



Committee: IAASB Consultative Advisory Group

Meeting Location: New York

Meeting Date: March 8–9, 2011

Compilations and Reviews—ISRS 4410 and ISRE 2400—Report Back

Objective of Agenda Item

1. The objective of this Agenda Item is to provide a brief report back on proposals of the Representatives on this project as discussed at the September 2010 CAG Meeting, in relation to proposed revised ISRS 4410¹ and ISRE 2400.²

Papers to Be Referred to during Discussion

2. The discussion of these topics will follow the structure of this CAG Paper.
3. The hyperlinks presented at the end of this CAG Paper to the exposure drafts (EDs) of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised) and proposed ISRE 2400 (Revised) are for reference only.

Project Status and Timeline

4. The IAASB has approved the following Exposure Drafts:
 - (a) Proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised), at its September 2010 meeting; and
 - (b) Proposed ISRE 2400 (Revised), at its December 2010 meeting.
5. The Appendix to this paper provides a project history, including links to the relevant CAG documentation.

September 8-9, 2010 CAG Discussion

6. Below are extracts from the draft minutes of the September 2010 CAG meeting,³ and an indication of how the project Task Force or IAASB has responded to the Representatives' comments.

¹ International Standard on Related Services (ISRS) 4410 (Revised), *Compilation Engagements*

² International Standard on Review Engagements (ISRE) 2400 (Revised), *Engagements to Review Historical Financial Statements*

³ The minutes will be approved at the March 2011 IAASB CAG meeting.

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
COMPILATION ENGAGEMENTS	
<p><i>Definition of “Applicable Financial Reporting Framework” and Management’s Responsibility to Adopt a Financial Reporting Framework that is Acceptable in the Context of the Intended Use of the Financial Information</i></p>	
<p>Mr. Damant expressed support for the flexibility in the standard, which acknowledges that smaller entities may use frameworks other than IFRS or U.S. Generally Accepting Accounting Principles (GAAP).</p>	<p>Support noted. The standard has maintained its flexibility and the IAASB believes it will be able to be applied in a broad range of possible financial reporting contexts.</p>
<p>Mr. Morris did not agree with the proposal. He noted that under the standards of the US Auditing Standards Board (ASB), if a practitioner performing a compilation engagement noted an exception, the exception would be reported in the practitioner’s report rather than allowing for a change in the financial reporting framework or resigning from the engagement. In his view, given that compilations are a fairly significant activity of the accounting profession, it is not in the public interest to require that practitioners always resign if the financial statements being compiled would be misleading. Rather, exception reporting should be permitted to allow for completion of the engagement if the client does not agree to change the financial information.</p>	<p>Point not accepted.</p> <p>The IAASB deliberated whether the approach suggested by Mr. Morris had merit. The majority of IAASB members disagreed with the use of the practitioner’s compilation report to disclose such a departure, as doing so would blur the distinction between a compilation engagement and an assurance engagement. Further, as the practitioner’s responsibility is to assist management in preparing and presenting financial information in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework, the practitioner would be directly associated with information that, if not in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework as presented, is possibly materially false or misleading.</p> <p>Accordingly, the IAASB concluded that instances of departures from the applicable financial reporting framework are required to be dealt with through amendment of the compiled financial information. The practitioner is required to agree with management on such amendments as are necessary for the compiled financial information to be in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework where, in the practitioner’s view, the compiled</p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
	<p>financial information would be materially misstated or misleading without those amendments. Amendments may include, where appropriate, proposing use of another financial reporting framework that is acceptable in view of the intended use of the information and the intended users.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the IAASB agreed that the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) of the ED should solicit feedback on whether these proposed requirements, including the practitioner's possible actions when amendment is need, are appropriate.</p> <p><i>See paragraphs 32–34 and A48–A51 of the ED, and questions #4–5 of the EM, of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</i></p>
<p>Mr. Ratnayake did not support allowing exception reporting, because the financial statements would be misleading if the user had not read the practitioner's report. It is also undesirable for the practitioner to be associated with financial information not prepared in accordance with the financial reporting framework.</p>	<p>Point accepted. See explanation immediately above.</p>
<p>Mr. Attolini suggested the standard could give guidance on who is responsible for preparing estimates in the compiled financial statements. Mr. Johnson recommended the standard be more explicit about the process by which the practitioner communicates with management and those charged with governance, on both general matters and topics such as the application of accounting policies. In his view, significant communication should take place at the beginning of a compilation engagement, but this communication should also continue throughout the engagement.</p>	<p>Points accepted.</p> <p>The proposed standard notes that management retains responsibility for accounting estimates, and also requires the practitioner, before accepting the engagement, to obtain the agreement of management that it acknowledges and understands its responsibilities. These responsibilities include preparation of the financial information in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework, including selection of appropriate accounting policies under the financial reporting framework where needed, and responsibility for management judgments needed to develop any accounting estimates required under the</p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
	<p>framework.</p> <p>The IAASB agreed to strengthen the requirement in paragraph 29 of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised) for the practitioner to discuss and agree with management significant judgments required to compile the financial information, including the basis for significant accounting estimates.</p> <p>While the proposed standard contains a requirement for the practitioner to communicate with management or those charged with governance on a timely basis during the course of the compilation engagement to address significant matters concerning the compilation engagement that, in the practitioner's professional judgment, need to be communicated, and application material notes that it may be appropriate to communicate a significant difficulty encountered during the compilation as soon as practicable if management, the Task Force did not believe it was necessary to specify exact timing of discussions in light of the requirements on the practitioner at engagement acceptance and while performing the engagement.</p> <p><i>See paragraphs 5, 23(c)(ii)b, 29, 35 and A52 of the ED of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</i></p>
<p>Mr. Attolini questioned whether the requirement in paragraph 35 of Agenda Item D.1 is meant to address circumstances in which the practitioner questions the existence of a going concern. If not, he suggested this could be made clearer in the proposed standard. Mr. Johnson suggested that it may be appropriate to acknowledge that management's selection of the appropriate financial reporting framework also depends on whether there is a going concern issue, and that it would be helpful to have the standard emphasize this early in the document.</p>	<p>Point accepted.</p> <p>During the meeting, Mr. Cowperthwaite explained that this was not meant to allow for the entity to adjust the financial reporting framework to avoid addressing going concern issues.</p> <p>To Mr. Johnson's point, the IAASB agreed to strengthen the requirement in paragraph 29 of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised) for the practitioner to discuss and agree with</p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
	<p>management significant judgments required to compile the financial information, including discussion on the use of the going concern assumption.</p> <p>See paragraphs 29 and A45 of the ED of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</p>
<p>Mr. Attolini suggested the use of the word “ordinarily” in describing that management or those charged with governance has responsibility for determining the financial reporting framework is not necessary, in that it is unclear who else would have this responsibility.</p>	<p>Point accepted.</p> <p>The word “ordinarily” has been deleted in the context of management’s responsibilities.</p> <p>See paragraph 5 of the ED of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</p>
<p><i>Purpose and Form of the Practitioner’s Compilation Report</i></p>	
<p>Mr. Koktvedgaard noted that the objective of the compilation engagement is not fully reflected in the illustrative reports. He suggested the report could be redrafted using language in the objective and requirements of the standard to more positively describe what the practitioner had done, to assist the reader in understanding what has work has been performed and what the objective of a compilation engagement is. He provided some suggested wording for consideration. Mr. Diomeda supported this view, suggesting that the current form appears to be more similar to a disclaimer.</p>	<p>Point taken into account.</p> <p>The IAASB agreed some, but not all, of the wording suggested.</p> <p>The illustrative practitioner’s compilation report contains the following description of a compilation engagement:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A compilation engagement involves applying expertise in accounting and financial reporting to assist management in preparing and presenting financial information. A compilation engagement does not include gathering evidence for the purpose of expressing an audit opinion or a review conclusion. Accordingly, we do not express an audit opinion or a review conclusion on these financial statements.</p> <p>See Appendix 3 of the ED of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</p>
<p>Mr. Baumann suggested that performing compilation engagements exposed firms to significant reputational risk. In his view, to mitigate this, it is necessary to explicitly state in the report that that the practitioner does not have any understanding whether the information (i.e., the underlying data)</p>	<p>Point not accepted. Relevant ethical requirements (for example under the IESBA Code) require the practitioner not to knowingly be associated with information that is materially false or misleading.</p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
<p>compiled in the financial statements is materially misstated. Mr. Koktvedgaard agreed and offered some suggested wording.</p>	<p>Accordingly, a key focus of the proposed revised ISRS is that the requirements would lead practitioners to apply sufficient work effort in the compilation engagement to be in a position to avoid that circumstance. That work effort is not sufficient as a basis for expressing any assurance opinion or conclusion on the compiled financial information. The practitioner's work effort should, however, provide a basis for meeting the ethical requirement explained above.</p> <p>The illustrative reports in the proposed standard highlight the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Management is responsible for the accuracy and completeness of the information used to compile the financial statements.• A compilation engagement does not involve gathering evidence for the purpose of expressing an audit opinion or a review conclusion.• Accordingly, the practitioner does not express an audit opinion or a review conclusion on the financial statements. <p>Furthermore, the IAASB agreed the overall importance of the point, as a precondition for accepting a compilation engagement that the practitioner should obtain management's agreement on various matters concerning management's responsibilities underlying to the proper presentation of the compiled financial information in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework.</p> <p><i>See paragraphs 23 and A26–A28, 27-34 and A42–A51, and Appendix 3 of the ED of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</i></p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
<p>Mr. Hansen suggested the phrase “on management’s behalf” could be deleted in the illustrations, and be replaced with language describing what the practitioner is responsible for.</p>	<p>Point taken into account.</p> <p>The phrase “on management’s behalf” has been deleted from the illustrative reports. The Task Force considered that the descriptions of the practitioner’s responsibility and the compilation engagement in the illustrative reports (including that a compilation engagement involves applying expertise in accounting and reporting to present financial information in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework) sufficiently describe these matters in a clear and concise manner, without the report becoming overly lengthy. Furthermore, while nothing in the proposed revised ISRS would prevent an individual practitioner from describing the work done for the engagement in the report in more detail, should that be considered appropriate in the circumstances, the Task Force believes there is risk in doing so because, foreseeably, a reader could misunderstand the “non-assurance” basis of the compilation engagement.</p> <p><i>See Appendix 3 of the ED of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</i></p>
<p>Mr. Johnson suggested Illustration 3 in Agenda D.1 was likely to be the most common form of reporting for compilation engagements and should be placed first. Messrs. Attolini and Hansen supported this. In Mr. Johnson’s view, as this illustration addresses significant accounting policies, it is a more appropriate illustration on which to focus to promote the knowledge and wider user of compilations, and strengthen the debate about the importance of including cash flow and other information. In his view, Illustration 1 was unlikely, and reversing the presentation would show how the first example could be further restricted. Mr. Cowperthwaite explained that Illustration 1 was put first in</p>	<p>Point accepted.</p> <p>Former Illustration 3 now appears as the first illustration in the proposed standard, and former Illustration 1 now appears as the last illustration in the proposed standard.</p> <p><i>See Appendix 3 of the ED of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</i></p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
accordance with the Task Force's view to "think small first," and in many cases the compilation may be part of a hybrid engagement.	
<p>Mr. Roussey suggested that when financial statements do not include notes, reference to this exclusion should be made within the report, as most frameworks require notes to the financial statements. Mr. Cowperthwaite explained that the terms of engagement would outline the financial reporting framework to be used, as agreed by the practitioner and management. Mr. Roussey noted other users of the report, such as suppliers, likely will not have access to the engagement letter and would benefit from it being made clear in the report.</p>	<p>Point not accepted.</p> <p>The Task Force understands that the circumstances envisioned in the commentary deal with special purpose frameworks.</p> <p>The IAASB concluded, and the standard makes clear, that when a practitioner compiles information using a special purpose financial reporting framework, the identification of the framework applied and the intended users of the information are key elements of the communication between the practitioner, management of the entity or the engaging party if different, and the intended users, and a description of the special purpose reporting framework is required in the practitioner's report (i.e., the title of each element of the compiled financial information).</p> <p>See paragraph 37 and Appendix 3 of the ED of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</p>
<p>Mr. Hansen also noted that the U.S. has a different view in regard to independence for compilation engagements. He suggested the illustrations should note that the practitioner <i>complies with</i> ethical standards rather than observing them.</p> <p>He also questioned why the concept of independence was not highlighted in the report. In his view, if independence is considered not to be present because of the nature of a compilation engagement, then the report should clearly state that the practitioner is not independent. Mr. Johnson noted that the requirement of the IESBA Code for the practitioner to not be associated with misleading information is a safeguard on which users of the report can rely. Mr.</p>	<p>Point accepted.</p> <p>The illustrative reports now note that the practitioner is required to "comply with quality control standards and relevant ethical requirements ..."</p> <p>Point taken into account.</p> <p>During the meeting, Mr. Cowperthwaite explained that independence in regard to a compilation engagement is not defined in the IESBA <i>Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants</i> (the IESBA Code) and, accordingly, the practitioner has no basis for reporting whether he or she is independent.</p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
Hansen suggested it could be confusing to readers of the report if independence is not addressed.	The IAASB has brought this issue to the attention of the IESBA.
<p>Mr. Koktvedgaard suggested the report could be more explicit in explaining to users what is meant by the reference to quality control and relevant ethical requirements and be more positive about what compliance with these standards involves. He provided some suggested wording for consideration. Mr. Attolini agreed, noted it may be useful to make a clear statement within the report as to which ethical requirements were applicable.</p>	<p>Point taken into account.</p> <p>The Task Force recommended that, in line with paragraph 7 of the proposed ISRS, the compilation report should also include more detailed reference to the fact that the practitioner is required to comply with relevant ethical principles, including integrity, objectivity, professional competence and due care. The Task Force agreed that along with the contribution of the practitioner's professional expertise, compliance with professional standards that embody these ethical requirements is a key element of the value of the compilation engagement for users. The practitioner's report for a compilation engagement differs from the auditor's report in this respect – as the latter simply notes the auditor's obligation to comply with ethical requirements.</p> <p>On the basis explained above, the IAASB did not believe it was necessary to describe how the practitioner complies with these standards in further detail in the report, and thought that the emphasis of the ethical underpinnings of the engagement explained above should be sufficient to help the reader understand the value of the compilation engagement.</p> <p><i>See paragraphs 7 and 15, and Appendix 3 of the ED of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</i></p>
Mr. Hansen also suggested the report could note that the auditor does not express any form of assurance rather than specifically referencing expressing an opinion or conclusion. He also suggested the illustrations alternated references to financial statements or financial information. Mr. Diomeda	<p>Points not accepted.</p> <p>The IAASB also concluded that the form of report required under the proposed revised ISRS should differentiate a compilation engagement from other types of services including services that could otherwise be</p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
<p>did not believe the report needed to emphasize that the practitioner does not express an audit opinion or review conclusion because it is clear that it is a compilation engagement. In his view, this may be misleading as readers may not understand the concepts of audit opinions or review conclusions. Mr. Cowperthwaite noted the Board had determined that a clear statement of differentiation was important, but agreed that the wording could be refined.</p> <p>Mr. Ratnayake supported making this distinction.</p>	<p>construed as compilation services, and also assurance services. Accordingly, the report is required to include a statement that the practitioner does not provide a review conclusion or an audit opinion on the compiled financial information.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the EM of the ED also poses a specific question of whether in the proposed standard and practitioner's report a compilation engagement is clearly distinguishable from assurance services.</p> <p>Point accepted.</p> <p>See paragraph 37 and Appendix 3 of the ED, and question #4 in the EM, of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</p>
<p>Mr. Attolini noted that the proposed standard assumes ISQC 1⁴ is in place but does not explicitly require it to be. In his view, if there is a requirement that ISQC 1 needs to be in place, SMEs will need a longer implementation period. He suggested the IAASB should consider whether the concepts of scalability and proportionality can be applied to ISQC 1 to assist small and medium practices (SMPs) doing compilation work. Mr. Cowperthwaite noted that the standard states that it is premised on ISQC 1 while not explicitly stating that the practitioner has to have implemented it in order to perform compilation engagements. He also shared his view that the only requirement in ISQC 1 that may pose challenges in the SMP context is the initial documentation of the system of quality control. Mr. Damant suggested it should be made clearer within the standard whether the IAASB expects ISQC 1 to be implemented when not required by national law.</p>	<p>Points taken into account.</p> <p>The IAASB notes that extant ISQC 1 applies to "related-services engagements" (as defined), which include compilation engagements performed under extant ISRS 4410 and, as such there should not be an effect on the implementation period needed for the revised standard. However, to make the requirement relating to ISQC 1 clear, the proposed standard now highlights that ISQC 1, or requirements that are at least as demanding, applies to firms of professional accountants in respect of a firm's engagements to compile financial information. The IAASB deliberated the placement of this obligation, and agreed that it should be positioned in the introduction of the proposed standard, consistent with the treatment in the ISAs. To Mr. Damant's point, the phrase "requirements that are at least as demanding"</p>

⁴ International Standard on Quality Control (ISQC) 1, *Quality Controls for Firms that Perform Audits and Reviews of Financial Statements, and Other Assurance and Related Services Engagements*

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
	<p>has been used in both the ISAs and proposed ISRS 4410 to clarify the IAASB's expectation about quality control requirements when ISQC 1 is not adopted.</p> <p>Nevertheless, recognizing the potential concerns relating to ISQC 1, the IAASB agreed to include a question in the EM of the ED relating to whether specifying quality control provisions in proposed ISRS 4410 creates difficulty at a national or firm level.</p> <p>In addition, the IAASB has also highlighted the broader matter of what further actions could be taken to assist in the implementation of ISQC 1 for smaller firms in its strategy consultation.</p> <p><i>See paragraphs 3 and A4–A9 of the ED, and question #7 in the EM, of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised), as well as possible additional action C.8 on page 17 of Agenda Item E.1.</i></p>
<p>Mr. Johnson questioned whether the restriction of the standard to engagements only where the practitioner is issuing a report is clear in the standard. In his view, some small practitioners may routinely do what they consider to be compilation engagements to which this standard may not always apply. Mr. Attolini suggested the standard could be more explicit in stating which types of circumstances would not be covered by this standard.</p>	<p>Points taken into account.</p> <p>The IAASB concluded that proposed revised ISRS 4410 should be designed to apply when the practitioner is engaged to compile financial information in accordance with an applicable financial reporting framework, and to provide a compilation report in accordance with the requirements of the proposed standard for the engagement performed. The Scope section of the proposed ISRS notes the standard applies when the practitioner is “engaged to compile and report on historical financial statements,” a compilation engagement is defined as an engagement in which a practitioner issues a report in accordance with the requirements of the ISRS, and application guidance explicitly notes an example of a service that may be done by a practitioner that would not fall under the scope of the standard.</p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
	<p>The EM of the ED also poses a specific question of whether the scope of the proposed standard is appropriate and whether it is clear when practitioners are required to apply the standard.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the IAASB acknowledges that a practitioner may nevertheless choose to apply the standard, to the extent applicable and adapted as necessary, in other situations that involve compiling information that are outside the scope of the proposed ISRS, including engagements to compile other types of information.</p> <p><i>See paragraphs 1, 17(c), and A1 of the ED, and question #1 of the EM, of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</i></p>
REVIEW ENGAGEMENTS	
<p>Ms. Sucher did not agree with the use of the phrase “to perform procedures” in the objective. In her view, it would be more appropriate to state “to obtain limited assurance.” Mr. Hansen suggested the phrase simply could be deleted. Mr. Kuramochi suggested that the concept of information being meaningful to users could be articulated in the objective.</p>	<p>Point taken into account.</p> <p>During the meeting, Mr. Cowperthwaite explained that since the concept of limited assurance is not defined, it would be difficult to make reference to it in the objective of the standard.</p> <p>The IAASB extensively debated the form of the objectives, and concluded that the practitioner’s objectives in conducting a review of financial statements should be stated as follows:</p> <p>(a) To conclude, through performing primarily inquiry and analytical procedures, and evaluating the sufficiency and appropriateness of evidence obtained, whether anything has come to the practitioner’s attention that causes the practitioner to believe the financial statements are not prepared, in all material respects, in accordance with an applicable financial reporting framework; and (Ref: Para. A11)</p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews — Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
	<p>(b) To report on the financial statements as a whole, and communicate as required by this ISRE.</p> <p>The IAASB believes these objectives focus appropriately on the outcome of the practitioner's work, while explaining the means by which the outcome is to be achieved. In particular, this objective addresses the procedures ordinarily expected to provide an adequate basis for the practitioner to conclude and report on the financial statements in the form required by the proposed ISRE. This approach was determined to be clearer than referring to concepts that may not be well-understood, such as "limited assurance" and "meaningful."</p> <p>Nevertheless, the IAASB agreed to raise the matter of whether the objectives of the standard were appropriate in the EM.</p> <p><i>See paragraph 4 of the ED, and question #3 of the EM, of proposed ISRE 2400 (Revised).</i></p>
<p>Mr. Kocktvedgaard questioned whether the omission of the concept of fair presentation from the objectives was deliberate. Mr. Damant suggested this could be further clarified in the standard.</p>	<p>During the meeting, Mr. Cowperthwaite confirmed this was the case, explaining that the standard could also be applied to a compliance framework.</p> <p>Accordingly, the proposed revised ISRE is drafted in the context of reviews of financial statements presented using a financial reporting framework that is acceptable in view of the intended use of the financial statements – including, for example, a fair presentation framework where that is appropriate.</p> <p><i>See paragraphs 17(c) and 30(a) of the ED of proposed ISRE 2400 (Revised).</i></p>
<p>Mr. Attolini reported the view of the SMP Committee that further differentiation needs to be made between audits, reviews, and compilations, and</p>	<p>Point taken into account.</p> <p>During the meeting, Mr. Sylph reminded the</p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
<p>that a communications approach could be developed for this purpose. In his view, practitioners may be performing reviews and compilations but not referring to them as such, as the terms may translate well.</p>	<p>Representatives that the concepts of review and compilation have existed for many years and standards are currently available to practitioners to meet the market demand for these services. These standards have also been translated. Nevertheless, the IAASB's strategy consultation acknowledges the need to more clearly differentiate the various services and their related levels of assurance, possibly through the development of a publication on the meaning of an audit.</p> <p>See current activity A.10 on page 17 of Agenda Item E.1.</p>
<p>Mr. Hansen suggested the term sufficient appropriate <i>review</i> evidence could be defined to differentiate it from the concept of sufficient appropriate audit evidence. He also suggested the phrase in the objective which makes reference to matters coming to the practitioner's attention could be deleted. In his view the objective is to obtain evidence and form a conclusion.</p>	<p>Points not accepted.</p> <p>The IAASB deliberated whether the term "sufficient appropriate review evidence" should be defined but concluded that doing so would not add further clarity.</p> <p>Regarding Mr. Hansen's second point, the IAASB has debated at some length how to best describe in the proposed revised ISRE the link between the practitioner's conclusion on the financial statements and the evidence obtained during the review. That link is essentially the operationalization of the principle of limited assurance in the context of a review. The IAASB agreed that the practitioner's objectives in a review should align with the principles agreed for limited assurance more widely – which assign a priority to making it clear that the evidential basis of a review is limited relative to that required for an audit.</p> <p>See also the response above on the practitioner's objectives in a review (the response to Ms. Sucher's point on page 12).</p> <p>See paragraph 14 of the ED of proposed ISRE 2400 (Revised).</p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews —Report Back

Representatives' Comments	Task Force/IAASB Response
OTHER COMMENTS	
Mr. Diomeda expressed his view that the review and compilation projects should continue to move together.	Point noted. The IAASB will endeavor to do so, having regard to the time necessary for the finalization of each standard in light of all its current projects.
Mr. Kockvedgaard encouraged the IAASB to explicitly seek comments on the understandability of the practitioner's reports for both types of engagement during the exposure process.	Point accepted. The IAASB has raised questions in the respective EMs for each of the proposed revised standards about whether the content of the illustrative report in each case is clear and appropriate (see Question 7 in the case of proposed revised ISRE 2400 and question 6 in the case of proposed revised ISRS 4410). <i>See question #7 of the EM of proposed ISRE 2400 (Revised) and question #6 of the EM of proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised).</i>

Material Presented – FOR IAASB CAG REFERENCE PURPOSES ONLY

Exposure draft of proposed ISRS 4410
(Revised)

<http://www.ifac.org/Guidance/EXD-Details.php?EDID=0144>

Exposure draft of proposed ISRE 2400
(Revised)

<http://www.ifac.org/Guidance/EXD-Details.php?EDID=0153>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews — Report Back

Appendix

Project History

Project: Proposed ISRS 4410 (Revised), *Compilation Engagements* and Proposed ISRE 2400 (Revised) *Engagements to Review Historical Financial Statements*

Summary

	CAG Meeting	IAASB Meeting
Project Commencement	March 2009	March 2009
Development of Proposed International Pronouncement (up to Exposure)	September 2009 March 2010 September 2010	September 2009 December 2009 March 2010 June 2010 September 2010 December 2010 (Reviews)
Exposure	ISRS 4410 – September 2010 ISRE 2400 – December 2010	

CAG Discussions: Detailed References

Project Commencement	<p><u>March 2009</u></p> <p>See IAASB CAG meeting material: http://www.ifac.org/IAASB/Meeting-FileDL.php?FID=4599</p> <p>See CAG meeting minutes (in Agenda Item H of the following material): http://www.ifac.org/IAASB/Meeting-FileDL.php?FID=5589</p> <p>See report back on March 2009 CAG meeting (in paragraph 13 of the following material): http://www.ifac.org/IAASB/Meeting-FileDL.php?FID=4932</p>
Development of Proposed International	<p><u>March 2009</u></p>

IAASB CAG PAPER

IAASB CAG Agenda (March 2011)

Agenda Item J.4

Compilations and Reviews — Report Back

Pronouncement	<p>See IAASB CAG meeting material: http://www.ifac.org/IAASB/Meeting-FileDL.php?FID=4599</p> <p>See CAG meeting minutes (in Agenda Item H of the following material): http://www.ifac.org/IAASB/Meeting-FileDL.php?FID=5589 <u>September 2009</u></p> <p>See IAASB CAG meeting material: http://www.ifac.org/IAASB/Meeting-FileDL.php?FID=4932</p> <p>See CAG meeting minutes (in Agenda Item F of the following material): http://www.ifac.org/IAASB/Meeting-FileDL.php?FID=5305 <u>March 2010</u></p> <p>See IAASB CAG meeting material: http://www.ifac.org/IAASB/Meeting-FileDL.php?FID=5267</p> <p>See CAG meeting minutes (in Agenda Item M of the following material) http://www.ifac.org/IAASB/Meeting-FileDL.php?FID=5882 <u>September 2010</u></p> <p>See IAASB CAG meeting material: http://www.ifac.org/IAASB/Meeting-FileDL.php?FID=5670</p> <p>See draft September 2010 CAG meeting minutes at Agenda Item D.</p> <p>See report back on September 2010 meeting in paragraph 6 of this CAG Paper.</p>
----------------------	--