

Proposed International Standard on Sustainability Assurance™ (ISSA) 5000, *General Requirements for Sustainability Assurance Engagements***Part 4 – Evidence and Documentation****Key Issues Identified in the Project Proposal Relevant to this Part**

- The difference in work effort between limited and reasonable assurance, including sufficiency of evidence.
- Evidence, including the reliability of information and what comprises sufficient appropriate evidence.

Key Feedback from the Reference Groups Relevant to this Part

Reference Groups #1 and #2 provided feedback regarding evidence:

1. Sources of data outside of the entity but within the scope of the engagement may not be readily accessible, such as data needed from the value chain, which may drive a need for the entity to have contractual arrangements in place.
2. Reliability of data can be variable or problematic, due to data being gathered across jurisdictions, entities being outside of the control of the entity and the data being generated by information systems that are not well established.
3. Incomplete data can result from limitations in access and gaps in capturing the data.
4. Automated tools and techniques were not considered to be at a sufficient level of maturity at this stage to require detailed material within the standard.

Key Issues for the Board's Consideration**Adaptation of Requirements from Proposed ISA 500 (Revised)¹**

5. As explained in **Agenda Item 7**, the Sustainability Assurance Task Force (SATF) has incorporated into this Part a large portion of the requirements and application material from Proposed ISA 500 (Revised). Further revisions to this Part may be needed as the project on Proposed ISA 500 (Revised) progresses, however these revisions, if any, may only be determined after the Exposure Draft of this standard is issued. The SATF will continue to monitor and consider the work of the Audit Evidence Task Force as ISA 500 (Revised) is finalized.
6. The following outlines the SATF's key considerations in adapting the requirements of Proposed ISA 500 (Revised) for the new overarching standard on assurance on sustainability information:

¹ Proposed ISA 500 (Revised), *Audit Evidence*, currently on exposure for public comment

(a) *Evaluating the relevance and reliability of information intended to be used as evidence*

The SATF considered paragraph 9 of Proposed ISA 500 (Revised), which requires the auditor to consider the source of the information and attributes of relevance and reliability that are applicable in the circumstances. The SATF did not incorporate this requirement in full into this Part and has instead developed a principles-based requirement for evaluating the relevance and reliability of information intended to be used as evidence that is more aligned with ISAE 3000 (Revised)² (see paragraph 2 of the drafting). The consideration of the source of the information and the attributes of relevance and reliability has been retained within the application material (see paragraph A20 of the drafting). The SATF believes this is a more appropriate approach for an overarching standard. A more granular focus on attributes that may be applicable in the circumstances, taking into account the myriad of topics, aspects of topics and disclosures, is better suited to a future separate ISSA on evidence. The future ISSA focused on evidence could also provide more specific guidance on the nature and extent of evidence that may be appropriate based on the types of topics, aspects of topics and characteristics of disclosures.

(b) *Obtaining evidence over completeness and accuracy*

Based on the decision of the SATF regarding attributes of relevance and reliability described above, the SATF also agreed not to include paragraph 10 of Proposed ISA 500 (Revised), which requires the auditor to obtain audit evidence over the completeness and accuracy of information intended to be used as evidence. However, additional emphasis has been given in the application material to the likely importance of the completeness and accuracy of information intended to be used as evidence (see paragraphs A35-A36 of the drafting). This is consistent with views expressed by the Reference Group #1 that these were the most important attributes to consider in relation to sustainability assurance engagements.

(c) *Focusing on the purpose of procedures*

The SATF has adopted:

- Paragraph 8 of Proposed ISA 500 (Revised), relating to designing and performing procedures *“the nature, timing and extent of which are appropriate in the circumstances to provide evidence to meet the intended purpose of those procedures”* (see paragraph 1(b) of the drafting).
- Paragraph 13 of Proposed ISA 500 (Revised), which requires the auditor to also *“evaluate whether the audit evidence obtained meets the intended purpose of the procedures”* (see paragraph 6(a) of the drafting).

The SATF intends to consider the feedback from respondents to Proposed ISA 500 (Revised) to determine whether these requirements are sufficiently understood and supported before concluding whether to retain them within Proposed ISSA 5000.

² International Standard on Assurance Engagement (ISAE) 3000 Revised, *Assurance Engagements Other Than Audits or Review of Historical Financial Information*

Addressing Evidence in the Context of Assurance Engagements on Sustainability Information

7. Sustainability information may comprise a wide range of topics, aspects of topics, and disclosures, and the underlying characteristics of the disclosures may vary (see the diagram in **Agenda Item 7**). The application material in this part has been developed based on principles and is focused on core concepts supported by examples that relate to sustainability information when appropriate, rather than seeking to describe the nature of evidence that may be appropriate for various topics, aspects of topics, disclosures or characteristics of disclosures. As explained in paragraph 6(a) above, the SATF believes guidance at that level of granularity is more suited to a future specific ISSA on evidence. Nevertheless, specific application material has been developed to describe considerations that may be applicable in obtaining evidence for qualitative information and forward-looking information, because these are often areas of particular challenge (see paragraphs A14-A18 of the drafting).

Location of Documentation Requirements

8. In the ISAs, documentation requirements exist in both ISA 230³ and across other individual ISAs⁴, as applicable. In the Proposed International Standard on Auditing of Financial Statements of Less Complex Entities (Proposed ISA for LCE), on which the structure of Proposed ISSA 5000 is broadly based, documentation requirements are similarly located in a “general requirements” section (Part 2), which addresses base principles, and across other Parts to deal with more specific documentation requirements (e.g., documentation for materiality or risk assessment). The ISAEs⁵ traditionally have all documentation requirements within a single section at the end of the requirements. The SATF is of the view that adopting the ISAE approach, rather than the Proposed ISA for LCE approach, may be preferable.

Questions for the IAASB:

(Please note these questions will be asked in 2 separate rounds – Question 8 and 9 together, and Question 10 separately)

8. Does the Board support how the requirements have been adapted from Proposed ISA 500 (Revised), and does this Part appropriately address the issues associated with evidence in performing sustainability assurance engagements? In particular, does the Board agree with the following approach (subject to considering the feedback from Proposed ISA 500 (Revised)):
- (a) A principles-based requirement to evaluate the relevance and reliability of information intended to be used as evidence, with application material highlighting the sources and attributes?
 - (b) Addressing completeness and accuracy in the application material?
 - (c) Including requirements from Proposed ISA 500 (Revised) that focus on the purpose of the procedures?
9. With respect to the requirements for documentation:
- (a) Does the Board believe that documentation requirements for specific matters are necessary, such as documentation requirements for identifying and assessing risks of material misstatement (e.g., see illustrative paragraphs 15L and 15R of the drafting)?

- (b) Should all documentation requirements be located together in this Part, or should any documentation requirements that relate to specific Parts (e.g., paragraphs 15L and 15R of the drafting) be located in the Part to which they relate?
10. General questions for the Board:
- (a) Does the Board believe that the requirements and application material in Part 4 are at an appropriate degree of specificity for an overarching standard?
- (b) Are there any other significant comments regarding matters addressed in Part 4, for example:
- (i) Are there concepts or issues the Board expected to be addressed that have not been addressed?
- (ii) Are there any proposals in this Part that were not addressed by the questions above on which the Board has significant comments?

Requirements and Application Material

Color coding for requirements and application material		If a requirement or application material only applies to either limited or reasonable assurance:
Green	Reasonable and limited assurance	
Blue	Reasonable assurance only	
Orange	Limited assurance only	

- The letter “L” is used in the paragraph number for limited assurance.
- The letter “R” is used in the paragraph number for reasonable assurance.

³ ISA 230, *Documentation*

⁴ International Standards on Auditing

⁵ International Standards on Assurance Engagements

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
	Part 4: Evidence and Documentation		
	<i>4.1 Designing and Performing Procedures to Obtain Sufficient Appropriate Evidence</i>		<i>4.1 Designing and Performing Procedures to Obtain Sufficient Appropriate Evidence</i>
1.	<p>For the purpose of obtaining sufficient appropriate evidence, the practitioner shall design and perform procedures:</p> <p>(a) In a manner that is not biased towards obtaining evidence that may be corroborative, or towards excluding evidence that may be contradictory; and</p> <p>(b) The nature, timing and extent of which are appropriate in the circumstances to provide evidence to meet the intended purpose of those procedures.</p> <p>[ED-500⁶ Para.8]</p>	A1.	<p>Evidence is necessary to support the practitioner’s conclusion and assurance report. It is cumulative in nature and is primarily obtained from procedures performed during the course of the engagement. It may, however, also include information obtained from other sources, such as previous engagements (provided the practitioner has determined whether changes have occurred since the previous engagement that may affect the relevance of the information to the current engagement) or a firm’s quality policies or procedures for acceptance and continuance of client relationships and assurance engagements. Evidence comprises both information that supports and corroborates disclosures in the sustainability information, and any information that contradicts disclosures in the sustainability information. [Extract of ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. A147]</p>
		A2.	<p>The practitioner obtains evidence by designing and performing procedures, including risk procedures, further procedures, and other procedures to comply with this ISSA. The nature of a procedure refers to its purpose and its type. Types of procedures include inquiries, inspection, observation, confirmation, recalculation, reperformance and analytical procedures. [Extract of ED-500 Para. A15 and Appendix]</p>

⁶ ED-500 refers to Proposed ISA 500 (Revised)

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			Designing and Performing Procedures in a Manner that is not Biased
		A3.	<p>Unconscious or conscious biases may affect the engagement team’s professional judgments in designing and performing procedures, which may impede the exercise of professional skepticism. An awareness of such biases when designing and performing procedures may help to mitigate impediments to the practitioner’s exercise of professional skepticism in critically assessing evidence and determining whether sufficient appropriate evidence has been obtained. Such awareness may also enable the practitioner to design and perform procedures that seek to avoid:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Corroborating the practitioner’s expectations about disclosures where material misstatements are likely to arise (in a limited assurance engagement) or risks of material misstatement (in a reasonable assurance engagement), or excluding evidence that may contradict such expectations or risks. (b) Placing more weight on evidence that corroborates disclosures than evidence that contradicts or casts doubt on such disclosures (confirmation bias). (c) Using an initial piece of information or evidence as an anchor against which subsequent information or evidence is assessed (anchoring bias). (d) Placing more weight on information that immediately comes to mind or uses information from sources that are more readily available or accessible (availability bias). (e) Placing weight or undue reliance on output from automated systems or information in digital format, or assuming it is relevant and reliable, without performing appropriate procedures (automation bias). <p>[ED-500 Para. A19-A20]</p>
		A4.	In a reasonable assurance engagement, obtaining evidence in an unbiased manner may involve obtaining information from multiple sources (see also paragraphs A28-A30).
			Procedures that are Appropriate in the Circumstances

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
		A5.	<p>Procedures are appropriate in the circumstances when the nature, timing and extent of such procedures are designed, performed and executed in a manner that achieves the intended purpose of the procedures. The purpose of performing a procedure may be related to risk procedures, further procedures or another procedure to comply with this ISSA. For example, the purpose may be to obtain evidence about whether an event affecting the sustainability information has occurred or whether the sustainability information is complete. [Extract of ED-500 Para. A25]</p>
		A6.	<p>In designing and performing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances to provide evidence, the practitioner's considerations may include whether information intended to be used as evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Is expected to be available in digital, written or oral form, related to a point in time or for a period, and is to be obtained from internal or external sources. (b) Is needed across multiple disclosures and how that affects the nature, timing and extent of evidence needed. For example, the nature and availability of appropriate evidence may vary based on whether the disclosures relate to an entity's processes, governance, controls or key performance indicators, and the characteristics of the disclosures, such as whether they are quantitative, qualitative, historical or forward-looking (see also paragraphs A14-A18). (c) Relates to disclosures that include information from the entity's value chain, and how that may affect the ability to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence. (d) Will need to be obtained across multiple locations. [Adapted from ISAE 3410⁷ Para.31] (e) Relates to disclosures that are factual, judgmental or subject to estimation uncertainty. <p>[Extract of EER Para. 273-274]</p>
		A7.	<p>In designing and performing procedures, the appropriateness of an approach or technique in selecting items for testing depends on several factors, such as:</p>

⁷ International Standard on Assurance Engagement (ISAE) 3410, *Assurance Engagements on Greenhouse Gas Statements*

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			<p>(a) The intended purpose of the procedure;</p> <p>(b) How the procedure is designed;</p> <p>(c) Whether the practitioner is performing the procedure manually or using automated tools and techniques;</p> <p>(d) The matters described in paragraph A6 relating to information intended to be used as evidence; and</p> <p>(e) The persuasiveness of evidence that is needed in the circumstances.</p> <p>[ED-500 Para. A28]</p>
			Sufficiency and Appropriateness of Evidence
		A8.	<p>The practitioner is required to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence to provide a basis for the assurance conclusion. The sufficiency and appropriateness of evidence are interrelated and together affect the persuasiveness of evidence. In both limited and reasonable assurance engagements the collective persuasiveness of the evidence obtained establishes the level of assurance obtained. The practitioner aims to obtain evidence that is collectively persuasive to respond to risk considerations. Ordinarily, evidence will be persuasive rather than conclusive. [Extracts of ED-500 Para. A6 and EER Para. 269-270]</p>
		A9.	<p>Sufficiency is the measure of the quantity of evidence. The quantity of evidence needed is affected by the risks of the sustainability information being materially misstated (the more likely, or higher, the risks, the more evidence is likely to be required) and also by the quality of such evidence (the higher the quality, the less may be required). Obtaining more evidence, however, may not compensate for its poor quality. [ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. A148]</p>
		A10.	<p>The appropriateness of evidence refers to its quality. The quality of evidence depends on the relevance and reliability of the information intended to be used as evidence as well as the effectiveness of the design of the assurance procedures and the practitioner's application of those procedures. Information that is more relevant and reliable ordinarily is of a higher quality and,</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			<p>therefore, may provide more persuasive evidence. If the evidence is more persuasive, the practitioner may determine that the evidence is sufficient in providing support for the conclusions that form the basis for the practitioner’s assurance conclusion. Alternatively, when evidence is less persuasive, the practitioner may determine that additional evidence is needed to provide support for the practitioner’s conclusions. However, increasing the quantity of evidence by performing the same type of procedures may not provide more persuasive evidence in all circumstances. [ED-500 Para. A13]</p>
		A11.	<p>The practitioner uses professional judgment and exercises professional skepticism in evaluating the sufficiency and appropriateness of evidence to support the assurance conclusion. [EER Para. 276]</p>
		A12.	<p>Factors that affect the evidence that may be available in the circumstances, in terms of quantity or quality, and therefore impact its sufficiency or appropriateness, include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The characteristics of the underlying subject matter or disclosures. For example, less objective evidence might be expected when the disclosures are forward-looking rather than historical. (b) Other circumstances, such as when evidence that could reasonably be expected to exist is not available because of, for example, the timing of the practitioner’s appointment, an entity’s document retention policy, inadequate information systems, or a restriction imposed by management. <p>[ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. A53]</p>
		A13.	<p>The procedures designed and performed by the practitioner may also affect the persuasiveness of the evidence obtained. For example, in a reasonable assurance engagement, inspection of an entity’s processes and related controls that support the preparation of the sustainability information, or external confirmation procedures to obtain evidence over information used by management in preparing the sustainability information, may provide more persuasive evidence than inquiry of management. In a reasonable assurance engagement, inquiry alone ordinarily does not provide sufficient appropriate evidence. [Modified from ED-500 Para. A24]</p>
			<p>Qualitative Information</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
		A14.	<p>Some qualitative disclosures may be factual and directly observable or otherwise able to be subject to evidence-gathering procedures. However, some qualitative disclosures may be inherently judgmental, not directly observable and may be susceptible to management bias. The practitioner may need to exercise significant professional judgment in evaluating what constitutes sufficient appropriate evidence in these circumstances. [Modified from EER Para. 331]</p>
		A15.	<p>Although the processes and control activities within the entity’s information system may be sufficient to provide the preparer with a reasonable basis for the sustainability information, they may not be sufficient to provide the practitioner with the evidence needed to support the practitioner’s assurance conclusion. This may have implications for the practitioner’s planned procedures, their ability to obtain the evidence needed about the qualitative sustainability information, and the assurance conclusion. For example, when designing and performing procedures for qualitative sustainability information, the practitioner may consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Whether, in the case of a reasonable assurance engagement, substantive testing alone will provide sufficient appropriate evidence regarding the occurrence, completeness or neutrality of the sustainability information. If not, the practitioner may need to perform tests of controls over the integrity of data, or other control activities within the entity’s information system that support the preparation of the qualitative information. (b) The source of the information intended to be used as evidence, how such information has been captured and processed by the entity’s information system, and how this may affect the reliability of the information. For example, information may be captured directly into the entity’s information system on a real-time basis without supporting documentation or may be obtained through informal communication. <p>[EER Para. 327 and Extract of Para. 337]</p>
			Forward-looking Information
		A16.	<p>Forward-looking information, by its nature, is predictive and may be expressed in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Disclosures about future conditions or outcomes relates to events and actions</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			<p>that have not yet occurred and may not occur, or that have occurred but are still evolving in unpredictable ways. While forward-looking information may result from applying criteria to the underlying subject matter, the underlying subject matter (a future event, occurrence or action) may be subject to greater uncertainty, and generally able to be evaluated with less precision than historical underlying subject matter(s). Uncertainty and the need for judgment are also likely to increase the further into the future the period to which the disclosures relate. Unlike historical information, it is not possible for the practitioner to determine whether the results or outcomes forecasted or projected have been or will be achieved or realized. In seeking evidence, the practitioner may obtain evidence about whether the forward-looking information has been prepared in accordance with the applicable criteria on the basis of the assumptions used by the entity, and:</p> <p>(a) In the case of forecasts, there is a reasonable basis for the assumptions used in preparing the sustainability information; or</p> <p>(b) In the case of hypothetical assumptions, such assumptions are consistent with the purpose of the information.</p> <p>[Extract of EER Para. 379]</p>
		A17.	<p>Evidence may be available to support the assumptions on which the forward-looking sustainability information is based, but such evidence itself may also be forward-looking and, therefore, speculative in nature. Accordingly, the practitioner may need to exercise professional judgment in determining the persuasiveness of the evidence. In some circumstances, the evidence available may support a range of possible outcomes with the disclosure falling within that range. The practitioner’s evaluation of whether the disclosure is reasonable based on the evidence obtained is further addressed in paragraphs 1 and A1-A7 in Part 8. [Modified from EER Paras. 364-65]</p>
		A18.	<p>The nature and availability of evidence for forward-looking information, and what constitutes sufficient appropriate evidence, will likely vary by topics, aspects of topics and disclosures, and the practitioner’s consideration of potential material misstatements. For example:</p> <p>(a) When disclosures relate to future strategy, a target, or other intentions of an entity the practitioner may focus evidence gathering activities on whether management or those charged</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			<p>with governance have an intention to follow that strategy, the target or intention exists, or there is a reasonable basis for the intended strategy or target (e.g., the practitioner may obtain evidence to support that the entity has the ability to carry out its intent, or is building the means to do so by considering the processes, systems and controls over the development of the assumptions, and the source data on which they are based). [Modified from EER Para. 374]</p> <p>(b) When disclosures relate to future risks and opportunities, the practitioner may focus evidence gathering activities on information available from the entity’s risk register or records of discussions of those charged with governance if the entity’s processes and controls in place over the maintenance of the risk register and the minuting of discussions provide a reasonable basis for using these sources as evidence. In a reasonable assurance engagement, the practitioner may need to consider obtaining evidence over the effectiveness of internal controls.</p> <p>[Modified from EER Para. 377]</p>
	<p><i>4.2 Information Intended to be Used as Evidence</i></p>		<p><i>4.2 Information Intended to be Used as Evidence</i></p>
<p>2.</p>	<p>When designing and performing procedures, the practitioner shall evaluate the relevance and reliability of information intended to be used as evidence. [Based on ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. 50]</p>	<p>A19.</p>	<p>In planning and performing a sustainability assurance engagement, the practitioner may obtain information from a variety of sources and in different forms. Such information ordinarily is expected to result in evidence to support the conclusions that form the basis for the practitioner’s assurance conclusion and report. However, such information can become evidence only after procedures are applied to it, including evaluating its relevance and reliability. For purposes of this ISSA, this information is referred to as “information intended to be used as evidence.” [ED-500 Para. A34]</p>
		<p>A20.</p>	<p>Evaluating the relevance and reliability of information intended to be used as evidence involves performing procedures. Factors that may influence the nature, timing and extent of such procedures, include:</p> <p>(a) The source of the information; and</p> <p>(b) The attributes of relevance and reliability of the information that are considered applicable in the circumstances.</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			[Modified from ED-500 Para. A36]
		A21.	In some circumstances, the procedures to evaluate relevance and reliability may be straightforward (e.g., comparing information used by management to published information from a national government body). In other circumstances, procedures, including tests of controls, may be performed to evaluate the reliability of information (e.g., the accuracy and completeness of information generated internally from the entity's information system). [Extract of ED-500 Para. A37]
		A22.	<p>Evidence from performing other procedures in accordance with this ISSA also may assist the practitioner in evaluating the relevance and reliability of information intended to be used as evidence. For example, evidence obtained from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The practitioner's understanding of the entity and its environment, the applicable criteria and the entity's system of internal control. (b) Tests of controls over the preparation and maintenance of the information. (c) Procedures performed when using of the work of a practitioner's expert. <p>[Extract of ED-500 Para. A38]</p>
			Form, Availability, Accessibility and Understandability of Information
		A23.	<p>The form, availability, accessibility and understandability of the information intended to be used as evidence may affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The design and performance of the procedures in which the information will be used; and (b) In the practitioner's evaluation of the relevance and reliability of the information. <p>For example, information may only be available in digital form on a continuous basis. In such circumstances, the practitioner may use automated tools and techniques that are designed to operate on a real-time basis to evaluate the relevance and reliability of the information.</p> <p>[Extract of ED-500 Para. A42]</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
		A24.	<p>The practitioner may receive information intended to be used as evidence in many forms, ranging from information generated from highly complex automated systems to information manually prepared by management and others within the entity. The practitioner may have an expectation of the form in which information intended to be used as evidence will be received. Remaining alert for information intended to be used as evidence that is received in a form different from the expected form may assist the practitioner in mitigating unconscious biases that may impede the practitioner’s exercise of professional skepticism. In addition, receiving information in a form different from that expected may also be relevant to the practitioner’s evaluation of the reliability of that information. [ED-500 Para. A44]</p>
		A25.	<p>Information intended to be used as evidence may exist, but access to such information may be restricted, for example, due to restrictions imposed by law or regulation or the source providing the information, or due to war, civil unrest or outbreaks of disease. In some cases, the practitioner may be able to overcome restrictions on access to information. For example, the practitioner may request management or those charged with governance of the entity to assist in requesting information from a source when contractual obligations exist between an information source and the entity, or the practitioner may choose to visit a location to inspect information that is available but cannot be transferred outside of a jurisdiction. [Extract of ED-500 Para. A45]</p>
		A26.	<p>The practitioner may be unable to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence if the practitioner determines that it is not practicable to obtain or understand information intended to be used as evidence. For example, if the practitioner does not have a sufficient basis to evaluate the relevance and reliability of information from a source external to the entity, the practitioner may have a limitation on scope if sufficient appropriate evidence cannot be obtained through alternative procedures. The practitioner’s inability to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence requires the practitioner to express a qualified conclusion or disclaim a conclusion on the sustainability information in accordance with Part 9 of this ISSA. [Extract of ED-500 Para. A46]</p>
		A27.	<p>In some circumstances, specialized skills or knowledge may be needed to understand or interpret the information intended to be used as evidence, for example, emissions data. Accordingly, the practitioner may consider using a practitioner’s expert to assist in understanding or interpreting the</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			<p>information intended to be used as evidence if the engagement team does not have the appropriate competence and capabilities to do so. [ED-500 Para. A47]</p> <p>[Placeholder for any examples deemed necessary]</p>
			Sources of Information
		A28.	<p>Information intended to be used as evidence may come from internal sources or external sources and may affect the availability, accessibility and understandability of the information intended to be used as evidence. For example, information may come from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The entity's records, management or other sources internal to the entity. (b) A management's expert. (c) A practitioner's expert. (d) Independent sources external to the entity, other than a management's or practitioner's expert, that provide information, such as the entity's bank, legal counsel, customers, suppliers, or general data providers (e.g., entities providing macro-economic, industry or social data). (e) A service organization <p>[Modified from ED-500 Para. A48]</p>
		A29.	<p>The practitioner is not required to perform an exhaustive search to identify all possible sources of information to be used as evidence. The practitioner's understanding of the entity and its environment, the applicable criteria and the entity's system of internal control may assist the practitioner in identifying appropriate sources of information. [Extract of ED-500 Para. A51]</p>
		A30.	<p>The practitioner ordinarily obtains more assurance from consistent evidence obtained from different sources or of a different nature than from items of evidence considered individually. In addition, obtaining information intended to be used as evidence from different sources or of a different nature may indicate that an individual item of information intended to be used as evidence is not reliable. [Extract of ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. A150]</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			Attributes of Relevance and Reliability of Information
		A31.	The quality of evidence depends on the relevance and reliability of the information upon which it is based. Whether, and the degree to which, certain attributes of relevant and reliable information are considered applicable in the circumstances is a matter of professional judgment. [ED-500 Para. A53]
			Relevance
		A32.	The principal attribute of the relevance of information intended to be used as evidence deals with the logical connection with, or bearing upon, the purpose of the procedure, including, in a reasonable assurance engagement, the assertion being tested. The degree to which the information relates to meeting the purpose of the procedure may also be a consideration. [ED-500 Para. A54]
			Reliability
		A33.	<p>The reliability of information intended to be used as evidence deals with the degree to which the practitioner may depend on such information. Common attributes that may be applicable when considering the degree to which information intended to be used as evidence is reliable may include whether the information is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Accurate (free from error). (b) Complete (reflecting all applicable events, conditions and circumstances). (c) Authentic (genuine, authorized and not inappropriately altered). (d) Free from bias (whether intentional or unintentional). (e) Credible (generated by a competent, capable and trustworthy source). <p>[Extract of ED-500 Para. A56]</p>
			Factors That Affect the Practitioner’s Professional Judgment Regarding the Attributes of Relevance and Reliability

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
		A34.	<p>Factors that may affect the practitioner’s professional judgment about the relevance and reliability of information intended to be used as evidence, including which attributes of reliability may be applicable in the circumstances, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The disclosures and, for reasonable assurance engagements, the assertions, for which the information will be used as evidence. Information may be relevant to multiple disclosures. Some information may be relevant for certain assertions but not others. (b) The period of time to which the information relates. (c) The controls over the preparation and maintenance of the information. (d) The practitioner’s assessment of disclosures where material misstatements are likely to arise (in a limited assurance engagement) or the assessed risks of material misstatement (in a reasonable assurance engagement). (e) The intended purpose of the procedure in which the information will be used. [ED-500 Para.A59] (f) The level of detail of the information needed given the intended purpose of the procedure. For example, information related to key performance indicators used by management may not be precise enough to detect material misstatements at the assertion level and therefore may not, in a reasonable assurance engagement, be appropriate for use by the practitioner in performing further procedures. (g) The level of precision within the applicable criteria regarding what is to be reported and how it is to be measured or evaluated. For example, when the applicable criteria require more granular quantitative disclosures, the practitioner may consider the attributes of accuracy and completeness to be important. (h) The source of the information. For example, accuracy and completeness ordinarily will be applicable attributes for information generated internally from the entity’s information system (such as when performing further procedures). For information obtained from a source external to the entity, the practitioner may be more focused on other attributes of reliability, including the credibility of the source providing the information.

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			<p>(i) The ability of the reporting entity to influence information obtained from external sources with whom they have relationships.</p> <p>(j) Evidence of general market acceptance by users of the relevance and reliability of information from an external source.</p> <p>[Extracts of ED-500 Para. A55, A59, A60 and A63; EER Para. 277]</p>
		A35.	<p>The reliability of information, in particular the attributes of accuracy, completeness and authenticity, when deemed to be applicable in the circumstances, may also be affected by whether the integrity of the information has been maintained through all stages of processing through the entity's information systems. For example, an entity's information system may include general information technology controls to safeguard and maintain the integrity of the sustainability information. In a reasonable assurance engagement, the practitioner may determine, based on the practitioner's understanding and evaluation of the entity's information system and control activities, that the integrity of the sustainability information has been maintained through all stages of information processing, including when information is extracted for reporting purposes. [ED-500 Para. A58]</p>
		A36.	<p>The source of the information intended to be used as evidence may affect the nature and extent of the practitioner's evaluation of the relevance and reliability of the information. It may also affect how the practitioner responds to matters such as doubts about the reliability of the information, or inconsistencies in evidence. For example:</p> <p>(a) If the information comes from a highly reputable external source, such as an authorized jurisdictional environmental agency, the practitioner's work effort in considering the reliability of the information may not be extensive.</p> <p>(b) If the information is provided by management, such as information generated internally from the entity's information system, the practitioner may need to consider obtaining evidence about the accuracy and completeness of the information.</p> <p>[Extract of ED-500 Para. A50]</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
	4.2.1 Work Performed by a Management's Expert		4.2.1 Work Performed by a Management's Expert
			The Competence, Capabilities and Objectivity of the Management's Expert
3.	<p>If information intended to be used as evidence has been prepared by a management's expert, as part of the practitioner's evaluation in accordance with paragraph 2, the practitioner shall, to the extent necessary having regard to the significance of that expert's work for the practitioner's purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Evaluate the competence, capabilities and objectivity of that expert; (b) Obtain an understanding of the work performed by that expert; and (c) Obtain an understanding about how the information prepared by that expert has been used by management in the preparation of the sustainability information. <p>[Modified from ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. 54, including (c) from ED-500 Para. 10]</p>	A37.	<p>When evaluating the relevance and reliability of information intended to be used as evidence prepared by a management's expert:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The competence and capabilities of that expert may inform the practitioner's consideration of the attribute of credibility. The credibility of the source providing the information affects the degree to which information intended to be used as evidence is reliable. (b) The objectivity of that expert may inform the practitioner's consideration of the attribute of bias. A broad range of circumstances may influence the professional judgments of the management's expert, which may threaten the management expert's objectivity, for example, self-interest threats, advocacy threats, familiarity threats, self-review threats and intimidation threats. Bias in the information intended to be used as evidence also affects the degree to which information is reliable. In some cases, information prepared by a management's expert may be subject to bias, as management may have an influence on the professional judgments of the management's expert. <p>[Modified from ED-500 Para. A69 and A72]</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			Competence and Capabilities
		A38.	<p>Competence relates to the nature and level of expertise of the management’s expert. Factors that may affect whether the management’s expert has the appropriate competence include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Whether the expert’s work is subject to technical performance standards or other professional or industry requirements, for example, ethical standards and other membership requirements of a professional body or industry association, accreditation standards of a licensing body, or requirements imposed by law or regulation. (b) The matter for which the management expert’s work will be used, and whether they have the appropriate level of expertise applicable to the matter, including expertise in a particular area of specialty. (c) The management’s expert’s competence with respect to relevant underlying subject matter, for example, knowledge of assumptions and methods, including models when applicable, that are consistent with the applicable criteria. <p>[ED-500 Para. A70]</p>
		A39.	<p>Capabilities relates to the ability of the management’s expert to exercise the competence in the circumstances. Factors that may influence capabilities may include geographic location, and the availability of time and resources. [ED-500 Para. A71]</p>
			Obtain an Understanding of the Work Performed by the Management’s Expert
		A40.	<p>Matters relevant to the practitioner’s understanding of the work performed by the management’s expert may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The relevant field of expertise; (b) The nature, scope and objectives of the management’s expert’s work;

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			<p>(c) Whether there are professional or other standards, and regulatory or legal requirements that apply in preparing the information;</p> <p>(d) How the information has been prepared by the management’s expert, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The assumptions and methods used by the management’s expert, and whether they are generally accepted within that expert’s field and appropriate in the context of the applicable criteria and the underlying subject matter; and (ii) The underlying information used by the management’s expert; and <p>(e) The relevance and reasonableness of that expert’s findings or conclusions, and their consistency with other evidence.</p> <p>[ED-500 Para. A74]</p>
			<p>Obtain an Understanding of How the Information Prepared by the Management’s Expert Has Been Used by Management in the Preparation of the Sustainability Information</p>
		A41.	<p>Obtaining an understanding about how the information prepared by a management’s expert has been used by management in the preparation of the sustainability information may include understanding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) How management has considered the appropriateness of the information prepared by the management’s expert; and (b) The modifications made by management to the information prepared by the management’s expert. <p>This understanding may assist the practitioner in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Evaluating the relevance and reliability of the information intended to be used as evidence; and (b) Understanding whether the expert’s findings or conclusions have been appropriately reflected in the sustainability information. For example, in some circumstances, management may need to modify the information prepared by the management’s expert, such as when the information provided is too general and requires adjustment to reflect the circumstances unique to the entity. Management’s adjustments may give rise to bias, or management may not have the

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			<p>appropriate competence and capabilities to adapt or adjust the information, which may cause the information to be inaccurate, incomplete or lack credibility.</p> <p>[Modified from ED-500 Para. A77]</p>
	4.2.2 Doubts About the Relevance and Reliability of Information Intended to be Used as Evidence		4.2.2 Doubts About the Relevance and Reliability of Information Intended to be Used as Evidence
4.	<p>If conditions identified during the assurance engagement cause the practitioner to believe that a document may not be authentic or that terms in a document have been modified but not disclosed to the practitioner, the practitioner shall investigate further and determine the effect on the rest of the evidence obtained. [Modified from ISA 240⁸ Para. 14]</p>	A42.	<p>Unless the practitioner has reason to believe the contrary, the practitioner may accept records and documents as genuine. When the practitioner identifies conditions that give cause to believe that a document may not be authentic or that terms in a document have been modified but not disclosed to the practitioner, possible procedures to investigate further may include:</p> <p>(a) Confirming directly with the third party.</p> <p>(b) Using the work of an expert to assess the document's authenticity.</p> <p>[Extract of ISA 240 Para. A10]</p>
5.	<p>If the practitioner has doubts about the relevance or reliability of information intended to be used as evidence, the practitioner shall:</p> <p>(a) Determine whether modifications or additions to procedures are necessary to resolve the doubts, and</p>	A43.	<p>Factors or circumstances that may give rise to doubts about the reliability of information intended to be used as evidence include:</p> <p>(a) An inability to evaluate the relevance and reliability of the information, including, for example, whether the information is authentic.</p> <p>(b) Misstatements identified during the assurance engagement.</p> <p>(c) Deficiencies in internal control identified by the practitioner, particularly when there is a significant deficiency in internal control.</p>

⁸ ISA 240, *Auditor's Responsibilities Relating to Fraud in an Audit of Financial Statements*

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
	<p>(b) If the doubts cannot be resolved, consider the effect, if any, on other aspects of the engagement, including whether such doubts indicate a risk of material misstatement due to fraud.</p> <p>[ED-500 Para. 12]</p>		<p>(d) When procedures performed on a population result in a higher rate of deviation than expected.</p> <p>(e) When information intended to be used as evidence is inconsistent with other information or evidence.</p> <p>[ED-500 Para. A80]</p>
		A44.	<p>The relevance of information intended to be used as evidence may be affected by the period of time to which the information relates. For example, the relevance of such information may change based on the passage of time or due to events or conditions, such as the identification of new information. Such circumstances may occur when the practitioner identifies information from an alternative or more credible source which negates, or causes doubt about, the relevance of the initial information intended to be used as evidence. [ED-500 Para. A79]</p>
		A45.	<p>In cases of doubt about the reliability of information or indications of possible fraud, this ISSA requires the practitioner to investigate further and determine what modifications or additions to procedures are necessary to resolve the matter. Doubts about the reliability of information from management may indicate a risk of fraud. [Extracts of ED-500 Paras. A82–A83]</p>
	4.2.3 Evaluating the Evidence Obtained		4.2.3 Evaluating the Evidence Obtained
6.	<p>The practitioner shall evaluate the sufficiency and appropriateness of the evidence obtained in the context of the engagement and, if necessary in the circumstances, attempt to obtain further evidence. In making this evaluation, the practitioner shall:</p>	A46.	<p>An assurance engagement is an iterative process, and information may come to the practitioner’s attention that differs significantly from that on which the determination of planned procedures was based. This may particularly be the case when the entity’s information system is less mature or when the disclosures, and their characteristics, are subject to greater judgment. As the practitioner performs planned procedures, the evidence obtained may cause the practitioner to perform additional procedures to meet the intended purpose(s) in performing those procedures. In some circumstances, the practitioner may not have obtained the evidence that the practitioner had expected to obtain through the planned procedures. When the practitioner determines that the evidence obtained from</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
	<p>(a) Evaluate whether the evidence obtained meets the intended purpose of the procedures; and</p> <p>(b) Consider all evidence obtained, including evidence that is consistent or inconsistent with other evidence, and regardless of whether it appears to corroborate or to contradict the disclosures.</p> <p>[ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. 64 and ED-500 Para. 13]</p>		<p>the procedures performed is not sufficient and appropriate to be able to form a conclusion on the subject matter information, the practitioner may:</p> <p>(a) Extend the work performed; or</p> <p>(b) Perform other procedures judged by the practitioner to be necessary in the circumstances.</p> <p>When neither of these is practicable in the circumstances, the practitioner will not be able to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence to be able to form a conclusion. [Expansion on ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. A113 and A153]</p>
		A47.	<p>A procedure may be designed to be effective in achieving an intended purpose, but if the performance or execution of the procedure (i.e., its application) is inappropriate the purpose of the procedure may not be met. Part 2 of this ISSA addresses the specific responsibilities of the practitioner regarding quality management at the engagement level, and the related responsibilities of the engagement leader, which may affect the application of procedures. In addition, Part 2 explains that the review of the engagement team’s work consists of considering whether, for example:</p> <p>(a) The evidence obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for the practitioner’s assurance conclusion; and</p> <p>(b) The objectives of the procedures have been achieved.</p> <p>[ED-500 Para. A88]</p>
		A48.	<p>If the practitioner is unable to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence, the practitioner is required to express a qualified conclusion or disclaim a conclusion on the sustainability information in accordance with Part 9 of this ISSA. [Extract of ED-500 Para. A86]</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
7.	<p>If the practitioner obtains evidence that is inconsistent with other evidence, the practitioner shall:</p> <p>(a) Determine what modifications or additions to procedures are necessary to understand and address the inconsistency; and</p> <p>(b) Consider the effect, if any, on other aspects of the assurance engagement.</p> <p>[ED-500 Para.14]</p>	A49.	<p>In some cases, the evidence obtained may corroborate the disclosures, but when considered with other evidence, may indicate possible management bias. See also paragraph 8 of Part 8 on evaluating misstatements. [ED-500 Para. A89]</p>
		A50.	<p>When evidence is inconsistent with other evidence, it may indicate that some of the information used as evidence is not reliable. This may be the case, for example, when responses to inquiries of management, those charged with governance, internal auditors, or others are inconsistent. Such inconsistencies may therefore call into question the appropriateness of the practitioner's evaluation of the relevance and reliability of such information, in accordance with paragraph 2. Paragraph 5 addresses the practitioner's responsibilities when the practitioner has doubts about the relevance and reliability of information intended to be used as evidence. The extent to which the practitioner may need to modify or add to the procedures to resolve the doubts and the effect on other aspects of the assurance engagement may vary. [ED-500 Para. A90]</p>
		A51.	<p>When performing a procedure, the practitioner may identify items that are inconsistent with the practitioner's expectations or that exhibit characteristics that are unusual. Different terminology may be used to describe these items, for example, exceptions, outliers, notable items, or items of interest. These items may indicate a possible misstatement in the sustainability information. They may also indicate inconsistencies in evidence, particularly when other evidence has not identified similar exceptions or outliers, or cast doubt on the reliability of the information. [ED-500 Para. A91]</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
		A52.	In considering the effect of inconsistencies in evidence on other aspects of the assurance engagement, the practitioner may consider whether the practitioner’s identification of disclosures where material misstatements are likely to arise (limited assurance) or risk assessment (reasonable assurance) remains appropriate. [ED-500 Para. A92]
	<i>4.3 Documentation</i>		<i>4.3 Documentation</i>
	4.3.1 Form, Content and Extent of Assurance Engagement Documentation		4.3.1 Form, Content and Extent of Assurance Engagement Documentation
8.	<p>The practitioner shall prepare on a timely basis assurance engagement documentation that provides a record of the basis for the assurance report that is sufficient and appropriate to enable a practitioner experienced in sustainability assurance, having no previous connection with the assurance engagement, to understand:</p> <p>(a) The nature, timing and extent of the procedures performed to comply with this ISSA, other relevant ISSAs and applicable legal and regulatory requirements;</p> <p>(b) The results of the procedures performed, and the evidence obtained; and</p> <p>(c) Significant matters arising during the assurance engagement, the</p>	A53.	<p>A practitioner experienced in sustainability assurance refers to an individual (whether internal or external to the firm) who has practical experience in sustainability assurance, and a reasonable understanding of:</p> <p>(a) Assurance processes;</p> <p>(b) ISSAs and applicable legal and regulatory requirements;</p> <p>(c) The business environment in which the entity operates; and</p> <p>(d) Assurance and sustainability reporting matters relevant to the entity’s industry.</p> <p>[NEW – Based on ISA 230 Para. 6(c)]</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
	<p>conclusions reached thereon, and significant professional judgments made in reaching those conclusions.</p> <p>[ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. 79]</p>		
		A54.	<p>Preparing sufficient and appropriate assurance engagement documentation on a timely basis helps to enhance the quality of the assurance engagement and facilitates the effective review and evaluation of the evidence obtained and conclusions reached before the practitioner’s report is finalized. Documentation prepared after the assurance engagement work has been performed is likely to be less accurate than documentation prepared at the time such work is performed. [ISA 230 Para. A1]</p>
		A55.	<p>The form, content and extent of assurance engagement documentation depend on factors such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The size and complexity of the entity. (b) The scope of the assurance engagement and nature of the procedures to be performed. For example, the extent of documentation would ordinarily be less: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) For a limited assurance engagement compared to a reasonable assurance engagement. (ii) When the assurance engagement addresses only certain aspects of the sustainability information, rather than all of the sustainability information that comprises multiple disclosures. (c) The extent of disclosures where material misstatements are likely to arise (in a limited assurance engagement) or the identified and assessed risks of material misstatement (in a reasonable assurance engagement). (d) The significance of the evidence obtained. (e) The nature and extent of exceptions identified. (f) The need to document a conclusion or the basis for a conclusion not self-evident from the documentation of the work performed or evidence obtained.

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			<p>(g) The assurance methodology and tools used. [Modified from ISA 230 Para. A2]</p>
		A56.	<p>Judging the significance of a matter requires an objective analysis of the facts and circumstances. Examples of significant matters include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Matters that give rise to higher assessed risks (in a reasonable assurance engagement). (b) Results of procedures indicating that the sustainability information could be materially misstated or, in a reasonable assurance engagement, a need to revise the practitioner's previous assessment of the risks of material misstatement and the practitioner's responses to those risks. (c) Circumstances that cause the practitioner significant difficulty in applying necessary procedures. (d) Findings that could result in a modification to the assurance conclusion or the inclusion of an Emphasis of Matter paragraph in the Assurance report. <p>[ISA 230 Para. A8]</p>
		A57.	<p>An important factor in determining the form, content and extent of assurance engagement documentation of significant matters is the extent of professional judgment exercised in performing the work and evaluating the results. Documentation of the professional judgments made, when significant, serves to explain the practitioner's conclusions and to reinforce the quality of the judgment. [Extract of ISA 230 Para. A9]</p>
		A58.	<p>Examples of circumstances in which, in accordance with paragraph 8, it is appropriate to prepare assurance engagement documentation relating to the use of professional judgment include matters and judgments that are significant to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The rationale for the practitioner's conclusion when a requirement provides that the practitioner "shall consider" certain information or factors, and that consideration is significant in the context of the particular engagement.

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
			<p>(b) The basis for the practitioner’s conclusion on the reasonableness of areas of judgments (for example, the reasonableness of significant estimates).</p> <p>(c) The basis for the practitioner’s conclusions about the authenticity of a document when further investigation is undertaken in response to conditions identified during the assurance engagement that caused the practitioner to believe that the document may not be authentic.</p> <p>[Extract of ISA 230 Para. A10]</p>
		A59.	<p>It is neither necessary nor practical to document every matter considered, or professional judgment made, during an engagement. Further, it is unnecessary for the practitioner to document separately (e.g., through a checklist) compliance with matters for which compliance is demonstrated by documents included within the assurance engagement file. [Extract of ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. A201]</p>
9.	<p>In documenting the nature, timing and extent of procedures performed, the practitioner shall record:</p> <p>(a) The identifying characteristics of the specific items or matters tested;</p> <p>(b) Who performed the assurance engagement work and the date such work was completed; and</p> <p>(c) Who reviewed the assurance engagement work performed and the date and extent of such review.</p> <p>[ISAE 3410 Para. 65]</p>	A60.	<p>The requirement to document who reviewed the work performed does not imply a need for each specific working paper to include evidence of review. The requirement, however, means documenting what work was reviewed, who reviewed such work, and when it was reviewed. [ISA 230 Para. A13]</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
10.	<p>The assurance engagement documentation prepared in accordance with paragraph 8 shall also include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Discussions of significant matters with management, those charged with governance and others, including the nature of the significant matters discussed, and when and with whom the discussions took place; [ISAE 3410 Para. 66] (b) If the practitioner identifies information that is inconsistent with the practitioner’s final conclusion regarding a significant matter, how the practitioner addressed the inconsistency. [ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. 80] (c) Issues identified with respect to compliance with relevant ethical requirements and how they were resolved; [ISAE 3410 Para. 67] (d) Conclusions on compliance with independence requirements that apply to the assurance engagement, and any relevant discussions with the firm that 	A61.	<p>Documentation is not limited to records prepared by the practitioner but may include other appropriate records such as minutes of meetings prepared by the entity’s personnel and agreed by the practitioner. Others with whom the practitioner may discuss significant matters may include other personnel within the entity, and external parties, such as persons providing professional advice to the entity. [ISA 230 Para. A14]</p>

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
	<p>support these conclusions; [ISAE 3410 Para. 67]</p> <p>(e) Conclusions reached regarding the acceptance and continuance of client relationships and assurance engagements, including with respect to the preconditions for an assurance engagement; and [Enhanced from ISAE 3410 Para. 67]</p> <p>(f) The nature and scope of, and conclusions resulting from, consultations undertaken during the course of the assurance engagement. [ISAE 3410 Para. 67]</p>		
		A62.	The requirement to document how the practitioner addressed inconsistencies in information does not imply that the practitioner needs to retain documentation that is incorrect or superseded. [ISA 230 Para. A15]
	4.3.2 Departure from a Relevant Requirement		4.3.2 Departure from a Relevant Requirement
11.	If, in exceptional circumstances, the practitioner judges it necessary to depart from a relevant requirement in this ISSA, the practitioner shall document how the alternative procedures performed achieve the aim of that requirement, and	A63.	The requirements of this ISSA are designed to enable the practitioner to achieve the objectives specified in this ISSA, and thereby the overall objectives of the practitioner. Accordingly, other than in exceptional circumstances, this ISSA calls for compliance with each requirement that is relevant in the circumstances of the assurance engagement. [ISA 230 Para. A18]

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
	the reasons for the departure. [ISA 230 Para. 12]		
		A64.	The documentation requirement applies only to requirements that are relevant in the circumstances. A requirement is not relevant only in the cases when the requirement is conditional and the condition does not exist (for example, the requirement to modify the practitioner's conclusion when there is an inability to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence, and there is no such inability). [Extract of ISA 230 Para. A19]
	4.3.3 Matters Arising After the Date of the Practitioner's Report		4.3.3 Matters Arising After the Date of the Practitioner's Report
12.	<p>If, in exceptional circumstances, the practitioner performs new or additional procedures or draws new conclusions after the date of the practitioner's report, the practitioner shall document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The circumstances encountered; (b) The new or additional procedures performed, evidence obtained, and conclusions reached, and their effect on the assurance report; and (c) When and by whom the resulting changes to assurance engagement documentation were made and reviewed. <p>[ISAE 3410 Para. 68]</p>	A65.	Examples of exceptional circumstances include facts that become known to the practitioner after the date of the assurance report but which existed at that date and which, if known at that date, might have caused the sustainability information to be amended or the practitioner to modify the conclusion in the assurance report, for example, the discovery of a significant uncorrected error. The resulting changes to the assurance engagement documentation are reviewed in accordance with the firm's policies or procedures with respect to the nature, timing and extent of the review of engagement team members' work as required by ISQM 1, with the engagement leader taking final responsibility for the changes. [ISAE 3410 Para. A128]

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
	4.3.4 Assembly of the Final Engagement File		4.3.4 Assembly of the Final Engagement File
13.	The practitioner shall assemble the assurance engagement documentation in an engagement file and complete the administrative process of assembling the final engagement file on a timely basis after the date of the assurance report. After the assembly of the final engagement file has been completed, the practitioner shall not delete or discard engagement documentation of any nature before the end of its retention period. [ISAE 3000 (Revised) Paras. 81-82]	A66.	ISQM 1 (or other professional requirements, or requirements in law or regulation that are at least as demanding as ISQM 1) requires firms to establish a quality objective that addresses the assembly of engagement documentation on a timely basis after the date of the engagement report. An appropriate time limit within which to complete the assembly of the final engagement file is ordinarily not more than 60 days after the date of the assurance report. [ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. A205]
		A67.	The completion of the assembly of the final engagement file after the date of the assurance report is an administrative process that does not involve the performance of new procedures or the drawing of new conclusions. Changes may, however, be made to the documentation during the final assembly process if they are administrative in nature. Examples of such changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Deleting or discarding superseded documentation. (b) Sorting, collating and cross-referencing working papers. (c) Signing off on completion checklists relating to the file assembly process. (d) Documenting evidence that the practitioner has obtained, discussed and agreed with the relevant members of the engagement team before the date of the assurance report. [ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. A206]

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
		A68.	ISQM 1 (or national requirements that are at least as demanding as ISQM 1) requires firms to establish a quality objective that addresses the maintenance and retention of engagement documentation to meet the needs of the firm and comply with law, regulation, relevant ethical requirements, or professional standards. The retention period for assurance engagements ordinarily is no shorter than five years from the date of the assurance report.[ISAE 3000 (Revised) Para. A207]
14.	<p>In circumstances other than those envisaged in paragraph 12 when the practitioner finds it necessary to modify existing engagement documentation or add new engagement documentation after the assembly of the final engagement file has been completed, the practitioner shall, regardless of the nature of the modifications or additions, document:</p> <p>(a) The specific reasons for making them; and</p> <p>(b) When and by whom they were made and reviewed.</p> <p>[ISAE 3410 Para. 70]</p>		
	4.3.5 Specific Documentation Requirements – Risk Procedures		
15L.	The practitioner shall include in the documentation:		

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
	<p>(a) The discussion among the assurance engagement team and the significant decisions reached;</p> <p>(b) Key elements of the practitioner’s understanding in accordance with Part 6; and</p> <p>(c) Disclosures identified by the practitioner where material misstatements are likely to arise</p> <p>[Adapted from ISA 315 (Revised)⁹ Para.38]</p>		
15R.	<p>The practitioner shall include in the documentation:</p> <p>(a) The discussion among the assurance engagement team and the significant decisions reached;</p> <p>(b) Key elements of the practitioner’s understanding in accordance with Part 6;</p> <p>(c) The evaluation of the design of identified controls, and determination whether such controls have been implemented, in accordance with the</p>		

⁹ International Standard on Auditing (ISA) 315 (Revised), *Identifying and Assessing the Risks of Material Misstatement through Understanding the Entity and Its Environment*

Par #	Requirements	Par #	Application Material
	requirements in paragraph 12R of Part 6; and (d) The identified and assessed risks of material misstatement of the disclosures. [ISA 315 (Revised) Para.38]		