AUASB MEETING 19 NOVEMBER 2024 AGENDA ITEM 5a Feedback on ED 02/24

- This presentation is a high-level initial overview of key messages from outreach and written responses received to date.
- We are expecting further written responses which have not been considered.
- The Office of the AUASB has summarised some key themes however this is not exhaustive and is not intended to fully represent the views or feedback received from stakeholders.
- Accordingly, no conclusions should be drawn on these slides, and no decisions will be made at this meeting.



ED 02/24 CONSULTATION PROCESS

Roundtables held in Sydney, Melbourne, Perth and online

Over 90 Australian stakeholders attended these events, representing:

- Financial statement audit firms (small, medium and large);
- Public sector auditors;
- Non-accountant assurance providers;
- Preparers;
- Directors;
- Regulators;
- Professional bodies; and
- Academics.

ED 02/24 CONSULTATION PROCESS

Received 25 written comment letters from stakeholders comprising (expecting at least 4 more):

- 3 of the Big 4 audit firms
- 3 small and medium financial audit firms
- 1 non-accountant assurance provider
- 1 director representative
- 4 academics
- 3 RSE representatives
- 1 consultant
- 1 ISO standard setter
- 3 preparers (including one private entity)
- 3 professional bodies
- 1 user/investor
- Auditors General (ACAG)



SOME EARLY THEMES

Is it appropriate or necessary for all disclosures (ie. scope 3, scenario analysis) to go to RA at all

First year of reporting – fairly consistent feedback	 Broad support for limited assurance over scope 1 and scope 2 greenhouse gas emissions and governance The paragraphs included in the ED for Strategy (risks and opportunities) are too broad and should be scaled back to just those identified, or not assured at all
	- Some support for risk management disclosures especially if Strategy (risks and opportunities) is to be assured in year 1
Second year of reporting – mixed views	 Some supportive Some concern that there is significant uplift in capacity required from year 1 to year 2. So consider: Delaying reasonable assurance over scope 1 and scope 2 greenhouse gas emissions to keep assurance levels constant in any reporting year Delaying limited assurance over scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions as this is the first year of reporting
Fourth year of reporting – mixed views	 Larger audit firms and some academics supportive transitioning to reasonable assurance Others disagree noting: Moving ahead of international May take more time to build capacity in audit profession

A review should be conducted in 2027/28

OTHER MESSAGES

- Majority supportive of:
 - statements that there are no material risks or opportunities being subject to the same level of assurance as identified risks and opportunities for any given year
 - requirements for groups 1, 2 and 3 entities commencing with the same settings and progressing at the same pace
 - entities that enter a group after the first reporting year for that group to be subject to the same assurance requirements as other entities in the group
 - the approach to assurance over comparative information
- 3 Big 4 firms seek clarity around the timing and applicability of ISSA 5000 given its 2026 effective date
- Cost of assurance framework likely to be significant initially and needs to be examined further
- Broad support for guidance on:
 - Differences between limited and reasonable assurance
 - Combined assurance reports and managing users' expectation gap
 - Example assurance reports



Next Steps

- We will continue to analyse responses received and meeting with stakeholders
- An in-depth analysis of the feedback will be presented to the board on 16 December 2024
- Draft standard will be presented to the board on 19 February 2025