

Objective of Agenda Item

1. The purpose of this paper is to set out a first draft of a summary table illustrating the difference between procedures that might be performed for each of an:
 - EER limited assurance engagement, and
 - EER reasonable assurance engagement.

in order to illustrate the approach, discussed in paragraph 25 of **Agenda Item 5**, that the Task Force proposes to take to address respondents' calls for further guidance and practical examples on applying the differential requirements set out in International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 (Revised), *Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information* (see paragraph 24 of **Agenda Item 5**).

2. The Task Force recognizes the challenges that practitioners face in knowing 'how much is enough' in applying the differential requirements for limited and reasonable assurance. The Task Force has given considerable thought to how respondents' comments, in this area, might be addressed. The Task Force considers that it will be helpful to set out illustrative procedures to draw out the key differences between limited and reasonable assurance, and the implications. Consequently, the Task Force has prepared a first draft of an illustrative summary table in this paper:
 - to follow the stages of an assurance engagement from pre-acceptance through to reporting for those matters addressed by the chapters of the Guidance,
 - using material from both ISAE 3000 (Revised) and ISAE 3410, *Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements* as a basis for considerations and procedures, and
 - to include short practical illustrative examples.
3. The summary table of illustrative procedures is not intended to:
 - cover the entire engagement process,
 - repeat the requirements of the Standards word-for-word, or
 - suggest requirements or 'best practice',but is intended to:
 - illustrate those aspects covered by the Guidance where differential requirements of ISAE 3000 (Revised) apply,
 - discuss in 'plain English' and illustrate, in practical terms, how the requirements might be applied, and
 - set out, for illustrative purposes only, the procedures that might be performed.

Appropriate caveats will therefore need to be included.

4. It is proposed that the table be positioned as an appendix to the Guidance, and referenced, where relevant, from the Guidance. The Task Force does not propose to add material to the text of the Guidance – other than to reference to the appendix. The intention is to bring together, in one place, applicable material from ISAE 3000 (Revised) and ISAE 3410 to assist practitioners in how they might apply ISAE 3000 (Revised).
5. In the illustrative table below, for each stage of the engagement identified in the left-hand column of the table, the following aspects are included:
 - A reference to the source of the requirement in ISAE 3000 (Revised)
 - The chapter(s) of the Guidance where the particular topic is addressed
 - In green shaded cells, considerations and examples that may be applied to both limited and reasonable assurance engagements
 - In grey shaded cells, considerations and examples that may apply in a limited assurance engagement
 - In yellow shaded cells, considerations and examples that may apply in a reasonable assurance engagement.

DRAFT - Limited and Reasonable Assurance – EER Illustrative Procedures

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
			Limited Assurance	Reasonable Assurance
<p>Preconditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities of the appropriate parties are suitable in the circumstances • The underlying subject matter is appropriate • The criteria are suitable and will be available to intended users • The practitioner expects to be able to obtain the evidence needed to support the conclusion • The practitioner’s conclusion to be contained in a written report • The engagement has a rational purpose 	<p>ISAE 3000 (Revised) 24(a),(b)</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Procedures to determine the presence of preconditions are the same for limited and reasonable assurance, and based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a preliminary knowledge of the engagement circumstances, and • discussion with the preparer. <p>The extent of preliminary knowledge the practitioner considers necessary to be able to make that determination may be driven, for example, by the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complexity and diversity of the EER subject matter • complexity and extent of the organizational boundary. <p>The more complex or diverse the EER subject matter and the more complex the organization, the greater the extent of preliminary knowledge of the practitioner may need to be. For example, the preliminary knowledge needed to determine the presence of preconditions may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not be very extensive for an engagement to assure the Scope 2 GHG emissions of a standalone entity • be more extensive for an engagement to assure a number of discrete metrics for a small domestic group • be even more extensive for an engagement to assure an EER report that includes extensive and interrelated qualitative and quantitative, historical and future oriented information for a large multi-national group with diverse operations. 	

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures
			<p>If the criteria are not suitable for reasonable assurance, then they are not suitable for limited assurance, and vice versa.</p> <p>If the preparer is still in the process of developing the criteria, the preconditions may not have been met and the engagement cannot be accepted.</p> <p>In practice, while the criteria may not yet be fully documented at the start of the engagement in a form suitable to make available to the intended users, and their documentation may need to be further refined during the course of the engagement, the expectation is that the criteria are able to be articulated by the preparer and made available to the practitioner from the outset of the engagement. Without the criteria, the preparer will not have been able to measure or evaluate the underlying subject matter.</p>
Competence and capabilities	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 31(b), (c), 32	1	<p>The engagement partner has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • competence in assurance skills and techniques, and • sufficient subject matter competence to accept responsibility for the assurance conclusion. <p>The engagement team and any practitioner's external experts collectively have the necessary professional competencies to perform the assurance engagement.</p> <p>The skill, knowledge, experience and subject matter expertise are not determined by the level of assurance but, for example, by the complexity of the EER subject matter and its measurement or evaluation.</p>

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures
Professional skepticism, professional judgment, and assurance skills and techniques	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 37-39	2	The need to apply professional skepticism and professional judgment, and to apply assurance skills and techniques as part of an iterative, systematic engagement process is the same for limited and reasonable assurance.
Suitability of the criteria at the planning stage	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 41-43	4, 6	<p>As part of planning the engagement, the practitioner determines whether the criteria are suitable for the engagement. The work effort to do so may be driven, for example, by the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • complexity and diversity of the EER subject matter • complexity and extent of the organizational boundary. <p>If it is discovered after accepting the engagement that the criteria are unsuitable or one or more of the other preconditions is not present, the practitioner discusses the matter with the preparer as set out in paragraph 42 of the Standard, or considers withdrawal. If the practitioner continues with the engagement, a qualified or adverse conclusion or a disclaimer of conclusion will be required. This is the same for limited and reasonable assurance.</p>
Materiality	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 44	9	<p>Materiality considerations are the same for limited and reasonable assurance as they are based on the information needs of the intended users (i.e. what 'matters' to, or would change, the decisions of intended users), not on the nature or extent of procedures the practitioner performs to address assurance risk.</p> <p>Materiality is considered in the context of quantitative and qualitative factors.</p>
	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 45	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	<p>What to understand</p> <p>The practitioner is required to make inquiries about:</p>

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures
<p>Understanding the underlying subject matter and other engagement circumstances</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether the preparer has any knowledge of actual, suspected or alleged intentional misstatement or non-compliance with laws and regulations affecting the subject matter information • the preparer's internal audit function (if any), and its activities and main findings with respect to the subject matter information • whether the preparer has used any experts in preparing the subject matter information. <p>In addition, the practitioner may obtain an understanding of, among other matters (source ISAE 3410.23):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the industry, regulatory and other external factors relevant to the EER engagement (e.g. the entity's suppliers, customers, service organizations, competitors, and the political, geographical, social and economic environment in which the entity operates) • the nature of the entity and its operations, its location(s), and its organizational boundary (including whether the organizational boundary is the same for non-financial and financial information reported in the same document) • changes from the prior period in the nature or extent of operations – e.g. mergers, acquisitions, divestments, new or discontinued product lines, changes in suppliers, customers, outsourcing arrangements, labor force or other conditions affecting the organization • the criteria to be used, whether those are set out in an established framework, developed by the entity, or a combination of both

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • changes in criteria or bases of preparation and the reasons for those changes, or whether there has not been a change when the changes in the entity’s operations suggest that a change may be needed • the entity’s governance, strategy, risk assessment process, and the oversight of, and responsibility for, the EER subject matter information <p>How to obtain an understanding</p> <p>Procedures may include (source ISAE 3410.24):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inquiries of those within the entity who have information that is likely to assist in identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement • analytical procedures • observation and inspection <p>and are iterative in nature. In addition, the practitioner may perform media searches or may have performed other engagements for the entity and obtained information that is relevant to the EER subject matter information, in which case the practitioner also considers that information.</p>	
	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 46L/R	3, 4, 5, 6, 7	<p>Extent of understanding</p> <p>Procedures (which may be one or more of those above) performed are sufficient to be able to identify areas where a material misstatement of the EER information is likely to arise i.e.</p>	<p>Extent of understanding</p> <p>Procedures (above) performed are sufficient to be able to identify and assess the risks of material misstatement in the EER information, i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at the level of the EER subject information as a whole

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> at the level of the EER subject matter information as a whole, and for material aspects of the EER information <p>as a basis for designing and performing procedures to address the areas identified, and to obtain limited assurance to support the practitioner’s conclusion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> at the level of the type of misstatement that might arise for material aspects of the EER information (it may be useful to use assertions to consider the type of misstatement that might arise) <p>as a basis for designing and performing procedures to respond to the assessed risks and obtain reasonable assurance.</p>
<p>Considering whether to use the work of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> internal audit a practitioner’s expert another practitioner <p>at the planning stage</p>	<p>ISAE 3000 (Revised) 32(a),(b), 45(b),(c)</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>Considerations about whether to use the work of internal audit, practitioner’s expert or another practitioner are the same for limited and reasonable assurance, and may be based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for internal audit, whether the entity has an internal audit function, and the nature and relevance of their work to the EER engagement for a practitioner’s expert, the nature and diversity of the EER underlying subject matter, the complexity or uncertainty in measuring or evaluating it, whether the preparer has used any experts to prepare the subject matter information, and whether or not there is already sufficient subject matter competence on the team, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> if the underlying subject matter is ‘water abstracted’, measured using water meters, there may be little need to use a practitioner’s expert, but if the underlying subject matter is ‘biochemical oxygen demand of effluent’ there may be a need for scientific expertise to analyze chemical outputs, and identify the effect of uncertainties on the subject matter information 	

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> for another practitioner, the entity's organizational boundary and location of its operations, both physical and logical (e.g. is it a standalone local entity or does it have multi-territory or multi-site facilities, does it outsource any of its operations, or operate as a joint venture or similar such that the practitioner may decide to use the work of another practitioner?)
<p>Assessing the objectivity and competence of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> internal audit a practitioner's expert another practitioner <p>when the work of such a party is to be used</p>	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 52 (a),(b), 53, 55(a),(b)	1	<p>When the work of internal audit, a practitioner's expert or another practitioner is to be used, information may come from a variety of sources, including from personal experience, discussions with these parties or with others who are familiar with their work, or from other sources. In assessing their competence, capabilities and objectivity, it may be useful to consider, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> who they report to (e.g. IA to the Board of Directors or Audit committee) professional body membership requirements, for example those relating to ethics and independence, continuing professional education, or license to practice published papers written by the expert and the expert's membership of industry or other bodies whether another practitioner is from within the same network or firm or outside of the practitioner's own organization and what quality control procedures that organization has in place personal or professional relationships with the preparer entity whether the other practitioner operates in a regulatory environment that actively oversees the practitioner the extent of involvement the practitioner expects to be able to have in the work of these other parties.

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
			Considerations about the competence, capabilities and objectivity of internal audit, a practitioner's expert and another practitioner are the same for limited and reasonable assurance.	
Obtaining an understanding of processes and internal control	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 47 L/R	5, 6	<p>Obtaining an understanding of the process used to prepare the subject matter information may include making inquiries to obtain an understanding of (based on ISAE 3410.25L with illustrative examples added):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the control environment, including the 'tone at the top', and whether the systems and processes are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – well-established or still developing – complex or less complex – automated or manual – devolved or centrally operated and monitored • the information systems and related business processes (including the entity's process to identify EER reporting topics) 	<p>The practitioner obtains an understanding of, for example (based on ISAE 3410.25R with examples added):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the control environment • the information systems and related business processes (including the entity's process to identify EER reporting topics) • communication of EER reporting roles and responsibilities • the entity's risk assessment process • control activities relevant to the engagement that are judged necessary to understand in order to assess the risks of material misstatement (at the assertion level) • the entity's monitoring of controls <p>In obtaining an understanding of the above, the practitioner is required to evaluate the design of relevant controls and determine</p>

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • communication of EER reporting roles and responsibilities • the results of the entity’s EER risk assessment process <p>In a limited assurance engagement, the practitioner is not required to evaluate the design of controls and determine whether they have been implemented.</p> <p>While it may often be appropriate to inquire about control activities and monitoring of controls relevant to the measurement or evaluation, and reporting of EER subject matter information, it will often not be necessary to obtain a detailed understanding of these aspects of the entity’s internal control, particularly in the case of uncomplex entities or underlying subject matters. Judgment about whether particular control activities are relevant to the engagement may be affected by the level of sophistication, documentation and formality of information systems relevant to the EER subject matter information.</p>	<p>whether they have been implemented by performing procedures in addition to inquiry of personnel responsible for the subject matter information. Additional procedures may include, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inspecting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – procedures manuals – documentation of user acceptance testing (UAT) and remediation of design weaknesses identified during UAT – evidence of training of personnel in how to operate controls • observing controls being performed

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
<p>Designing and performing procedures to obtain evidence</p>	<p>ISAE 3000 (Revised) 48L/R,</p>	<p>7, 8, 11, 12</p>	<p>In designing and performing procedures to address the areas identified as being where a misstatement is likely to arise, consider the reasons for those areas being identified. For example, among other reasons, it may be because of (source ISAE 3410.34 added to with examples):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the inherent nature of the underlying subject matter, the uncertainty or extent of judgment needed in its measurement, evaluation or disclosure • aspects of the underlying subject matter being easily missed, for example because of events or transactions outside of the normal course of business, because the preparer relies on a third party for information, because of undetected water or effluent leaks, fugitive GHG emissions, or similar • significant economic or regulatory changes 	<p>In designing and performing further procedures to respond to the assessed risks of material misstatement, consider the reasons for the assessment given to the risks of material misstatement. For example, among other reasons, it may be because of source ISAE 3410.34 added to with examples):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the inherent nature of the underlying subject matter, the uncertainty or extent of judgment needed in its measurement, evaluation or disclosure • the risk that unidentified aspects of the underlying subject matter may be missed, for example because of events or transactions outside of the normal course of business, because the preparer relies on a third party for information, or because of undetected water or effluent leaks, fugitive GHG emissions, or similar • significant economic or regulatory changes

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the complexity of the organization, its ownership and control arrangements, or its geographical spread • complex criteria, including the way in which its organizational boundary is determined • systems, processes and internal controls that are less automated or still developing, such that there may be a greater likelihood of human error, design or processing flaws or opportunity for unauthorized intervention • incentives to misstate <p>Obtain more persuasive evidence the higher the assessed likelihood of material misstatement, considering, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the nature and source of the evidence (e.g. written or oral; internal or external, reputation of the source) • whether analytical review procedures are appropriate or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the complexity of the organization, its ownership and control arrangements, or its geographical spread • complex criteria, including the way in which its organizational boundary is determined • systems, processes and internal controls that are less automated or still developing, such that there may be a greater likelihood of human error, design or processing flaws or opportunity for unauthorized intervention • incentives to misstate <p>Consider the likelihood of material misstatement due to the particular characteristics of the EER underlying subject matter (inherent risk)</p> <p>Design and perform tests of controls (to address control risk) when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is an intention to rely on the operating effectiveness of controls relevant to the EER engagement, or • procedures other than test of controls cannot alone provide sufficient

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> whether it would be more appropriate to perform tests of details, but to a lesser extent than would be the case for a reasonable assurance engagement. 	<p>appropriate evidence at the level of the type of misstatement that might arise (assertion level).</p> <p>An example of the latter is the quantification of subject matter information that may include processes that are highly automated, or robotic processes, with little or no manual intervention, such as when relevant information is recorded, processed and reported only in electronic form or when the processing of subject matter activity data is integrated with an information technology-based operational or financial reporting system. In such cases, evidence may be available only in electronic form, with its sufficiency and appropriateness dependent on the effectiveness of controls.</p> <p>If deviations from controls on which reliance is intended are detected, make specific inquiries to understand the matter(s) and potential consequences, and determine whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the tests of controls performed provide an appropriate basis for reliance on the controls, additional tests of controls are necessary, or

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the potential risks of material misstatement need to be addressed by other procedures because reliance on the controls is not warranted. <p>Irrespective of the assessed risks of material misstatement, design and perform tests of details or analytical procedures in addition to tests of controls (if any), for material aspects of the EER subject matter information.</p> <p>Consider whether external confirmation procedures are to be performed (for example, they may be used when data or other information is collected by a third party on behalf of the preparer entity, to confirm contract terms, to confirm results of laboratory tests, or when the preparer entity has used benchmark data in preparing the subject matter information). If confirmation procedures are to be performed, they are performed under the practitioner’s direct control, from initiation of the confirmation request to the receipt of the confirmation response, bypassing any involvement by the preparer of the EER subject matter information.</p>

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
				Obtain more persuasive evidence the higher the assessed likelihood of material misstatement.
<p>Procedures regarding estimates, including for future-oriented information</p>	<p>ISAE 3000 (Revised) 48 L/R – 49L/R</p>	<p>[8], 12</p>	<p>Procedures may include, for example (source: ISAE 3410.44L):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evaluation of whether the entity has appropriately applied the requirements of the applicable criteria relevant to estimates • evaluating whether the methods for making estimates are appropriate and have been applied consistently or whether changes, if any, are appropriate in the circumstances • other procedures, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – considering the source of assumptions used by the preparer – how the preparer has considered alternative assumptions and why it rejected them 	<p>Based on the assessed risks of material misstatement, procedures may include, for example, evaluation of whether (source: ISAE 3410.44R):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the entity has appropriately applied the requirements of the applicable criteria relevant to estimates • the methods for making estimates are appropriate and have been applied consistently or whether changes, if any, are appropriate in the circumstances <p>Taking account of the nature of the estimate, one or more of the following may be undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • test how the entity made the estimate and the data on which it is based, evaluating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the appropriateness of the method of quantification, and

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – where appropriate, performing one or more of the procedures indicated in the right-hand column alongside 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the reasonableness of assumptions used • test operating effectiveness of the controls over how the entity made the estimate together with other appropriate procedures • develop a point estimate or a range to evaluate the entity’s estimate; for this purpose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – if assumptions or methods are used that differ from those used by the preparer’s, obtain an understanding of the preparer’s assumptions or methods sufficient to establish that the point estimate or range being developed takes into account relevant variables and to evaluate any significant differences from the entity’s point estimate – if it is concluded that a range is appropriate - for example, when considering uncertain future-oriented information with a long-term time horizon – narrow the range, based on evidence available,

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures
			until all outcomes are within the range considered reasonable.
Accumulation and evaluation of quantitative misstatements	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 51	9	<p>The considerations are the same for limited and reasonable assurance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accumulate all misstatements (other than those that are clearly trivial) • Consider whether the overall engagement strategy and plan need to be revised if (source: ISAE 3410.51): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the nature of identified misstatements and their circumstances indicate that other misstatements may exist that, when aggregated with other misstatements accumulated during the engagement, could be material, or – the aggregate of quantitative misstatements accumulated during the engagement approaches materiality established during planning • Determine whether uncorrected misstatements are material, individually or in the aggregate, considering the size, nature and circumstances of the occurrence of the misstatements.
Accumulation and evaluation of qualitative misstatements	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 51	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accumulate all identified qualitative misstatements (for example, by listing their location in the qualitative information, their context, and the reason why it is considered a misstatement) • Consider the effect of qualitative misstatements on the aspect of the EER subject matter information to which it relates, as well as to the EER information as a whole; considerations include whether there is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – exaggeration or ‘underplaying’ of EER subject matter information to present the entity in a better light than is warranted,

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the relative prominence or emphasis given to aspects of the subject matter information, – a lack of connectivity of the subject matter information as a whole or between related aspects of the subject matter information, – whether visual or audio representations included in the subject matter information are congruent with the written information or whether they are presented in a biased manner (for example skewed graphs, quotations taken out of context, images that are incongruent with the substance of the text or similar) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine whether uncorrected misstatements are material, individually or when considered together with other uncorrected misstatements, considering the nature and circumstance of the occurrence of the misstatements.
Other information	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 62	8, 10, 11, 12	<p>The requirements are the same for limited and reasonable assurance. When documents containing the subject matter information and the assurance report contain other information, the practitioner is required to read that other information to identify material inconsistencies, if any, with the subject matter information or assurance report. For example, if the EER subject matter information is included in an entity's Annual Report and Accounts, all information - other than the EER subject matter information subject to assurance - in that document, including the financial statements, is 'other information'</p> <p>If the practitioner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifies a material inconsistency between that other information and the subject matter information or the assurance report, or

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> becomes aware of a material misstatement of fact in that other information that is unrelated to matters appearing in the subject matter information or the assurance report, <p>the practitioner is required to discuss the matter with the appropriate party and take further action as appropriate.</p>	
<p>Forming the assurance conclusion</p>	<p>ISAE 3000 (Revised) 64-66</p>	<p>8, 9, 11, 12</p>	<p>Evaluate whether anything has come to the practitioner’s attention that causes the practitioner to believe that the EER subject matter information has not been prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable criteria.</p> <p>If there is insufficient evidence to support the practitioner’s conclusion, a scope limitation exists, and a qualification of the assurance conclusion or withdrawal is necessary.</p> <p>The practitioner cannot agree to a change in the terms of the engagement (for example, to a request by the preparer to leave out aspects of the subject matter information for which there is insufficient evidence) where there is no reasonable justification for doing so.</p>	<p>Evaluate whether the EER subject matter information is prepared, in all material respects, with the applicable criteria.</p> <p>The practitioner cannot agree to a change in the terms of the engagement where there is no reasonable justification for doing so. An inability to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence to form a reasonable conclusion is not an acceptable reason to change from a reasonable assurance engagement to a limited assurance engagement.</p>

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
Reporting	ISAE 3000 (Revised) 67-71	10	<p>The assurance report is required to include the basic elements set out in paragraph 69 of the Standard.</p> <p>The summary of work performed (paragraph 69(k)) is required to state that the procedures performed in a limited assurance engagement vary in nature and timing, and are less in extent than for a reasonable assurance engagement and, consequently, the level of assurance obtained in a limited assurance engagement is substantially lower than the assurance that would have been obtained had a reasonable assurance engagement been performed.</p> <p>The summary of work performed is ordinarily more detailed than for a reasonable assurance engagement because an appreciation of the nature, timing and extent of procedures performed is essential to understanding a conclusion in a form that conveys whether, <u>based on the procedures performed</u>, a material matter has come to the practitioner's attention to cause them to believe that the</p>	<p>The assurance report is required to include the basic elements set out in paragraph 69 of the Standard</p> <p>The summary of work performed (paragraph 69 (k) does <u>not</u> include a statement that the procedures performed in a limited assurance engagement vary in nature and timing, and are less in extent than for a reasonable assurance engagement and, consequently, the level of assurance obtained in a limited assurance engagement is substantially lower than the assurance that would have been obtained had a reasonable assurance engagement been performed.</p>

	Source of requirement in the Standard	EER Guidance chapter	Guidance and illustrative procedures	
			subject matter information is materially misstated.	