accounting periods, or to achieve a designated earnings level in order to deceive financial statement users by influencing their perceptions as to the entity's performance and profitability.

A46. The purpose of performing a retrospective review of management judgments and assumptions related to significant accounting estimates reflected in the financial statements of the prior year is to determine whether there is an indication of a possible bias on the part of management. It is not intended to call into question the auditor's professional judgments made in the prior year that were based on information available at the time.

A47. A retrospective review is also required by ISA 540.<sup>53</sup> That review is conducted as a risk assessment procedure to obtain information regarding the effectiveness of management's prior period estimation process, audit evidence about the outcome, or where applicable, the subsequent re-estimation of prior period accounting estimates that is pertinent to making current period accounting estimates, and audit evidence of matters, such as estimation uncertainty, that may be required to be disclosed in the financial

<sup>53</sup> ISA 540, *Auditing Accounting Estimates, Including Fair Value Accounting Estimates, and Related Disclosures*, paragraph 9

statements. As a practical matter, the auditor's review of management judgments and assumptions for biases that could represent a risk of material misstatement due to fraud in accordance with this ISA may be carried out in conjunction with the review required by ISA 540.

#### Business Rationale for Significant Transactions (Ref: Para. 32(c))

A48. Indicators that may suggest that significant transactions that are outside the normal course of business for the entity, or that otherwise appear to be unusual, may have been entered into to engage in fraudulent financial reporting or to conceal misappropriation of assets include:

- The form of such transactions appears overly complex (for example, the transaction involves multiple entities within a consolidated group or multiple unrelated third parties).
- Management has not discussed the nature of and accounting for such transactions with those charged with governance of the entity, and there is inadequate documentation.
- Management is placing more emphasis on the need for a particular accounting treatment than on the underlying economics of the transaction.
- Transactions that involve non-consolidated related parties, including special purpose entities, have not been properly reviewed or approved by those charged with governance of the entity.
- The transactions involve previously unidentified related parties or parties that do not have the substance or the financial strength to support the transaction without assistance from the entity under audit.

#### Evaluation of Audit Evidence (Ref: Para. 34–37)

A49. ISA 330 requires the auditor, based on the audit procedures performed and the audit evidence obtained, to evaluate whether the assessments of the risks of material misstatement at the assertion level remain appropriate.<sup>54</sup> This evaluation is primarily a qualitative matter based on the auditor's judgment. Such an evaluation may provide further insight about the risks of material misstatement due to fraud and whether there is a need to perform additional or different audit procedures. Appendix 3 contains examples of circumstances that may indicate the possibility of fraud.

#### Analytical Procedures Performed Near the End of the Audit in Forming an Overall Conclusion (Ref: Para. 34)

A50. Determining which particular trends and relationships may indicate a risk of material misstatement due to fraud requires professional judgment. Unusual relationships involving year-end revenue and income are particularly relevant. These might include, for example: uncharacteristically large amounts of income being reported in the last few weeks of the reporting period or unusual transactions; or income that is inconsistent with trends in cash flow from operations.

#### Consideration of Identified Misstatements (Ref: Para. 35–37)

A51. Since fraud involves incentive or pressure to commit fraud, a perceived opportunity to do so or some rationalization of the act, an instance of fraud is unlikely to be an isolated occurrence. Accordingly,

---

<sup>54</sup> ISA 330, paragraph 25

misstatements, such as numerous misstatements at a specific location even though the cumulative effect is not material, may be indicative of a risk of material misstatement due to fraud.

A52. The implications of identified fraud depend on the circumstances. For example, an otherwise insignificant fraud may be significant if it involves senior management. In such circumstances, the reliability of evidence previously obtained may be called into question, since there may be doubts about the completeness and truthfulness of representations made and about the genuineness of accounting records and documentation. There may also be a possibility of collusion involving employees, management or third parties.

A53. ISA 450<sup>55</sup> and ISA 700 (Revised)<sup>56</sup> establish requirements and provide guidance on the evaluation and disposition of misstatements and the effect on the auditor's opinion in the auditor's report.

#### **Auditor Unable to Continue the Engagement (Ref: Para. 38)**

A54. Examples of exceptional circumstances that may arise and that may bring into question the auditor's ability to continue performing the audit include:

- The entity does not take the appropriate action regarding fraud that the auditor considers necessary in the circumstances, even where the fraud is not material to the financial statements;
- The auditor's consideration of the risks of material misstatement due to fraud and the results of audit tests indicate a significant risk of material and pervasive fraud; or
- The auditor has significant concern about the competence or integrity of management or those charged with governance.

A55. Because of the variety of the circumstances that may arise, it is not possible to describe definitively when withdrawal from an engagement is appropriate. Factors that affect the auditor's conclusion include the implications of the involvement of a member of management or of those charged with governance (which may affect the reliability of management representations) and the effects on the auditor of a continuing association with the entity.

A56. The auditor has professional and legal responsibilities in such circumstances and these responsibilities may vary by country. In some countries, for example, the auditor may be entitled to, or required to, make a statement or report to the person or persons who made the audit appointment or, in some cases, to regulatory authorities. Given the exceptional nature of the circumstances and the need to consider the legal requirements, the auditor may consider it appropriate to seek legal advice when deciding whether to withdraw from an engagement and in determining an appropriate course of action, including the possibility of reporting to shareholders, regulators or others.<sup>57</sup>

#### *Considerations Specific to Public Sector Entities*

A57. In many cases in the public sector, the option of withdrawing from the engagement may not be available to the auditor due to the nature of the mandate or public interest considerations.

---

<sup>55</sup> ISA 450, *Evaluation of Misstatements Identified during the Audit*

<sup>56</sup> ISA 700 (Revised), *Forming an Opinion and Reporting on Financial Statements*

<sup>57</sup> The IESBA *Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants* provides guidance on communications with an auditor replacing the existing auditor.

### **Written Representations (Ref: Para. 39)**

A58. ISA 580<sup>58</sup> establishes requirements and provides guidance on obtaining appropriate representations from management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance in the audit. In addition to acknowledging that they have fulfilled their responsibility for the preparation of the financial statements, it is important that, irrespective of the size of the entity, management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance acknowledge their responsibility for internal control designed, implemented and maintained to prevent and detect fraud.

A59. Because of the nature of fraud and the difficulties encountered by auditors in detecting material misstatements in the financial statements resulting from fraud, it is important that the auditor obtain a written representation from management and, where appropriate, those charged with governance confirming that they have disclosed to the auditor:

- (a) The results of management's assessment of the risk that the financial statements may be materially misstated as a result of fraud; and
- (b) Their knowledge of actual, suspected or alleged fraud affecting the entity.

### **Communications to Management and with Those Charged with Governance**

#### *Communication to Management (Ref: Para. 40)*

A60. When the auditor has obtained evidence that fraud exists or may exist, it is important that the matter be brought to the attention of the appropriate level of management as soon as practicable. This is so even if the matter might be considered inconsequential (for example, a minor defalcation by an employee at a low level in the entity's organization). The determination of which level of management is the appropriate one is a matter of professional judgment and is affected by such factors as the likelihood of collusion and the nature and magnitude of the suspected fraud. Ordinarily, the appropriate level of management is at least one level above the persons who appear to be involved with the suspected fraud.

#### *Communication with Those Charged with Governance (Ref: Para. 41)*

A61. The auditor's communication with those charged with governance may be made orally or in writing. ISA 260 (Revised) identifies factors the auditor considers in determining whether to communicate orally or in writing.<sup>59</sup> Due to the nature and sensitivity of fraud involving senior management, or fraud that results in a material misstatement in the financial statements, the auditor reports such matters on a timely basis and may consider it necessary to also report such matters in writing.

A62. In some cases, the auditor may consider it appropriate to communicate with those charged with governance when the auditor becomes aware of fraud involving employees other than management that does not result in a material misstatement. Similarly, those charged with governance may wish to be informed of such circumstances. The communication process is assisted if the auditor and those charged with governance agree at an early stage in the audit about the nature and extent of the auditor's communications in this regard.

---

<sup>58</sup> ISA 580, *Written Representations*

<sup>59</sup> ISA 260 (Revised), paragraph A38

A63. In the exceptional circumstances where the auditor has doubts about the integrity or honesty of management or those charged with governance, the auditor may consider it appropriate to obtain legal advice to assist in determining the appropriate course of action.

*Other Matters Related to Fraud* (Ref: Para. 42)

A64. Other matters related to fraud to be discussed with those charged with governance of the entity may include, for example:

- Concerns about the nature, extent and frequency of management's assessments of the controls in place to prevent and detect fraud and of the risk that the financial statements may be misstated.
- A failure by management to appropriately address identified significant deficiencies in internal control, or to appropriately respond to an identified fraud.
- The auditor's evaluation of the entity's control environment, including questions regarding the competence and integrity of management.
- Actions by management that may be indicative of fraudulent financial reporting, such as management's selection and application of accounting policies that may be indicative of management's effort to manage earnings in order to deceive financial statement users by influencing their perceptions as to the entity's performance and profitability.
- Concerns about the adequacy and completeness of the authorization of transactions that appear to be outside the normal course of business.

**Communications to Regulatory and Enforcement Authorities** (Ref: Para. 43)

A65. The auditor's professional duty to maintain the confidentiality of client information may preclude reporting fraud to a party outside the client entity. However, the auditor's legal responsibilities vary by country and, in certain circumstances, the duty of confidentiality may be overridden by statute, the law or courts of law. In some countries, the auditor of a financial institution has a statutory duty to report the occurrence of fraud to supervisory authorities. Also, in some countries the auditor has a duty to report misstatements to authorities in those cases where management and those charged with governance fail to take corrective action.

A66. The auditor may consider it appropriate to obtain legal advice to determine the appropriate course of action in the circumstances, the purpose of which is to ascertain the steps necessary in considering the public interest aspects of identified fraud.

*Considerations Specific to Public Sector Entities*

A67. In the public sector, requirements for reporting fraud, whether or not discovered through the audit process, may be subject to specific provisions of the audit mandate or related law, regulation or other authority.

## Appendix 1

(Ref: Para. A25)

### Examples of Fraud Risk Factors

The fraud risk factors identified in this Appendix are examples of such factors that may be faced by auditors in a broad range of situations. Separately presented are examples relating to the two types of fraud relevant to the auditor's consideration – that is, fraudulent financial reporting and misappropriation of assets. For each of these types of fraud, the risk factors are further classified based on the three conditions generally present when material misstatements due to fraud occur: (a) incentives/pressures, (b) opportunities, and (c) attitudes/rationalizations. Although the risk factors cover a broad range of situations, they are only examples and, accordingly, the auditor may identify additional or different risk factors. Not all of these examples are relevant in all circumstances, and some may be of greater or lesser significance in entities of different size or with different ownership characteristics or circumstances. Also, the order of the examples of risk factors provided is not intended to reflect their relative importance or frequency of occurrence.

Fraud risk factors related to incentives or pressures typically arise from conditions that create susceptibility to misstatement due to management bias or fraud (which is an inherent risk factor). Fraud risk factors related to opportunities may also arise from other identified inherent risk factors (e.g., complexity or uncertainty may create opportunities that result in susceptibility to misstatement due to fraud). Fraud risk factors related to opportunities may also relate to conditions within the entity's system of internal control, such as limitations or deficiencies in the entity's internal control that create such opportunities. Fraud risk factors related to attitudes or rationalizations may arise, in particular, from limitations or deficiencies in the entity's control environment.

### Risk Factors Relating to Misstatements Arising from Fraudulent Financial Reporting

The following are examples of risk factors relating to misstatements arising from fraudulent financial reporting.

#### *Incentives/Pressures*

Financial stability or profitability is threatened by economic, industry, or entity operating conditions, such as (or as indicated by):

- High degree of competition or market saturation, accompanied by declining margins.
- High vulnerability to rapid changes, such as changes in technology, product obsolescence, or interest rates.
- Significant declines in customer demand and increasing business failures in either the industry or overall economy.
- Operating losses making the threat of bankruptcy, foreclosure, or hostile takeover imminent.
- Recurring negative cash flows from operations or an inability to generate cash flows from operations while reporting earnings and earnings growth.
- Rapid growth or unusual profitability especially compared to that of other companies in the same industry.
- New accounting, statutory, or regulatory requirements.

Excessive pressure exists for management to meet the requirements or expectations of third parties due to the following:

- Profitability or trend level expectations of investment analysts, institutional investors, significant creditors, or other external parties (particularly expectations that are unduly aggressive or unrealistic), including expectations created by management in, for example, overly optimistic press releases or annual report messages.
- Need to obtain additional debt or equity financing to stay competitive – including financing of major research and development or capital expenditures.
- Marginal ability to meet exchange listing requirements or debt repayment or other debt covenant requirements.
- Perceived or real adverse effects of reporting poor financial results on significant pending transactions, such as business combinations or contract awards.

Information available indicates that the personal financial situation of management or those charged with governance is threatened by the entity's financial performance arising from the following:

- Significant financial interests in the entity.
- Significant portions of their compensation (for example, bonuses, stock options, and earn-out arrangements) being contingent upon achieving aggressive targets for stock price, operating results, financial position, or cash flow.<sup>60</sup>
- Personal guarantees of debts of the entity.

There is excessive pressure on management or operating personnel to meet financial targets established by those charged with governance, including sales or profitability incentive goals.

### *Opportunities*

The nature of the industry or the entity's operations provides opportunities to engage in fraudulent financial reporting that can arise from the following:

- Significant related-party transactions not in the ordinary course of business or with related entities not audited or audited by another firm.
- A strong financial presence or ability to dominate a certain industry sector that allows the entity to dictate terms or conditions to suppliers or customers that may result in inappropriate or non-arm's-length transactions.
- Assets, liabilities, revenues, or expenses based on significant estimates that involve subjective judgments or uncertainties that are difficult to corroborate.
- Significant, unusual, or highly complex transactions, especially those close to period end that pose difficult "substance over form" questions.
- Significant operations located or conducted across international borders in jurisdictions where differing business environments and cultures exist.

---

<sup>60</sup> Management incentive plans may be contingent upon achieving targets relating only to certain accounts or selected activities of the entity, even though the related accounts or activities may not be material to the entity as a whole.

- Use of business intermediaries for which there appears to be no clear business justification.
- Significant bank accounts or subsidiary or branch operations in tax-haven jurisdictions for which there appears to be no clear business justification.

The monitoring of management is not effective as a result of the following:

- Domination of management by a single person or small group (in a non owner-managed business) without compensating controls.
- Oversight by those charged with governance over the financial reporting process and internal control is not effective.

There is a complex or unstable organizational structure, as evidenced by the following:

- Difficulty in determining the organization or individuals that have controlling interest in the entity.
- Overly complex organizational structure involving unusual legal entities or managerial lines of authority.
- High turnover of senior management, legal counsel, or those charged with governance.

~~Internal control components are deficient~~ Deficiencies in internal control as a result of the following:

- ~~Inadequate monitoring of controls process to monitor the entity's system of internal control~~, including automated controls and controls over interim financial reporting (where external reporting is required).
- High turnover rates or employment of staff in accounting, information technology, or the internal audit function that are not effective.
- Accounting and information systems that are not effective, including situations involving significant deficiencies in internal control.

#### *Attitudes/Rationalizations*

- Communication, implementation, support, or enforcement of the entity's values or ethical standards by management, or the communication of inappropriate values or ethical standards, that are not effective.
- Nonfinancial management's excessive participation in or preoccupation with the selection of accounting policies or the determination of significant estimates.
- Known history of violations of securities laws or other laws and regulations, or claims against the entity, its senior management, or those charged with governance alleging fraud or violations of laws and regulations.
- Excessive interest by management in maintaining or increasing the entity's stock price or earnings trend.
- The practice by management of committing to analysts, creditors, and other third parties to achieve aggressive or unrealistic forecasts.
- Management failing to remedy known significant deficiencies in internal control on a timely basis.
- An interest by management in employing inappropriate means to minimize reported earnings for tax-motivated reasons.
- Low morale among senior management.
- The owner-manager makes no distinction between personal and business transactions.

- Dispute between shareholders in a closely held entity.
- Recurring attempts by management to justify marginal or inappropriate accounting on the basis of materiality.
- The relationship between management and the current or predecessor auditor is strained, as exhibited by the following:
  - Frequent disputes with the current or predecessor auditor on accounting, auditing, or reporting matters.
  - Unreasonable demands on the auditor, such as unrealistic time constraints regarding the completion of the audit or the issuance of the auditor's report.
  - Restrictions on the auditor that inappropriately limit access to people or information or the ability to communicate effectively with those charged with governance.
  - Domineering management behavior in dealing with the auditor, especially involving attempts to influence the scope of the auditor's work or the selection or continuance of personnel assigned to or consulted on the audit engagement.

### **Risk Factors Arising from Misstatements Arising from Misappropriation of Assets**

Risk factors that relate to misstatements arising from misappropriation of assets are also classified according to the three conditions generally present when fraud exists: incentives/pressures, opportunities, and attitudes/rationalization. Some of the risk factors related to misstatements arising from fraudulent financial reporting also may be present when misstatements arising from misappropriation of assets occur. For example, ineffective monitoring of management and other deficiencies in internal control may be present when misstatements due to either fraudulent financial reporting or misappropriation of assets exist. The following are examples of risk factors related to misstatements arising from misappropriation of assets.

#### *Incentives/Pressures*

Personal financial obligations may create pressure on management or employees with access to cash or other assets susceptible to theft to misappropriate those assets.

Adverse relationships between the entity and employees with access to cash or other assets susceptible to theft may motivate those employees to misappropriate those assets. For example, adverse relationships may be created by the following:

- Known or anticipated future employee layoffs.
- Recent or anticipated changes to employee compensation or benefit plans.
- Promotions, compensation, or other rewards inconsistent with expectations.

#### *Opportunities*

Certain characteristics or circumstances may increase the susceptibility of assets to misappropriation. For example, opportunities to misappropriate assets increase when there are the following:

- Large amounts of cash on hand or processed.
- Inventory items that are small in size, of high value, or in high demand.

- Easily convertible assets, such as bearer bonds, diamonds, or computer chips.
- Fixed assets which are small in size, marketable, or lacking observable identification of ownership.

Inadequate ~~internal controls~~ over assets may increase the susceptibility of misappropriation of those assets. For example, misappropriation of assets may occur because there is the following:

- Inadequate segregation of duties or independent checks.
- Inadequate oversight of senior management expenditures, such as travel and other re-imbursements.
- Inadequate management oversight of employees responsible for assets, for example, inadequate supervision or monitoring of remote locations.
- Inadequate job applicant screening of employees with access to assets.
- Inadequate record keeping with respect to assets.
- Inadequate system of authorization and approval of transactions (for example, in purchasing).
- Inadequate physical safeguards over cash, investments, inventory, or fixed assets.
- Lack of complete and timely reconciliations of assets.
- Lack of timely and appropriate documentation of transactions, for example, credits for merchandise returns.
- Lack of mandatory vacations for employees performing key control functions.
- Inadequate management understanding of information technology, which enables information technology employees to perpetrate a misappropriation.
- Inadequate access controls over automated records, including controls over and review of computer systems event logs.

#### *Attitudes/Rationalizations*

- Disregard for the need for monitoring or reducing risks related to misappropriations of assets.
- Disregard for ~~internal controls~~ over misappropriation of assets by overriding existing controls or by failing to take appropriate remedial action on known deficiencies in internal control.
- Behavior indicating displeasure or dissatisfaction with the entity or its treatment of the employee.
- Changes in behavior or lifestyle that may indicate assets have been misappropriated.
- Tolerance of petty theft.

## **Examples of Possible Audit Procedures to Address the Assessed Risks of Material Misstatement Due to Fraud**

The following are examples of possible audit procedures to address the assessed risks of material misstatement due to fraud resulting from both fraudulent financial reporting and misappropriation of assets. Although these procedures cover a broad range of situations, they are only examples and, accordingly they may not be the most appropriate nor necessary in each circumstance. Also the order of the procedures provided is not intended to reflect their relative importance.

### **Consideration at the Assertion Level**

Specific responses to the auditor's assessment of the risks of material misstatement due to fraud will vary depending upon the types or combinations of fraud risk factors or conditions identified, and the classes of transactions, account balances, disclosures and assertions they may affect.

The following are specific examples of responses:

- Visiting locations or performing certain tests on a surprise or unannounced basis. For example, observing inventory at locations where auditor attendance has not been previously announced or counting cash at a particular date on a surprise basis.
- Requesting that inventories be counted at the end of the reporting period or on a date closer to period end to minimize the risk of manipulation of balances in the period between the date of completion of the count and the end of the reporting period.
- Altering the audit approach in the current year. For example, contacting major customers and suppliers orally in addition to sending written confirmation, sending confirmation requests to a specific party within an organization, or seeking more or different information.
- Performing a detailed review of the entity's quarter-end or year-end adjusting entries and investigating any that appear unusual as to nature or amount.
- For significant and unusual transactions, particularly those occurring at or near year-end, investigating the possibility of related parties and the sources of financial resources supporting the transactions.
- Performing substantive analytical procedures using disaggregated data. For example, comparing sales and cost of sales by location, line of business or month to expectations developed by the auditor.
- Conducting interviews of personnel involved in areas where a risk of material misstatement due to fraud has been identified, to obtain their insights about the risk and whether, or how, controls address the risk.
- When other independent auditors are auditing the financial statements of one or more subsidiaries, divisions or branches, discussing with them the extent of work necessary to be performed to address the assessed risk of material misstatement due to fraud resulting from transactions and activities among these components.
- If the work of an expert becomes particularly significant with respect to a financial statement item for which the assessed risk of material misstatement due to fraud is high, performing additional procedures

relating to some or all of the expert's assumptions, methods or findings to determine that the findings are not unreasonable, or engaging another expert for that purpose.

- Performing audit procedures to analyze selected opening balance sheet accounts of previously audited financial statements to assess how certain issues involving accounting estimates and judgments, for example, an allowance for sales returns, were resolved with the benefit of hindsight.
- Performing procedures on account or other reconciliations prepared by the entity, including considering reconciliations performed at interim periods.
- Performing computer-assisted techniques, such as data mining to test for anomalies in a population.
- Testing the integrity of computer-produced records and transactions.
- Seeking additional audit evidence from sources outside of the entity being audited.

### **Specific Responses—Misstatement Resulting from Fraudulent Financial Reporting**

Examples of responses to the auditor's assessment of the risks of material misstatement due to fraudulent financial reporting are as follows:

#### *Revenue Recognition*

- Performing substantive analytical procedures relating to revenue using disaggregated data, for example, comparing revenue reported by month and by product line or business segment during the current reporting period with comparable prior periods. Computer-assisted audit techniques may be useful in identifying unusual or unexpected revenue relationships or transactions.
- Confirming with customers certain relevant contract terms and the absence of side agreements, because the appropriate accounting often is influenced by such terms or agreements and basis for rebates or the period to which they relate are often poorly documented. For example, acceptance criteria, delivery and payment terms, the absence of future or continuing vendor obligations, the right to return the product, guaranteed resale amounts, and cancellation or refund provisions often are relevant in such circumstances.
- Inquiring of the entity's sales and marketing personnel or in-house legal counsel regarding sales or shipments near the end of the period and their knowledge of any unusual terms or conditions associated with these transactions.
- Being physically present at one or more locations at period end to observe goods being shipped or being readied for shipment (or returns awaiting processing) and performing other appropriate sales and inventory cutoff procedures.
- For those situations for which revenue transactions are electronically initiated, processed, and recorded, testing controls to determine whether they provide assurance that recorded revenue transactions occurred and are properly recorded.

#### *Inventory Quantities*

- Examining the entity's inventory records to identify locations or items that require specific attention during or after the physical inventory count.

- Observing inventory counts at certain locations on an unannounced basis or conducting inventory counts at all locations on the same date.
- Conducting inventory counts at or near the end of the reporting period to minimize the risk of inappropriate manipulation during the period between the count and the end of the reporting period.
- Performing additional procedures during the observation of the count, for example, more rigorously examining the contents of boxed items, the manner in which the goods are stacked (for example, hollow squares) or labeled, and the quality (that is, purity, grade, or concentration) of liquid substances such as perfumes or specialty chemicals. Using the work of an expert may be helpful in this regard.
- Comparing the quantities for the current period with prior periods by class or category of inventory, location or other criteria, or comparison of quantities counted with perpetual records.
- Using computer-assisted audit techniques to further test the compilation of the physical inventory counts – for example, sorting by tag number to test tag controls or by item serial number to test the possibility of item omission or duplication.

#### *Management Estimates*

- Using an expert to develop an independent estimate for comparison to management's estimate.
- Extending inquiries to individuals outside of management and the accounting department to corroborate management's ability and intent to carry out plans that are relevant to developing the estimate.

#### **Specific Responses—Misstatements Due to Misappropriation of Assets**

Differing circumstances would necessarily dictate different responses. Ordinarily, the audit response to an assessed risk of material misstatement due to fraud relating to misappropriation of assets will be directed toward certain account balances and classes of transactions. Although some of the audit responses noted in the two categories above may apply in such circumstances, the scope of the work is to be linked to the specific information about the misappropriation risk that has been identified.

Examples of responses to the auditor's assessment of the risk of material misstatements due to misappropriation of assets are as follows:

- Counting cash or securities at or near year-end.
- Confirming directly with customers the account activity (including credit memo and sales return activity as well as dates payments were made) for the period under audit.
- Analyzing recoveries of written-off accounts.
- Analyzing inventory shortages by location or product type.
- Comparing key inventory ratios to industry norm.
- Reviewing supporting documentation for reductions to the perpetual inventory records.
- Performing a computerized match of the vendor list with a list of employees to identify matches of addresses or phone numbers.
- Performing a computerized search of payroll records to identify duplicate addresses, employee identification or taxing authority numbers or bank accounts.

- Reviewing personnel files for those that contain little or no evidence of activity, for example, lack of performance evaluations.
- Analyzing sales discounts and returns for unusual patterns or trends.
- Confirming specific terms of contracts with third parties.
- Obtaining evidence that contracts are being carried out in accordance with their terms.
- Reviewing the propriety of large and unusual expenses.
- Reviewing the authorization and carrying value of senior management and related party loans.
- Reviewing the level and propriety of expense reports submitted by senior management.

### **Examples of Circumstances that Indicate the Possibility of Fraud**

The following are examples of circumstances that may indicate the possibility that the financial statements may contain a material misstatement resulting from fraud.

#### *Discrepancies in the accounting records, including:*

- Transactions that are not recorded in a complete or timely manner or are improperly recorded as to amount, accounting period, classification, or entity policy.
- Unsupported or unauthorized balances or transactions.
- Last-minute adjustments that significantly affect financial results.
- Evidence of employees' access to systems and records inconsistent with that necessary to perform their authorized duties.
- Tips or complaints to the auditor about alleged fraud.

#### *Conflicting or missing evidence, including:*

- Missing documents.
- Documents that appear to have been altered.
- Unavailability of other than photocopied or electronically transmitted documents when documents in original form are expected to exist.
- Significant unexplained items on reconciliations.
- Unusual balance sheet changes, or changes in trends or important financial statement ratios or relationships – for example, receivables growing faster than revenues.
- Inconsistent, vague, or implausible responses from management or employees arising from inquiries or analytical procedures.
- Unusual discrepancies between the entity's records and confirmation replies.
- Large numbers of credit entries and other adjustments made to accounts receivable records.
- Unexplained or inadequately explained differences between the accounts receivable sub-ledger and the control account, or between the customer statements and the accounts receivable sub-ledger.
- Missing or non-existent cancelled checks in circumstances where cancelled checks are ordinarily returned to the entity with the bank statement.
- Missing inventory or physical assets of significant magnitude.
- Unavailable or missing electronic evidence, inconsistent with the entity's record retention practices or policies.
- Fewer responses to confirmations than anticipated or a greater number of responses than anticipated.

- Inability to produce evidence of key systems development and program change testing and implementation activities for current-year system changes and deployments.

*Problematic or unusual relationships between the auditor and management, including:*

- Denial of access to records, facilities, certain employees, customers, vendors, or others from whom audit evidence might be sought.
- Undue time pressures imposed by management to resolve complex or contentious issues.
- Complaints by management about the conduct of the audit or management intimidation of engagement team members, particularly in connection with the auditor's critical assessment of audit evidence or in the resolution of potential disagreements with management.
- Unusual delays by the entity in providing requested information.
- Unwillingness to facilitate auditor access to key electronic files for testing through the use of computer-assisted audit techniques.
- Denial of access to key IT operations staff and facilities, including security, operations, and systems development personnel.
- An unwillingness to add or revise disclosures in the financial statements to make them more complete and understandable.
- An unwillingness to address identified deficiencies in internal control on a timely basis.

*Other*

- Unwillingness by management to permit the auditor to meet privately with those charged with governance.
- Accounting policies that appear to be at variance with industry norms.
- Frequent changes in accounting estimates that do not appear to result from changed circumstances.
- Tolerance of violations of the entity's code of conduct.

## INTERNATIONAL STANDARD ON AUDITING 330 THE AUDITOR'S RESPONSES TO ASSESSED RISKS

### Introduction

#### Scope of this ISA

1. This International Standard on Auditing (ISA) deals with the auditor's responsibility to design and implement responses to the risks of material misstatement identified and assessed by the auditor in accordance with ISA 315 (Revised)<sup>61</sup> in an audit of financial statements.

#### Effective Date

2. This ISA is effective for audits of financial statements for periods beginning on or after December 15, 2009.

#### Objective

3. The objective of the auditor is to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence regarding the assessed risks of material misstatement, through designing and implementing appropriate responses to those risks.

#### Definitions

4. For purposes of the ISAs, the following terms have the meanings attributed below:
  - (a) Substantive procedure – An audit procedure designed to detect material misstatements at the assertion level. Substantive procedures comprise:
    - (i) Tests of details (of classes of transactions, account balances, and disclosures); and
    - (ii) Substantive analytical procedures.
  - (b) Test of controls – An audit procedure designed to evaluate the operating effectiveness of controls in preventing, or detecting and correcting, material misstatements at the assertion level.

### Requirements

#### Overall Responses

5. The auditor shall design and implement overall responses to address the assessed risks of material misstatement at the financial statement level. (Ref: Para. A1–A3)

#### Audit Procedures Responsive to the Assessed Risks of Material Misstatement at the Assertion Level

6. The auditor shall design and perform further audit procedures whose nature, timing and extent are based on and are responsive to the assessed risks of material misstatement at the assertion level. (Ref: Para. A4–A8; A42-A52)

---

<sup>61</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), *Identifying and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement through Understanding the Entity and Its Environment*

7. In designing the further audit procedures to be performed, the auditor shall:
- (a) Consider the reasons for the assessment given to the risk of material misstatement at the assertion level for each significant class of transactions, account balance, and disclosure, including:
    - (i) The likelihood and magnitude of material misstatement due to the particular characteristics of the ~~relevant~~ significant class of transactions, account balance, or disclosure (that is, the inherent risk); and
    - (ii) Whether the risk assessment takes account of ~~relevant~~ controls that address the risk of material misstatement (that is, the control risk), thereby requiring the auditor to obtain audit evidence to determine whether the controls are operating effectively (that is, the auditor intends to rely on the operating effectiveness of controls in determining the nature, timing and extent of substantive procedures); and (Ref: Para. A9–A18)
  - (b) Obtain more persuasive audit evidence the higher the auditor's assessment of risk. (Ref: Para. A19)

#### *Tests of Controls*

8. The auditor shall design and perform tests of controls to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence as to the operating effectiveness of ~~relevant~~ controls if:
- (a) The auditor's assessment of risks of material misstatement at the assertion level includes an expectation that the controls are operating effectively (that is, the auditor intends to rely on the operating effectiveness of controls in determining the nature, timing and extent of substantive procedures); or
  - (b) Substantive procedures alone cannot provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence at the assertion level. (Ref: Para. A20–A24)
9. In designing and performing tests of controls, the auditor shall obtain more persuasive audit evidence the greater the reliance the auditor places on the effectiveness of a control. (Ref: Para. A25)

#### *Nature and Extent of Tests of Controls*

10. In designing and performing tests of controls, the auditor shall:
- (a) Perform other audit procedures in combination with inquiry to obtain audit evidence about the operating effectiveness of the controls, including:
    - (i) How the controls were applied at relevant times during the period under audit;
    - (ii) The consistency with which they were applied; and
    - (iii) By whom or by what means they were applied. (Ref: Para. A26–A29a)
  - (b) To the extent not already addressed, dDetermine whether the controls to be tested depend upon other controls (indirect controls), and, if so, whether it is necessary to obtain audit evidence supporting the effective operation of those indirect controls. (Ref: Para. A30–A31)

### Timing of Tests of Controls

11. The auditor shall test controls for the particular time, or throughout the period, for which the auditor intends to rely on those controls, subject to paragraphs 12 and 15 below, in order to provide an appropriate basis for the auditor's intended reliance. (Ref: Para. A32)

### Using audit evidence obtained during an interim period

12. If the auditor obtains audit evidence about the operating effectiveness of controls during an interim period, the auditor shall:
  - (a) Obtain audit evidence about significant changes to those controls subsequent to the interim period; and
  - (b) Determine the additional audit evidence to be obtained for the remaining period. (Ref: Para. A33–A34)

### Using audit evidence obtained in previous audits

13. In determining whether it is appropriate to use audit evidence about the operating effectiveness of controls obtained in previous audits, and, if so, the length of the time period that may elapse before retesting a control, the auditor shall consider the following:
  - (a) The effectiveness of other ~~elements~~ components of the entity's system of internal control, including the control environment, the entity's process to monitoring of the system of internal controls, and the entity's risk assessment process;
  - (b) The risks arising from the characteristics of the control, including whether it is manual or automated;
  - (c) The effectiveness of general IT controls;
  - (d) The effectiveness of the control and its application by the entity, including the nature and extent of deviations in the application of the control noted in previous audits, and whether there have been personnel changes that significantly affect the application of the control;
  - (e) Whether the lack of a change in a particular control poses a risk due to changing circumstances; and
  - (f) The risks of material misstatement and the extent of reliance on the control. (Ref: Para. A35)
14. If the auditor plans to use audit evidence from a previous audit about the operating effectiveness of specific controls, the auditor shall establish the continuing relevance and reliability of that evidence by obtaining audit evidence about whether significant changes in those controls have occurred subsequent to the previous audit. The auditor shall obtain this evidence by performing inquiry combined with observation or inspection, to confirm the understanding of those specific controls, and:
  - (a) If there have been changes that affect the continuing relevance of the audit evidence from the previous audit, the auditor shall test the controls in the current audit. (Ref: Para. A36)
  - (b) If there have not been such changes, the auditor shall test the controls at least once in every third audit, and shall test some controls each audit to avoid the possibility of testing all the controls on which the auditor intends to rely in a single audit period with no testing of controls in the subsequent two audit periods. (Ref: Para. A37–A39)

### Controls over significant risks

15. If the auditor plans to rely on controls over a risk the auditor has determined to be a significant risk, the auditor shall test those controls in the current period.

### Evaluating the Operating Effectiveness of Controls

16. When evaluating the operating effectiveness of ~~relevant~~ controls upon which the auditor intends to rely, the auditor shall evaluate whether misstatements that have been detected by substantive procedures indicate that controls are not operating effectively. The absence of misstatements detected by substantive procedures, however, does not provide audit evidence that controls related to the assertion being tested are effective. (Ref: Para. A40)
17. If deviations from controls upon which the auditor intends to rely are detected, the auditor shall make specific inquiries to understand these matters and their potential consequences, and shall determine whether: (Ref: Para. A41)
  - (a) The tests of controls that have been performed provide an appropriate basis for reliance on the controls;
  - (b) Additional tests of controls are necessary; or
  - (c) The ~~potential~~ risks of material misstatement need to be addressed using substantive procedures.

### Substantive Procedures

18. Irrespective of the assessed risks of material misstatement, the auditor shall design and perform substantive procedures for each ~~material~~ class of transactions, account balance, and disclosure that is quantitatively or qualitatively material. (Ref: Para. A42–A47)
19. The auditor shall consider whether external confirmation procedures are to be performed as substantive audit procedures. (Ref: Para. A48–A51)

### Substantive Procedures Related to the Financial Statement Closing Process

20. The auditor's substantive procedures shall include the following audit procedures related to the financial statement closing process:
  - (a) Agreeing or reconciling information in the financial statements with the underlying accounting records, including agreeing or reconciling information in disclosures, whether such information is obtained from within or outside of the general and subsidiary ledgers; and
  - (b) Examining material journal entries and other adjustments made during the course of preparing the financial statements. (Ref: Para. A52)

### Substantive Procedures Responsive to Significant Risks

21. If the auditor has determined that an assessed risk of material misstatement at the assertion level is a significant risk, the auditor shall perform substantive procedures that are specifically responsive to that risk. When the approach to a significant risk consists only of substantive procedures, those procedures shall include tests of details. (Ref: Para. A53)

### Timing of Substantive Procedures

22. If substantive procedures are performed at an interim date, the auditor shall cover the remaining period by performing:
- (a) substantive procedures, combined with tests of controls for the intervening period; or
  - (b) if the auditor determines that it is sufficient, further substantive procedures only,
- that provide a reasonable basis for extending the audit conclusions from the interim date to the period end. (Ref: Para. A54–A57)
23. If misstatements that the auditor did not expect when assessing the risks of material misstatement are detected at an interim date, the auditor shall evaluate whether the related assessment of risk and the planned nature, timing or extent of substantive procedures covering the remaining period need to be modified. (Ref: Para. A58)

### Adequacy of Presentation of the Financial Statements

24. The auditor shall perform audit procedures to evaluate whether the overall presentation of the financial statements is in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. In making this evaluation, the auditor shall consider whether the financial statements are presented in a manner that reflects the appropriate:
- Classification and description of financial information and the underlying transactions, events and conditions; and
  - Presentation, structure and content of the financial statements. (Ref: Para. A59)

### Evaluating the Sufficiency and Appropriateness of Audit Evidence

25. Based on the audit procedures performed and the audit evidence obtained, the auditor shall evaluate before the conclusion of the audit whether the assessments of the risks of material misstatement at the assertion level remain appropriate. (Ref: Para. A60–A61)
26. The auditor shall conclude whether sufficient appropriate audit evidence has been obtained. In forming an opinion, the auditor shall consider all relevant audit evidence, regardless of whether it appears to corroborate or to contradict the assertions in the financial statements. (Ref: Para. A62)
27. If the auditor has not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence as to the risk of material misstatement related to an material financial statement relevant assertion about a class of transactions, account balance or disclosure, the auditor shall attempt to obtain further audit evidence. If the auditor is unable to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence, the auditor shall express a qualified opinion or disclaim an opinion on the financial statements.

### Documentation

28. The auditor shall include in the audit documentation:<sup>62</sup>
- (a) The overall responses to address the assessed risks of material misstatement at the financial statement level, and the nature, timing and extent of the further audit procedures performed;

<sup>62</sup> ISA 230, *Audit Documentation*, paragraphs 8–11, and A6

- (b) The linkage of those procedures with the assessed risks at the assertion level; and
  - (c) The results of the audit procedures, including the conclusions where these are not otherwise clear. (Ref: Para. A63)
29. If the auditor plans to use audit evidence about the operating effectiveness of controls obtained in previous audits, the auditor shall include in the audit documentation the conclusions reached about relying on such controls that were tested in a previous audit.
30. The auditor's documentation shall demonstrate that information in the financial statements agrees or reconciles with the underlying accounting records, including agreeing or reconciling disclosures, whether such information is obtained from within or outside of the general and subsidiary ledgers.

### Application and Other Explanatory Material

#### Overall Responses (Ref: Para. 5)

- A1. Overall responses to address the assessed risks of material misstatement at the financial statement level may include:
- Emphasizing to the engagement team the need to maintain professional skepticism.
  - Assigning more experienced staff or those with special skills or using experts.
  - ~~Providing more supervision~~ Changes to the nature, timing and extent of direction and supervision of members of the engagement team and the review of the work performed.
  - Incorporating additional elements of unpredictability in the selection of further audit procedures to be performed.
  - Changes to the overall audit strategy as required by ISA 300, or planned audit procedures, and may include changes to:
    - The auditor's determination of performance materiality in accordance with ISA 320.
    - The auditor's plans to tests the operating effectiveness of controls, and the persuasiveness of audit evidence needed to support the planned reliance on the operating effectiveness of the controls, particularly when deficiencies in the control environment or the entity's monitoring activities are identified.
    - The nature, timing and extent of substantive procedures. For example, it may be appropriate to perform substantive procedures at or near the date of the financial statements when the risk of material misstatement is assessed as higher.
  - ~~Making general changes to the nature, timing or extent of audit procedures, for example: performing substantive procedures at the period end instead of at an interim date; or modifying the nature of audit procedures to obtain more persuasive audit evidence.~~
- A2. The assessment of the risks of material misstatement at the financial statement level, and thereby the auditor's overall responses, is affected by the auditor's understanding of the control environment. An effective control environment may allow the auditor to have more confidence in internal control and the reliability of audit evidence generated internally within the entity and thus, for example, allow the auditor to conduct some audit procedures at an interim date rather than at the period end.

Deficiencies in the control environment, however, have the opposite effect; for example, the auditor may respond to an ineffective control environment by:

- Conducting more audit procedures as of the period end rather than at an interim date.
- Obtaining more extensive audit evidence from substantive procedures.
- Increasing the number of locations to be included in the audit scope.

A3. Such considerations, therefore, have a significant bearing on the auditor's general approach, for example, an emphasis on substantive procedures (substantive approach), or an approach that uses tests of controls as well as substantive procedures (combined approach).

### **Audit Procedures Responsive to the Assessed Risks of Material Misstatement at the Assertion Level**

*The Nature, Timing and Extent of Further Audit Procedures (Ref: Para. 6)*

A4. The auditor's assessment of the identified risks of material misstatement at the assertion level provides a basis for considering the appropriate audit approach for designing and performing further audit procedures. For example, the auditor may determine that:

- (a) Only by performing tests of controls may the auditor achieve an effective response to the assessed risk of material misstatement for a particular assertion;
- (b) Performing only substantive procedures is appropriate for particular assertions and, therefore, the auditor excludes the effect of controls from the relevant risk assessment. This may be because the auditor's risk assessment procedures have not identified any effective controls relevant to the assertion, or because testing controls would be inefficient and therefore the auditor does not intend to rely on the operating effectiveness of controls in determining the nature, timing and extent of substantive procedures; or
- (c) A combined approach using both tests of controls and substantive procedures is an effective approach.

However, as required by paragraph 18, irrespective of the approach selected, the auditor designs and performs substantive procedures for each ~~material~~-class of transactions, account balance, and disclosure that is quantitatively or qualitatively material.

A5. The nature of an audit procedure refers to its purpose (that is, test of controls or substantive procedure) and its type (that is, inspection, observation, inquiry, confirmation, recalculation, reperformance, or analytical procedure). The nature of the audit procedures is of most importance in responding to the assessed risks.

A6. Timing of an audit procedure refers to when it is performed, or the period or date to which the audit evidence applies.

A7. Extent of an audit procedure refers to the quantity to be performed, for example, a sample size or the number of observations of a control activity.

A8. Designing and performing further audit procedures whose nature, timing and extent are based on and are responsive to the assessed risks of material misstatement at the assertion level provides a clear linkage between the auditor's further audit procedures and the risk assessment.

Responding to the Assessed Risks at the Assertion Level (Ref: Para. 7(a))

Nature

- A9. ISA 315 (Revised) requires that the auditor's assessment of the risks of material misstatement at the assertion level is performed by assessing inherent risk and control risk. The auditor assesses inherent risk by assessing the likelihood and magnitude of a material misstatement taking into account how, and the degree to which, identified events or conditions relating to significant classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures are subject to, or affected by, the inherent risk factors.<sup>63</sup> The auditor's assessed risks, including the reasons for those assessed risks, may affect both the types of audit procedures to be performed and their combination. For example, when an assessed risk is high, the auditor may confirm the completeness of the terms of a contract with the counterparty, in addition to inspecting the document. Further, certain audit procedures may be more appropriate for some assertions than others. For example, in relation to revenue, tests of controls may be most responsive to the assessed risk of material misstatement of the completeness assertion, whereas substantive procedures may be most responsive to the assessed risk of material misstatement of the occurrence assertion.
- A10. The reasons for the assessment given to a risk are relevant in determining the nature of audit procedures. For example, if an assessed risk is lower because of the particular characteristics of a class of transactions without consideration of the related controls, then the auditor may determine that substantive analytical procedures alone provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence. On the other hand, if the assessed risk is lower because of ~~internal~~ the operating effectiveness of controls, and the auditor intends to base the substantive procedures on that low assessment, then the auditor performs tests of those controls, as required by paragraph 8(a). This may be the case, for example, for a class of transactions of reasonably uniform, non-complex characteristics that are routinely processed and controlled by the entity's information system.

Timing

- A11. The auditor may perform tests of controls or substantive procedures at an interim date or at the period end. The higher the risk of material misstatement, the more likely it is that the auditor may decide it is more effective to perform substantive procedures nearer to, or at, the period end rather than at an earlier date, or to perform audit procedures unannounced or at unpredictable times (for example, performing audit procedures at selected locations on an unannounced basis). This is particularly relevant when considering the response to the risks of fraud. For example, the auditor may conclude that, when the risks of intentional misstatement or manipulation have been identified, audit procedures to extend audit conclusions from interim date to the period end would not be effective.
- A12. On the other hand, performing audit procedures before the period end may assist the auditor in identifying significant matters at an early stage of the audit, and consequently resolving them with the assistance of management or developing an effective audit approach to address such matters.
- A13. In addition, certain audit procedures can be performed only at or after the period end, for example:

---

<sup>63</sup> ISA 315 paragraph 26

- Agreeing or reconciling information in the financial statements with the underlying accounting records, including agreeing or reconciling disclosures, whether such information is obtained from within or outside of the general and subsidiary ledgers;
- Examining adjustments made during the course of preparing the financial statements; and
- Procedures to respond to a risk that, at the period end, the entity may have entered into improper sales contracts, or transactions may not have been finalized.

A14. Further relevant factors that influence the auditor's consideration of when to perform audit procedures include the following:

- The control environment.
- When relevant information is available (for example, electronic files may subsequently be overwritten, or procedures to be observed may occur only at certain times).
- The nature of the risk (for example, if there is a risk of inflated revenues to meet earnings expectations by subsequent creation of false sales agreements, the auditor may wish to examine contracts available on the date of the period end).
- The period or date to which the audit evidence relates.
- The timing of the preparation of the financial statements, particularly for those disclosures that provide further explanation about amounts recorded in the statement of financial position, the statement of comprehensive income, the statement of changes in equity or the statement of cash flows.

#### Extent

A15. The extent of an audit procedure judged necessary is determined after considering the materiality, the assessed risk, and the degree of assurance the auditor plans to obtain. When a single purpose is met by a combination of procedures, the extent of each procedure is considered separately. In general, the extent of audit procedures increases as the risk of material misstatement increases. For example, in response to the assessed risk of material misstatement due to fraud, increasing sample sizes or performing substantive analytical procedures at a more detailed level may be appropriate. However, increasing the extent of an audit procedure is effective only if the audit procedure itself is relevant to the specific risk.

A16. The use of computer-assisted audit techniques (CAATs) may enable more extensive testing of electronic transactions and account files, which may be useful when the auditor decides to modify the extent of testing, for example, in responding to the risks of material misstatement due to fraud. Such techniques can be used to select sample transactions from key electronic files, to sort transactions with specific characteristics, or to test an entire population instead of a sample.

#### Considerations specific to public sector entities

A17. For the audits of public sector entities, the audit mandate and any other special auditing requirements may affect the auditor's consideration of the nature, timing and extent of further audit procedures.

### Considerations specific to smaller entities

A18. In the case of very small entities, there may not be many controls ~~activities~~ that could be identified by the auditor, or the extent to which their existence or operation have been documented by the entity may be limited. In such cases, it may be more efficient for the auditor to perform further audit procedures that are primarily substantive procedures. In some rare cases, however, the absence of controls ~~activities~~ or of ~~other~~ components of the system of internal control may make it impossible to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence.

### Higher Assessments of Risk (Ref: Para 7(b))

A19. When obtaining more persuasive audit evidence because of a higher assessment of risk, the auditor may increase the quantity of the evidence, or obtain evidence that is more relevant or reliable, for example, by placing more emphasis on obtaining third party evidence or by obtaining corroborating evidence from a number of independent sources.

### Tests of Controls

#### Designing and Performing Tests of Controls (Ref: Para. 8)

A20. Tests of controls are performed only on those controls that the auditor has determined are suitably designed to prevent, or detect and correct, a material misstatement in a relevant assertion, and the auditor intends to rely upon those controls. If substantially different controls were used at different times during the period under audit, each is considered separately.

A21. Testing the operating effectiveness of controls is different from obtaining an understanding of and evaluating the design and implementation of controls. However, the same types of audit procedures are used. The auditor may, therefore, decide it is efficient to test the operating effectiveness of controls at the same time as evaluating their design and determining that they have been implemented.

A22. Further, although some risk assessment procedures may not have been specifically designed as tests of controls, they may nevertheless provide audit evidence about the operating effectiveness of the controls and, consequently, serve as tests of controls. For example, the auditor's risk assessment procedures may have included:

- Inquiring about management's use of budgets.
- Observing management's comparison of monthly budgeted and actual expenses.
- Inspecting reports pertaining to the investigation of variances between budgeted and actual amounts.

These audit procedures provide knowledge about the design of the entity's budgeting policies and whether they have been implemented, but may also provide audit evidence about the effectiveness of the operation of budgeting policies in preventing or detecting material misstatements in the classification of expenses.

A23. In addition, the auditor may design a test of controls to be performed concurrently with a test of details on the same transaction. Although the purpose of a test of controls is different from the purpose of a test of details, both may be accomplished concurrently by performing a test of controls and a test of

details on the same transaction, also known as a dual-purpose test. For example, the auditor may design, and evaluate the results of, a test to examine an invoice to determine whether it has been approved and to provide substantive audit evidence of a transaction. A dual-purpose test is designed and evaluated by considering each purpose of the test separately.

- A24. In some cases, the auditor may find it impossible to design effective substantive procedures that by themselves provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence at the assertion level.<sup>64</sup> This may occur when an entity conducts its business using IT and no documentation of transactions is produced or maintained, other than through the IT system. In such cases, paragraph 8(b) requires the auditor to perform tests of relevant controls that address the risk for which substantive procedures alone cannot provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence.

#### Audit Evidence and Intended Reliance (Ref: Para. 9)

- A25. A higher level of assurance may be sought about the operating effectiveness of controls when the approach adopted consists primarily of tests of controls, in particular where it is not possible or practicable to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence only from substantive procedures.

#### Nature and Extent of Tests of Controls

##### Other audit procedures in combination with inquiry (Ref: Para. 10(a))

- A26. Inquiry alone is not sufficient to test the operating effectiveness of controls. Accordingly, other audit procedures are performed in combination with inquiry. In this regard, inquiry combined with inspection or reperformance may provide more assurance than inquiry and observation, since an observation is pertinent only at the point in time at which it is made.
- A27. The nature of the particular control influences the type of procedure required to obtain audit evidence about whether the control was operating effectively. For example, if operating effectiveness is evidenced by documentation, the auditor may decide to inspect it to obtain audit evidence about operating effectiveness. For other controls, however, documentation may not be available or relevant. For example, documentation of operation may not exist for some factors in the control environment, such as assignment of authority and responsibility, or for some types of ~~controls activities~~, such as automated controls activities performed by a computer. In such circumstances, audit evidence about operating effectiveness may be obtained through inquiry in combination with other audit procedures such as observation or the use of CAATs.

##### Extent of tests of controls

- A28. When more persuasive audit evidence is needed regarding the effectiveness of a control, it may be appropriate to increase the extent of testing of the control. As well as the degree of reliance on controls, matters the auditor may consider in determining the extent of tests of controls include the following:
- The frequency of the performance of the control by the entity during the period.
  - The length of time during the audit period that the auditor is relying on the operating effectiveness of the control.

<sup>64</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraph 30

- The expected rate of deviation from a control.
- The relevance and reliability of the audit evidence to be obtained regarding the operating effectiveness of the control at the assertion level.
- The extent to which audit evidence is obtained from tests of other controls related to the assertion.

ISA 530<sup>65</sup> contains further guidance on the extent of testing.

A29. Because of the inherent consistency of IT processing, it may not be necessary to increase the extent of testing of an automated control. An automated controls can be expected to function consistently unless the ~~program~~ IT application (including the tables, files, or other permanent data used by the ~~program~~ IT application) is changed. Once the auditor determines that an automated control is functioning as intended (which could be done at the time the control is initially implemented or at some other date), the auditor may consider performing tests to determine that the control continues to function effectively. Such tests ~~might~~ may include testing the general IT controls related to the IT application, determining that:

- ~~• Changes to the program are not made without being subject to the appropriate program change controls;~~
- ~~• The authorized version of the program is used for processing transactions; and~~
- ~~• Other relevant general controls are effective.~~

~~Such tests also might include determining that changes to the programs have not been made, as may be the case when the entity uses packaged software applications without modifying or maintaining them. For example, the auditor may inspect the record of the administration of IT security to obtain audit evidence that unauthorized access has not occurred during the period.~~

A29a. Similarly, the auditor may perform tests of controls that address risks of material misstatement related to the integrity of the entity's data, or the completeness and accuracy of the entity's system-generated reports, or to address risks for which substantive procedures alone cannot provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence. These tests of controls may include tests of general IT controls that address the matters in paragraph 10(a). When this is the case, the auditor may not need to perform any further testing to obtain audit evidence about the matters in paragraph 10(a).

A29b. When the auditor determines that a general IT control is deficient, the auditor may consider the nature of the related risk(s) arising from the use of IT that were identified in accordance with ISA 315 (Revised)<sup>66</sup> to provide the basis for the design of the auditor's additional procedures to determine whether the underlying controls affected by the deficient general IT control functioned throughout the period. Such procedures may address determining whether:

- The related risk(s) arising from IT has occurred. For example, if users have unauthorized access to an IT application (but cannot access or modify the system logs that track access), the auditor may inspect the system logs to obtain audit evidence that those users did not access the IT application during the period.

---

<sup>65</sup> ISA 530, *Audit Sampling*

<sup>66</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraph 21A

- There are any alternate or redundant general IT controls, or any other controls, that address the related risk(s) arising from the use of IT. If so, the auditor may determine such controls to be relevant to the audit (if not already relevant to the audit) and therefore evaluate their design, determine that they have been implemented and perform tests of their operating effectiveness. For example, if a general IT control related to user access is deficient, the entity may have an alternate control whereby IT management reviews end user access reports on a timely basis. Circumstances when an application control may address a risk arising from the use of IT may include when the information that may be affected by the general IT control deficiency can be reconciled to external sources (e.g., a bank statement) or internal sources not affected by the general IT control deficiency (e.g., a separate IT application or data source).

#### Testing of indirect controls (Ref: Para. 10(b))

A30. In some circumstances, it may be necessary to obtain audit evidence supporting the effective operation of indirect controls (e.g., general IT controls). As explained in paragraphs A29 to A29b, general IT controls may have been determined to be relevant to the audit in accordance with ISA 315 (Revised) because of their support of the operating effectiveness of automated controls or due to their support in maintaining the integrity of information used in the entity's financial reporting, including system-generated reports. The requirement in paragraph 10(b) acknowledges that the auditor may have already tested certain indirect controls to address the matters in paragraph 10(a). For example, when the auditor decides to test the effectiveness of a user review of exception reports detailing sales in excess of authorized credit limits, the user review and related follow up is the control that is directly of relevance to the auditor. Controls over the accuracy of the information in the reports (for example, general IT controls) are described as "indirect" controls.

~~A31. Because of the inherent consistency of IT processing, audit evidence about the implementation of an automated application control, when considered in combination with audit evidence about the operating effectiveness of the entity's general controls (in particular, change controls), may also provide substantial audit evidence about its operating effectiveness.~~

#### Timing of Tests of Controls

##### Intended period of reliance (Ref: Para. 11)

A32. Audit evidence pertaining only to a point in time may be sufficient for the auditor's purpose, for example, when testing controls over the entity's physical inventory counting at the period end. If, on the other hand, the auditor intends to rely on a control over a period, tests that are capable of providing audit evidence that the control operated effectively at relevant times during that period are appropriate. Such tests may include tests of controls in the entity's process to monitoring of the system of internal controls.

##### Using audit evidence obtained during an interim period (Ref: Para. 12(b))

A33. Relevant factors in determining what additional audit evidence to obtain about controls that were operating during the period remaining after an interim period, include:

- The significance of the assessed risks of material misstatement at the assertion level.
- The specific controls that were tested during the interim period, and significant changes to them since they were tested, including changes in the information system, processes, and personnel.

- The degree to which audit evidence about the operating effectiveness of those controls was obtained.
- The length of the remaining period.
- The extent to which the auditor intends to reduce further substantive procedures based on the reliance of controls.
- The control environment.

A34. Additional audit evidence may be obtained, for example, by extending tests of controls over the remaining period or testing the entity's monitoring of controls.

Using audit evidence obtained in previous audits (Ref: Para. 13)

A35. In certain circumstances, audit evidence obtained from previous audits may provide audit evidence where the auditor performs audit procedures to establish its continuing relevance and reliability. For example, in performing a previous audit, the auditor may have determined that an automated control was functioning as intended. The auditor may obtain audit evidence to determine whether changes to the automated control have been made that affect its continued effective functioning through, for example, inquiries of management and the inspection of logs to indicate what controls have been changed. Consideration of audit evidence about these changes may support either increasing or decreasing the expected audit evidence to be obtained in the current period about the operating effectiveness of the controls.

Controls that have changed from previous audits (Ref: Para. 14(a))

A36. Changes may affect the relevance and reliability of the audit evidence obtained in previous audits such that there may no longer be a basis for continued reliance. For example, changes in a system that enable an entity to receive a new report from the system probably do not affect the relevance of audit evidence from a previous audit; however, a change that causes data to be accumulated or calculated differently does affect it.

Controls that have not changed from previous audits (Ref: Para. 14(b))

A37. The auditor's decision on whether to rely on audit evidence obtained in previous audits for controls that:

- (a) have not changed since they were last tested; and
- (b) are not controls that mitigate a significant risk,

is a matter of professional judgment. In addition, the length of time between retesting such controls is also a matter of professional judgment, but is required by paragraph 14 (b) to be at least once in every third year.

A38. In general, the higher the risk of material misstatement, or the greater the reliance on controls, the shorter the time period elapsed, if any, is likely to be. Factors that may decrease the period for retesting a control, or result in not relying on audit evidence obtained in previous audits at all, include the following:

- A deficient control environment.
- A deficiency in the entity's process to monitoring of the system of internal controls.

- A significant manual element to ~~the relevant~~ controls.
- Personnel changes that significantly affect the application of the control.
- Changing circumstances that indicate the need for changes in the control.
- Deficient general IT controls.

A39. When there are a number of controls for which the auditor intends to rely on audit evidence obtained in previous audits, testing some of those controls in each audit provides corroborating information about the continuing effectiveness of the control environment. This contributes to the auditor's decision about whether it is appropriate to rely on audit evidence obtained in previous audits.

#### Evaluating the Operating Effectiveness of Controls (Ref: Para.16–17)

A40. A material misstatement detected by the auditor's procedures is a strong indicator of the existence of a significant deficiency in internal control.

A41. The concept of effectiveness of the operation of controls recognizes that some deviations in the way controls are applied by the entity may occur. Deviations from prescribed controls may be caused by such factors as changes in key personnel, significant seasonal fluctuations in volume of transactions and human error. The detected rate of deviation, in particular in comparison with the expected rate, may indicate that the control cannot be relied on to reduce risk at the assertion level to that assessed by the auditor.

#### Substantive Procedures (Ref: Para. 6, 18)

A42. Paragraph 18 requires the auditor to design and perform substantive procedures for each ~~material~~ class of transactions, account balance, and disclosure, ~~irrespective of the assessed risks of material misstatement,~~ that is quantitatively or qualitatively material. For significant classes of transactions, account balances and disclosures, substantive procedures may have already been performed because paragraph 6 requires the auditor to design and perform further audit procedures that are responsive to the assessed risks of material misstatement at the assertion level. Accordingly, substantive procedures are required to be designed and performed in accordance with paragraph 18:

- When the further audit procedures designed and performed in accordance with paragraph 6 for significant classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures did not include substantive procedures; or
- For each class of transactions, account balance or disclosure that is not a significant class of transactions, account balance or disclosure, but that has been identified as quantitatively or qualitatively material in accordance with ISA 315 (Revised).<sup>67</sup>

This requirement reflects the facts that: (a) the auditor's assessment of risk is judgmental and so may not identify all risks of material misstatement; and (b) there are inherent limitations to ~~internal~~ controls, including management override.

A42a. In designing the substantive procedures to be performed, the auditor' consideration of the assertion(s) in which a possible misstatement could occur, and if it were to occur, the effect of that misstatement would

---

<sup>67</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraph 30B

be most material, may assist in identifying the appropriate nature, timing and extent of the procedures to be performed.

#### Nature and Extent of Substantive Procedures

A43. Depending on the circumstances, the auditor may determine that:

- Performing only substantive analytical procedures will be sufficient to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level. For example, where the auditor's assessment of risk is supported by audit evidence from tests of controls.
- Only tests of details are appropriate.
- A combination of substantive analytical procedures and tests of details are most responsive to the assessed risks.

A44. Substantive analytical procedures are generally more applicable to large volumes of transactions that tend to be predictable over time. ISA 520<sup>68</sup> establishes requirements and provides guidance on the application of analytical procedures during an audit.

A45. The nature assessment of the risk and or the nature of the assertion is relevant to the design of tests of details. For example, tests of details related to the existence or occurrence assertion may involve selecting from items contained in a financial statement amount and obtaining the relevant audit evidence. On the other hand, tests of details related to the completeness assertion may involve selecting from items that are expected to be included in the relevant financial statement amount and investigating whether they are included.

A46. Because the assessment of the risk of material misstatement takes account of internal controls upon which the auditor intends to rely, the extent of substantive procedures may need to be increased when the results from tests of controls are unsatisfactory. However, increasing the extent of an audit procedure is appropriate only if the audit procedure itself is relevant to the specific risk.

A47. In designing tests of details, the extent of testing is ordinarily thought of in terms of the sample size. However, other matters are also relevant, including whether it is more effective to use other selective means of testing. See ISA 500.<sup>69</sup>

#### Considering Whether External Confirmation Procedures Are to Be Performed (Ref: Para. 19)

A48. External confirmation procedures frequently are relevant when addressing assertions associated with account balances and their elements, but need not be restricted to these items. For example, the auditor may request external confirmation of the terms of agreements, contracts, or transactions between an entity and other parties. External confirmation procedures also may be performed to obtain audit evidence about the absence of certain conditions. For example, a request may specifically seek confirmation that no "side agreement" exists that may be relevant to an entity's revenue cutoff assertion. Other situations where external confirmation procedures may provide relevant audit evidence in responding to assessed risks of material misstatement include:

---

<sup>68</sup> ISA 520, *Analytical Procedures*

<sup>69</sup> ISA 500, *Audit Evidence*, paragraph 10

- Bank balances and other information relevant to banking relationships.
- Accounts receivable balances and terms.
- Inventories held by third parties at bonded warehouses for processing or on consignment.
- Property title deeds held by lawyers or financiers for safe custody or as security.
- Investments held for safekeeping by third parties, or purchased from stockbrokers but not delivered at the balance sheet date.
- Amounts due to lenders, including relevant terms of repayment and restrictive covenants.
- Accounts payable balances and terms.

A49. Although external confirmations may provide relevant audit evidence relating to certain assertions, there are some assertions for which external confirmations provide less relevant audit evidence. For example, external confirmations provide less relevant audit evidence relating to the recoverability of accounts receivable balances, than they do of their existence.

A50. The auditor may determine that external confirmation procedures performed for one purpose provide an opportunity to obtain audit evidence about other matters. For example, confirmation requests for bank balances often include requests for information relevant to other financial statement assertions. Such considerations may influence the auditor's decision about whether to perform external confirmation procedures.

A51. Factors that may assist the auditor in determining whether external confirmation procedures are to be performed as substantive audit procedures include:

- The confirming party's knowledge of the subject matter – responses may be more reliable if provided by a person at the confirming party who has the requisite knowledge about the information being confirmed.
- The ability or willingness of the intended confirming party to respond – for example, the confirming party:
  - May not accept responsibility for responding to a confirmation request;
  - May consider responding too costly or time consuming;
  - May have concerns about the potential legal liability resulting from responding;
  - May account for transactions in different currencies; or
  - May operate in an environment where responding to confirmation requests is not a significant aspect of day-to-day operations.

In such situations, confirming parties may not respond, may respond in a casual manner or may attempt to restrict the reliance placed on the response.

- The objectivity of the intended confirming party – if the confirming party is a related party of the entity, responses to confirmation requests may be less reliable.

Substantive Procedures Related to the Financial Statement Closing Process (Ref: Para. 20)

A52. The nature, and also the extent, of the auditor's substantive procedures related to the financial statement closing process depends on the nature and complexity of the entity's financial reporting process and the related risks of material misstatement.

*Substantive Procedures Responsive to Significant Risks (Ref: Para. 21)*

A53. Paragraph 21 of this ISA requires the auditor to perform substantive procedures that are specifically responsive to risks the auditor has determined to be significant risks. Audit evidence in the form of external confirmations received directly by the auditor from appropriate confirming parties may assist the auditor in obtaining audit evidence with the high level of reliability that the auditor requires to respond to significant risks of material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error. For example, if the auditor identifies that management is under pressure to meet earnings expectations, there may be a risk that management is inflating sales by improperly recognizing revenue related to sales agreements with terms that preclude revenue recognition or by invoicing sales before shipment. In these circumstances, the auditor may, for example, design external confirmation procedures not only to confirm outstanding amounts, but also to confirm the details of the sales agreements, including date, any rights of return and delivery terms. In addition, the auditor may find it effective to supplement such external confirmation procedures with inquiries of non-financial personnel in the entity regarding any changes in sales agreements and delivery terms.

*Timing of Substantive Procedures (Ref: Para. 22–23)*

A54. In most cases, audit evidence from a previous audit's substantive procedures provides little or no audit evidence for the current period. There are, however, exceptions, for example, a legal opinion obtained in a previous audit related to the structure of a securitization to which no changes have occurred, may be relevant in the current period. In such cases, it may be appropriate to use audit evidence from a previous audit's substantive procedures if that evidence and the related subject matter have not fundamentally changed, and audit procedures have been performed during the current period to establish its continuing relevance.

*Using audit evidence obtained during an interim period (Ref: Para. 22)*

A55. In some circumstances, the auditor may determine that it is effective to perform substantive procedures at an interim date, and to compare and reconcile information concerning the balance at the period end with the comparable information at the interim date to:

- (a) Identify amounts that appear unusual;
- (b) Investigate any such amounts; and
- (c) Perform substantive analytical procedures or tests of details to test the intervening period.

A56. Performing substantive procedures at an interim date without undertaking additional procedures at a later date increases the risk that the auditor will not detect misstatements that may exist at the period end. This risk increases as the remaining period is lengthened. Factors such as the following may influence whether to perform substantive procedures at an interim date:

- The control environment and other relevant controls.
- The availability at a later date of information necessary for the auditor's procedures.

- The purpose of the substantive procedure.
- The assessed risk of material misstatement.
- The nature of the class of transactions or account balance and related assertions.
- The ability of the auditor to perform appropriate substantive procedures or substantive procedures combined with tests of controls to cover the remaining period in order to reduce the risk that misstatements that may exist at the period end will not be detected.

A57. Factors such as the following may influence whether to perform substantive analytical procedures with respect to the period between the interim date and the period end:

- Whether the period-end balances of the particular classes of transactions or account balances are reasonably predictable with respect to amount, relative significance, and composition.
- Whether the entity's procedures for analyzing and adjusting such classes of transactions or account balances at interim dates and for establishing proper accounting cutoffs are appropriate.
- Whether the information system relevant to financial reporting will provide information concerning the balances at the period end and the transactions in the remaining period that is sufficient to permit investigation of:
  - (a) Significant unusual transactions or entries (including those at or near the period end);
  - (b) Other causes of significant fluctuations, or expected fluctuations that did not occur; and
  - (c) Changes in the composition of the classes of transactions or account balances.

Misstatements detected at an interim date (Ref: Para. 23)

A58. When the auditor concludes that the planned nature, timing or extent of substantive procedures covering the remaining period need to be modified as a result of unexpected misstatements detected at an interim date, such modification may include extending or repeating the procedures performed at the interim date at the period end.

**Adequacy of Presentation of the Financial Statements** (Ref: Para. 24)

A59. Evaluating the appropriate presentation, arrangement and content of the financial statements includes, for example, consideration of the terminology used as required by the applicable financial reporting framework, the level of detail provided, the aggregation and disaggregation of amounts and the bases of amounts set forth.

**Evaluating the Sufficiency and Appropriateness of Audit Evidence** (Ref: Para. 25–27)

A60. An audit of financial statements is a cumulative and iterative process. As the auditor performs planned audit procedures, the audit evidence obtained may cause the auditor to modify the nature, timing or extent of other planned audit procedures. Information may come to the auditor's attention that differs significantly from the information on which the risk assessment was based. For example:

- The extent of misstatements that the auditor detects by performing substantive procedures may alter the auditor's judgment about the risk assessments and may indicate a significant deficiency in internal control.
- The auditor may become aware of discrepancies in accounting records, or conflicting or missing evidence.
- Analytical procedures performed at the overall review stage of the audit may indicate a previously unrecognized risk of material misstatement.

In such circumstances, the auditor may need to reevaluate the planned audit procedures, based on the revised consideration of assessed risks of material misstatement for all or some of and the effect on the significant classes of transactions, account balances, or disclosures and ~~related their relevant~~ assertions. ISA 315 (Revised) contains further guidance on revising the auditor's risk assessment.<sup>70</sup>

- A61. The auditor cannot assume that an instance of fraud or error is an isolated occurrence. Therefore, the consideration of how the detection of a misstatement affects the assessed risks of material misstatement is important in determining whether the assessment remains appropriate.
- A62. The auditor's judgment as to what constitutes sufficient appropriate audit evidence is influenced by such factors as the following:
- Significance of the potential misstatement in the assertion and the likelihood of its having a material effect, individually or aggregated with other potential misstatements, on the financial statements.
  - Effectiveness of management's responses and controls to address the risks.
  - Experience gained during previous audits with respect to similar potential misstatements.
  - Results of audit procedures performed, including whether such audit procedures identified specific instances of fraud or error.
  - Source and reliability of the available information.
  - Persuasiveness of the audit evidence.
  - Understanding of the entity and its environment, the applicable financial reporting framework and including the entity's system of internal control.

**Documentation** (Ref: Para. 28)

- A63. The form and extent of audit documentation is a matter of professional judgment, and is influenced by the nature, size and complexity of the entity and its internal control, availability of information from the entity and the audit methodology and technology used in the audit.

---

<sup>70</sup> ISA 315 (Revised), paragraph 31

## Handbook Glossary

*(Note: Changes here are made to the glossary only – any other changes to terms within the ISAs presented that affect the glossary will also be made).*

Access controls—~~Procedures~~ Controls designed to restrict access to the IT applications and underlying IT infrastructure within the IT environment ~~on-line terminal devices, programs and data~~. Access controls consist of “user authentication” and “user authorization.” “User authentication” typically attempts to identify a user through unique logon identifications, passwords, access cards or biometric data. “User authorization” consists of access rules to determine the access privileges ~~computer resources~~ each user may have access. Specifically, such procedures are ~~designed to prevent or detect~~:

- ~~Unauthorized access to on-line terminal devices, programs and data;~~
- ~~Entry of unauthorized transactions;~~
- ~~Unauthorized changes to data files;~~
- ~~The use of computer programs by unauthorized personnel; and~~
- ~~The use of computer programs that have not been authorized.~~

Control environment—~~The control environment is a component of the entity’s system of internal control and~~ includes the governance and management functions and the attitudes, awareness, and actions of those charged with governance and management concerning the entity’s system of internal control and its importance in the entity. ~~The control environment is a component of internal control.~~

The eEntity’s risk assessment process—~~The entity’s risk assessment process is a~~ A component of the entity’s system of internal control that is the entity’s process for identifying business risks relevant to financial reporting objectives and deciding about actions to address those risks, and the results thereof.

Monitoring of controls ~~The entity’s process to monitor the system of internal control~~—The entity’s process to monitor the system of internal control is a component of the entity’s system of internal control. It is ~~A~~ a process to assess whether the system of internal control is present and functioning ~~effectiveness of internal control performance over time~~. It includes involves assessing the design and operation ~~effectiveness of~~ controls on a timely basis and taking necessary corrective actions ~~modified for changes in conditions~~ remedial actions. ~~Monitoring of controls is a component of internal control.~~

The Information-information system relevant to financial reporting and communication—The information system and communication is ~~A~~ a component of the entity’s system of internal control that includes the financial reporting system, and consists of the procedures controls and records, established to initiate, record, process and report entity transactions (as well as information about events and conditions) and to maintain accountability for the related assets, liabilities and equity. Communication occurs both internally and externally and provides the entity with the information needed to carry out day-to-day controls. Communication enables personnel to understand their responsibilities for controls and the importance to the achievement of the entity’s objectives.

Control activities—~~A component of the entity’s system of internal control that includes those controls put in place by the entity to effect controls over the flows of information relating to significant classes of transactions, account balances and disclosures and the financial reporting process used to prepare the financial statements. Such controls consist of application controls and general IT controls. These policies~~

~~and procedures that help ensure that management directives are carried out. Control activities are a component of internal control.~~

\*System of Internal Control—The ~~process~~ system designed, implemented and maintained by those charged with governance, management and other personnel, to provide reasonable assurance about the achievement of an entity's objectives with regard to reliability of financial reporting, effectiveness and efficiency of operations, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations. ~~The term "controls" refers to any aspects of one or more of the components of internal control.~~ For the purposes of the ISAs, the system of internal control consists of five inter-related components: (Ref: Para. A0k)

- Control environment.
- The entity's risk assessment process.
- The entity's process to monitor the system of internal control.
- The information system and communication.
- Control activities.

"System of internal control" may also be referred to as "internal control" in some ISAs.

*\*Deficiency in internal control*—This exists when:

- (a) A control is designed, implemented or operated in such a way that it is unable to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements in the financial statements on a timely basis; or
- (b) A control necessary to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements in the financial statements on a timely basis is missing.

"Deficiency in internal control" may also be referred to as "control deficiency" in some ISAs.

*\*Significant deficiency in internal control*—A deficiency or combination of deficiencies in internal control that, in the auditor's professional judgment, is of sufficient importance to merit the attention of those charged with governance. "Significant deficiency in internal control" may also be referred to as "significant control deficiency" in some ISAs.