

## Comments

- 1) I find that ED-4400 has appropriately clarified and modernized to respond to the needs of stakeholders and addressing public interest issues.
- 2) The definition, requirement and application material on professional judgment in paragraphs 13(j), 18 and A14-A16 of ED-4400 reflect the role professional judgment plays in an AUP engagement. However I find that paragraph A16 has superfluous at its end. The words “*is present*” at the end sound misleading.
- 3) I agree with not including a precondition for the practitioner to be independent when performing an AUP engagement (even though the practitioner is required to be objective)
- 4) In my view the disclosures about independence in the AUP report in the various scenarios described in the table in paragraph 22 of the Explanatory Memorandum, and the related requirements and application material in ED-4400 are appropriate.
- 5) I agree with the term “findings” and the related definitions and application material in paragraphs 13(f) and A10-A11 of ED-4400
- 6) The requirements and application material regarding engagement acceptance and continuance, as set out in paragraphs 20-21 and A20-A29 of ED-4400 are appropriate.
- 7) I agree with the proposed requirements and application material on the use of a practitioner’s expert in paragraphs 28 and A35-A36 of ED-4400, and references to the use of the expert in an AUP report in paragraphs 31 and A44 of ED-4400 EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM TO ED-4400
- 8) The AUP report should be restricted to parties that have agreed to the procedures to be performed. If circumstances entail non restriction, that may be considered appropriately in the AUP report.
- 9) I support the content and structure of the proposed AUP report as set out in paragraphs 30-32 and A37-A44 and Appendix 2 of ED-4400
- 10) I do not have specific concern on Translation but shorter period for Effective Date might not be practicable.

—Recognizing that ED-4400 is a substantive revision and given the need for national due process and translation, as applicable, the IAASB believes that an appropriate effective date for the standard would be for AUP engagements for which the terms of engagement are agreed approximately 18–24 months after the approval of the final ISRS. Earlier application would be permitted and encouraged. The IAASB welcomes comments on whether this would provide a

sufficient period to support effective implementation of the ISRS. Respondents are also asked to comment on whether a shorter period between the approval of the final ISRS and the effective date is practicable.