

## RESPONSE TEMPLATE FOR EXPOSURE DRAFT OF PROPOSED ISSA 5000, GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SUSTAINABILITY ASSURANCE ENGAGEMENTS

### Guide for Respondents

Comments are requested by **December 1, 2023**. *Note that requests for extensions of time cannot be accommodated due to the accelerated timeline for finalization of this proposed standard.*

This template is for providing comments on the Exposure Draft of proposed International Standard on Sustainability Assurance Engagements™ (ISSA) 5000, *General Requirements for Sustainability Assurance Engagements* (ED-5000), in response to the questions set out in the Explanatory Memorandum to ED-5000. It also allows for respondent details, demographics and other comments to be provided. Use of the template will facilitate the IAASB's automated collation of the responses.

You may respond to all questions or only selected questions.

To assist our consideration of your comments, please:

- For each question, start by indicating your overall response using the drop-down menu under each question. Then below that include any detailed comments, as indicated.
- When providing comments:
  - Respond directly to the questions.
  - Provide the rationale for your answers. If you disagree with the proposals in ED-5000, please provide specific reasons for your disagreement and specific suggestions for changes that may be needed to the requirements, application material or appendices. If you agree with the proposals, it will be helpful for the IAASB to be made aware of this view.
  - Identify the specific aspects of ED-5000 that your response relates to, for example, by reference to sections, headings or specific paragraphs in ED-5000.
  - Avoid inserting tables or text boxes in the template when providing your responses to the questions because this will complicate the automated collation of the responses.
- Submit your comments, using the response template only, without a covering letter or any summary of your key issues, instead identify any key issues, as far as possible, in your responses to the questions.

The response template provides the opportunity to provide details about your organization and, should you choose to do so, any other matters not raised in specific questions that you wish to place on the public record. All responses will be considered a matter of public record and will ultimately be posted on the IAASB website.

Use the "**Submit Comment**" button on the [ED-5000 webpage](#) to upload the completed template.

**Responses to IAASB’s Request for Comments in the Explanatory Memorandum for ED-5000, General Requirements for Sustainability Assurance Engagements**

**PART A: Respondent Details and Demographic information**

Your organization’s name (or your name if you are making a submission in your personal capacity)	TIC Council
Name(s) of person(s) responsible for this submission (or leave blank if the same as above)	
Name(s) of contact(s) for this submission (or leave blank if the same as above)	
E-mail address(es) of contact(s)	<a href="mailto:amonjegama@tic-council.org">amonjegama@tic-council.org</a>
Geographical profile that best represents your situation (i.e., from which geographical perspective are you providing feedback on ED-5000). Select the most appropriate option.	<a href="#">Global</a>
	If “Other”, please clarify
The stakeholder group to which you belong (i.e., from which perspective are you providing feedback on ED-5000). Select the most appropriate option.	<a href="#">Assurance practitioner or firm - other profession</a>
	If “Other”, please specify
Should you choose to do so, you may include information about your organization (or yourself, as applicable).	We represent Testing, Inspection and Certification companies responsible of assuring the sustainability reporting of companies, under CSRD for example.

Should you choose to do so, you may provide overall views or additional background to your submission. **Please note that this is optional.** The IAASB’s preference is that you incorporate all your views in your comments to the questions (also, the last question in Part B allows for raising any other matters in relation to ED-5000).

**Information, if any, not already included in responding to the questions in Parts B and C:**

## PART B: Responses to Questions in in the Explanatory Memorandum for ED-5000

*For each question, please start with your overall response by selecting one of the items in the drop-down list under the question. Provide your detailed comments, if any, below as indicated.*

### Overall Questions

1. Do you agree that ED-5000, as an overarching standard, can be applied for each of the items described in paragraph 14 of this EM to provide a global baseline for sustainability assurance engagements? If not, please specify the item(s) from paragraph 14 to which your detailed comments, if any, relate (use a heading for each relevant item).

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-A, paragraph 14)*

**Overall response:** [Agree, with comments below](#)

#### Detailed comments (if any):

The standard has the potential to provide a global baseline for sustainability assurance engagement. However, it will be appropriately scalable and adaptable if it could be developed into neutral language, instead of accounting language. Additionally, it needs to consider widening scope to cover existing mainstreaming international reporting frameworks and assurance standards, such as GRI, ESRS, IFRS, AA1000, etc. In a word, it needs to jump out the boundary of accounting to a much wider map.

### Public Interest Responsiveness

2. Do you agree that the proposals in ED-5000 are responsive to the public interest, considering the qualitative standard-setting characteristics and standard-setting action in the project proposal? If not, why not?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Sections 1-B, and Appendix)*

**Overall response:** [Agree, with comments below](#)

#### Detailed comments (if any):

ED-5000 is intended to be responsive to the public interest. This goal will be achieved if the standard could address more on reviewing process of stakeholder engagement, which is the foundation of sustainability management and disclosure. The characteristics are fine, it embeds basic principles that gives enough room to be widely used, however it does mention anything regards the accuracy.

### Specific Questions

#### *Applicability of ED-5000 and the Relationship with ISAE 3410*

3. Is the scope and applicability of ED-5000 clear, including when ISAE 3410 should be applied rather than ED-5000? If not, how could the scope be made clearer?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-C)*

**Overall response:** [Yes, with comments below](#)

#### **Detailed comments (if any):**

The scopes of ED-5000 and ISAE 3410 are clear. However, it's suggested to specify auditor competence regarding to GHG audit, regardless the assurance engagement is on sustainability information or only on GHG.

Paragraphs 2 & 8 could be clearer (with reference to 3410 A1) in that 3410 only to be followed where separate conclusions are required.

#### *Relevant Ethical Requirements and Quality Management Standards*

4. Is ED-5000 sufficiently clear about the concept of "at least as demanding" as the IESBA Code regarding relevant ethical requirements for assurance engagements, and ISQM 1 regarding a firm's responsibility for its system of quality management? If not, what suggestions do you have for additional application material to make it clearer?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-D)*

**Overall response:** [No, with comments below](#)

#### **Detailed comments (if any):**

The concept of "at least as demanding as" is not clear enough and could be argumentative. It will add more clarity and inclusivity to list paralleled global requirement from TIC industry e.g. IAF and ISO requirement on ethical, quality and personnel management. Or to provide suggestions/guidance for regulators' decision-making.

As a non-accounting audit provider, we do not refer to the IESBA code, but we comply with the 'International Federation of Inspection Agencies – Compliance Code – Third Edition' which we consider equivalent to 'Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants'. It would be of benefit to list other standards that can be considered equivalent (such as the International Federation of Inspection Agencies – Compliance Code – Third Edition) directly in the ISSA 5000 standard. We currently perform a gap analysis between IESBA code and ISO 17029 with the ambition to align both requirements.

ED-5000 refers to ISQM 1 and ISQM 2. These may be unfamiliar to independent assurance service providers (IASP). It would be helpful to provide a cross reference to comparable standards accepted as firm level quality management such as ISO 9000. Our members already possess QMS, they would need to acquire additional programs uniquely for assurance.

*ED-5000 | Response to request for comments*

Further clarity on conflict-of-interest managements where a firm are both (a) advising and providing assurance of the sustainability information (b) providing IT for and assurance of the sustainability information (c) have provided advisory on historic sustainability information and are providing assurance of current sustainability information. Many TIC companies, like many other service providers, deliver advisory, software and assurance services for sustainability information. We observe a variety of combinations of services being delivered by service providers presenting a risk of conflict of interest. The introduction of ISSA 5000 presents an opportunity to harmonize approaches to service combinations through provision of a decision tree / matrix demonstrating what combinations are acceptable or low risk versus those that are not / higher risk.

*Definitions of Sustainability Information and Sustainability Matters*

5. Do you support the definitions of sustainability information and sustainability matters in ED-5000? If not, what suggestions do you have to make the definitions clearer?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-E, paras. 27-32)*

**Overall response:** [No, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

Though paragraph 31 mentioned “*IAASB was of the view that governance is related to the actions taken by the entity to address sustainability matters, and therefore is an aspect of a topic*”, some of the topics that naturally fall under governance, such as anti-corruption and bribery, although they are essentially control measures the sustainability topic, doesn't really fit into any of the other topic categories mentioned, so may be missed.

6. Is the relationship between sustainability matters, sustainability information and disclosures clear? If not, what suggestions do you have for making it clearer?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-E, paras. 35-36)*

**Overall response:** [Yes \(with no further comments\)](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

*Differentiation of Limited Assurance and Reasonable Assurance*

7. Does ED-5000 provide an appropriate basis for performing both limited assurance and reasonable assurance engagements by appropriately addressing and differentiating the work effort between limited and reasonable assurance for relevant elements of the assurance engagement? If not, what do you propose and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-F, paras. 45-48)*

**Overall response:** [No, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

While the splitting out of limited and reasonable assurance into tables in sections of the standard is helpful, there is not enough depth of information about the difference between these two levels, in particular with reference to substantial and analytical procedures (126L/ R substantive procedures and 100L/R Analytical procedures and 132 Sampling). In addition to risk and control evaluation, there is a huge difference between the amount of data that needs to be reviewed for reasonable assurance vs limited. If this difference in work effort is not effectively highlighted, then there is a risk that new assurance providers may conduct reasonable assurance engagements using this standard without sufficient substantive and analytical data review.

In addition, there should be further focus in the standard on mixed engagements where some sustainability information is subject to reasonable assurance and other to limited assurance. There should be a logical and clear link between material areas to report for a company and where they are seeking reasonable assurance. Further consideration should be given to what sustainability information could be subject to reasonable assurance, for example to give reasonable assurance for scope 3 emissions would require much more reliance on data that is not within control of the entity, with more assumptions and may need a future set of procedures applied in order to reach a reasonable assurance conclusion.

The approach to undertaking both limited and reasonable assurance makes no reference to consideration of site visits and where these may be appropriate or required, in particular for reasonable assurance where these may be necessary to a selection of sites, depending on the entity and the sector in which they operate.

*Preliminary Knowledge of the Engagement Circumstances, Including the Scope of the Engagement*

8. Is ED-5000 sufficiently clear about the practitioner's responsibility to obtain a preliminary knowledge about the sustainability information expected to be reported and the scope of the proposed assurance engagement? If not, how could the requirements be made clearer?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-F, para. 51)*

**Overall response:** [No, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

Though ED-5000 has clear requirement of the practitioner to obtain a preliminary knowledge about the sustainability information. It hasn't clarified how the engagement leader decide the knowledge of the assurance team is sufficient and appropriate. For example, the sector experience related to particular sustainability matters, when to use an internal or external expert, and the qualification and independency of the roles, how to classify an expert, when it is needed, what skill set they use in the assurance engagement, how to evaluate the quality of their work, what is the difference between an expert and a sustainability practitioner.

It could further highlight the need for sustainability professionals and technical experts, in particular for sectors where there are technology or processes that may be difficult to comprehend without sector specific knowledge. Reference is made in the standards to experts (internal and external) but would benefit from further detail of the circumstances where these experts will be required where the core engagement team do not have this expertise already (expert names, expertise and number of days).

9. Does ED-5000 appropriately address the practitioner's consideration of the entity's "materiality process" to identify topics and aspects of topics to be reported? If not, what approach do you suggest and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-F, paras. 52-55)*

**Overall response:** [No, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

The standard addressed much on "materiality considered or determined by the practitioner", but not "materiality assessment" of the entity or "double materiality". Explanatory Memorandum paras.52-55 could be also addressed by Para. 72(c)), A172.and A179: "Relevance of the Criteria". Yet these parts haven't been connected and aligned in the current drafts.

In addition, there are different definitions of materiality and only the double materiality is highlighted. This is one of the newest concepts, but a more neutral wording of paragraphs 59 and 60, open to other definitions of materiality, would make the document more inclusive. Not all organization needs to comply with CSRD, so broad the concept. We have GRI, AA1000 Accountability Principles and SASB with their own definition.

The materiality of the client should be part of the assurance engagement if it is part of the scope of the audit. Otherwise, the auditor develops his own materiality study to define the assurance process, and this should be the focus of the ED-5000. Emphasize the importance of the materiality in the engagement, what value it has for the project, how it is to be used and how it is to be performed independently of the client's materiality.

If the client has done a double materiality, good for them. But it does impact the assurance materiality that still need to be performed.

And if the scope of the assurance is just few KPIs, how the materiality impact it? It is not answered in the document.

We recommend an approach to give a clear description of the entity's "materiality process" in the ED-5000, which should cover a process of materiality identification and prioritization involving stakeholder

*ED-5000 | Response to request for comments*

engagement. The practitioner should be including the evaluation the entity's "materiality assessment" as part of the scope of the assurance, in order to fulfill the evaluation of "Relevance of the Criteria".

#### *Suitability and Availability of Criteria*

10. Does ED-5000 appropriately address the practitioner's evaluation of the suitability and availability of the criteria used by the entity in preparing the sustainability information? If not, what do you propose and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-F, paras. 56-58)*

**Overall response:** [Yes \(with no further comments\)](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

11. Does ED-5000 appropriately address the notion of "double materiality" in a framework-neutral way, including how this differs from the practitioner's consideration or determination of materiality? If not, what do you propose and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-F, paras. 59-60 and 68)*

**Overall response:** [No, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):** Refer to question 9.

The current description of "double materiality" in ED -5000 seems try to be framework-neutral but at the other side looks confusing. Paragraph 59 first mentioned ESRS, whose "double materiality" consists of "impact materiality" and "financial materiality". Then said "*When the needs of the intended users relate to both the impacts on the entity and the entity's impacts, this can be referred to as double materiality*", which is more close to the GRI definition of "materiality".

We recommend the assurance standard to just address the entity's "materiality" process and leave the entity to decide which "double materiality" they prefer to use to meet up the needs of its intended users. The assurance provider's responsibility is to evaluate the entity's "materiality process" as mentioned above.

#### *Materiality*

12. Do you agree with the approach in ED-5000 for the practitioner to consider materiality for qualitative disclosures and determine materiality (including performance materiality) for quantitative disclosures? If not, what do you propose and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-F, paras. 65-74)*

**Overall response:** [Agree, with comments below](#)

*ED-5000 | Response to request for comments*

TIC Council  
Rue du Commerce 20-22, 1000 Brussels, Belgium | +32 2 880 21 37  
secretariat@tic-council.org | www.tic-council.org  
VAT: BE0724881295 | Transparency Register No.: 840667012559  
*Formerly known as IFIA and CEOC*



**Detailed comments (if any):**

Performance materiality (practitioner materiality) - is included in paragraph 17 definitions section, but no link to main explanation in paragraph A283-285. No materiality level is stated, or indication of appropriate level, could include a suggested 5%, and/ or an upper materiality level of 10% (for quantitative data).

A506 - not clear why uncorrected material misstatements would be relevant here as this is for a qualified conclusion. If material misstatements existed, this would be an adverse not a qualified conclusion.

Human judgement of the assessor is not properly highlighted, and there is need for some further guidance on the approach rather than just the situations, in particular for qualitative materiality assessment (fer A278-281).

It is not clear the benchmarks used for materiality, such as the use of revenue's X%, pre-tax net profit's X% or total asset's X% , under what conditions those benchmarks can be used as benchmarks for assessing materiality?

In addition, if the auditor obtains certain information during the audit process, and if such information will cause it to be materialistic in the audit planning to be different, will it be necessary to adjust and assess the materiality in a timely manner?

*Understanding the Entity's System of Internal Control*

13. Do you agree with the differentiation in the approach in ED-5000 for obtaining an understanding of the entity's system of internal control for limited and reasonable assurance engagements? If not, what suggestions do you have for making the differentiation clearer and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-F, paras. 75-81)*

**Overall response:** [Neither agree/disagree, but see comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

ED-5000 focus on the internal control of accounting world, which is no problem. However, it shall recognize other internal control system as well, for example the international management systems such as ISO 9001, 14001, 45001, etc.

*Using the Work of Practitioner's Experts or Other Practitioners*

14. When the practitioner decides that it is necessary to use the work of a firm other than the practitioner's firm, is ED-5000 clear about when such firm(s) and the individuals from that firm(s) are members of the engagement team, or are "another practitioner" and not members of the engagement team? If not, what suggestions do you have for making this clearer?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-G, paras. 82-87)*

**Overall response:** [No, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

ED-5000 | Response to request for comments

The requirement of whether to use another practitioner is clear. The unclear part is “How”. For instance, how to control the risks of conflict of interest, how to manage the assurance quality, how to issue the assurance statement, how to define the accountability of different practitioners?

It would be good to have further detail on what could be relied on from another practitioner, for example would an assurance statement from another practitioner that covers the relevant sustainability information be sufficient for a practitioner to accept?

It is necessary to clarify that joint audits performed by two practitioners are possible. In this case the work of the two practitioners will be used to deliver the assurance service conclusion.

It is important to also clarify whether this refers or includes external consultancies, since TIC companies often encounter external consultancies acting on behalf of clients in engagements.

We recommend more details to be provided in the guidance document.

We recommend this section of ED-5000 to align with ISO 17029 7.4 Outsourcing.

15. Are the requirements in ED-5000 for using the work of a practitioner's external expert or another practitioner clear and capable of consistent implementation? If not, how could the requirements be made clearer?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-G, paras. 88-93)*

**Overall response:** [No, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

Not clear why there is a distinction between internal and external expert as the ethical considerations should be the same. Either and internal or external sector/ industry expert may have bias so this should be made transparent and acknowledged as part of the process.

For industrial activities, we highly recommend having in the audit team a person with the experience of the industrial process to be audited. We also recommend for industrial activities to have on site audits to better capture the industry process risks and impacts.

We recommend applying principle of independence when selecting external expert or another practitioner. This could refer to ISO standards such as ISO 17029.

#### *Estimates and Forward-Looking Information*

16. Do you agree with the approach to the requirements in ED-5000 related to estimates and forward-looking information? If not, what do you propose and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-G, paras. 94-97)*

**Overall response:** [Disagree, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

ED-5000 | Response to request for comments

TIC Council  
Rue du Commerce 20-22, 1000 Brussels, Belgium | +32 2 880 21 37  
secretariat@tic-council.org | www.tic-council.org  
VAT: BE0724881295 | Transparency Register No.: 840667012559  
*Formerly known as IFIA and CEOC*

While agree that many aspects of the approach for estimates and forward-looking data, the two are very different and estimates and forward-looking data and should be considered separately as approaches with examples of what estimates hierarchy might be appropriate. For example, robust source data can be used for estimates such as proxy data, surrogate data, etc., whereas there will always be inherent uncertainties with forward looking information. (Ref 134L/R)

ED-5000 134L-135R listed the detailed approach to the requirement of Estimates and Forward-looking information. However, Para.97 mentioned "*The IAASB also noted that estimates and forward-looking information could be addressed further in a separate topic-specific ISSA in the future.*" We would urge this document to be published with ED-5000.

#### *Risk Procedures for a Limited Assurance Engagement*

17. Do you support the approach in ED-5000 to require the practitioner to design and perform risk procedures in a limited assurance engagement sufficient to identify disclosures where material misstatements are likely to arise, rather than to identify and assess the risks of material misstatement as is done for a reasonable assurance engagement? If not, what approach would you suggest and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-G, paras. 98-101)*

**Overall response:** [Yes, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

ED-5000 only refers to risk, does not refer to opportunities or impact. ESRS approach requires review of these three elements.

#### *Groups and "Consolidated" Sustainability Information*

18. Recognizing that ED-5000 is an overarching standard, do you agree that the principles-based requirements in ED-5000 can be applied for assurance engagements on the sustainability information of groups or in other circumstances when "consolidated" sustainability information is presented by the entity? If not, what do you propose and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-G, paras. 102-107)*

**Overall response:** [Agree, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

Where there is a group that has entities with different sector operations, there may will be a need for the entity materiality to be considered for each part of its group rather than at whole group level. Practitioners should be aware of this as it will feed into the entity materiality review process, and as such this should be covered in the ISSA 5000 standard.

For grouped information, ED-5000's requirement can be applied but more guidance is needed, e. the timing of assurance engagement, sampling requirements of limited and reasonable assurance, etc.

*ED-5000 | Response to request for comments*

We recommend referring to the International Accreditation Forum (IAF) guidance.

*Fraud*

19. Do you agree that ED-5000 appropriately addresses the topic of fraud (including “greenwashing”) by focusing on the susceptibility of the sustainability information to material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error? If not, what suggestions do you have for increasing the focus on fraud and why?

(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-G, paras. 108-110)

**Overall response:** [Disagree, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

There are no recommendations given to the practitioners and there should be more detail about misleading statements and the role of the practitioner to identify these. If it is looking at forward looking information, then it must be achievable. ED-5000 just refers to systems/ reports, but no reference to product labelling/ reports – all part of the external communication to customers through products/ services. Boundaries/ completeness of information/ consistency between what is done/ reported.

The standard address extensively on fraud. However, “greenwashing” is a more concealing concept and not all greenwashing are fraud. It might relate to some green claims or marketing activities that the company are not aware of greenwashing. In order to avoid greenwashing, the practitioner shall evaluate entity’s “materiality process” to determine if any material impact has been hidden/neglected from their reporting resulting in showing misleading information to intended users, i.e. greenwashing.

*Communication with Those Charged with Governance*

20. Do you support the high-level requirement in ED-5000 regarding communication with management, those charged with governance and others, with the related application material on matters that may be appropriate to communicate? If not, what do you propose and why?

(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-G, paras. 111-112)

**Overall response:** [Yes \(with no further comments\)](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

**Commented [RN(1)]:** Only if it's part of the scope. If the client wants us to verify 6 KPIs for example I don't think the client materiality will be the point here. I can't say that human rights is more important than water for a mining company. That's not my auditor role and it is not necessarily a greenwashing. I have wrote something in the other documents that relates to that. I agree with Rebecca that they need to better define the concepts of fraud and greenwashing. And highlight the auditor duty in these cases, how to classify and identify the cases...

**Commented [WP2R1]:** Add the comments in.

*Reporting Requirements and the Assurance Report*

21. Will the requirements in ED-5000 drive assurance reporting that meets the information needs of users? If not, please be specific about any matters that should not be required to be included in the assurance report, or any additional matters that should be included.

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-G, paras. 116-120, 124-130)*

**Overall response:** [No, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

To enable paras.120 "require the name of the engagement leader to be included in the assurance report ", the assurance practitioner shall ensure the engagement leader have the appropriate level of accountability. The concern is that sustainability assurance has far wider scope than financial audit and assurance.

The assurance report shall include what criteria (regarding to para.72 of ED-5000) the practitioner used to evaluate the sustainability information and the overall evaluation result.

22. Do you agree with the approach in ED-5000 of not addressing the concept of "key audit matters" for a sustainability assurance engagement, and instead having the IAASB consider addressing this in a future ISSA? If not, what do you propose and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-G, paras. 121-123)*

**Overall response:** [Agree \(with no further comments\)](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

23. For limited assurance engagements, is the explanation in the Basis for Conclusion section of the assurance report that the scope and nature of work performed is substantially less than for a reasonable assurance engagement sufficiently prominent? If not, what do you propose and why?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-G, para. 131)*

**Overall response:** [No, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

Mentioned by earlier comments, thresholds of limited assurance and reasonable assurance engagement are still quite blurred and complex, which may cause huge variance in practice by different practitioners. Limited Assurance itself extends very wide scope with a lower end and a higher end, which can't be identified by the intended users.

We recommend more detailed clarification with quantified guidance.

*Other Matters*

24. Are there any public sector considerations that need to be addressed in ED-5000?

*(See Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-I, para. 135)*

**Overall response:** [No \(with no further comments\)](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

25. Are there any other matters you would like to raise in relation to ED-5000?

**Overall response:** [Yes, as further explained below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

Terminology for partner/ firm/ staff is not necessarily profession agnostic. It is also not clear if subcontractors (exclusive or non-exclusive) count as staff or if they would be an internal or external expert can they be a lead practitioner or member of engagement team member. Definition (hh) only refers to partners and staff (further defined in (rr)) in firm - this an accounting structure and is not profession agnostic and should be widened to be agnostic and refer to subcontractors who are abiding by all of the firm's processes and procedures (with reference to firm Definition (s)).

Accessibility for wider groups not used to IASSB standards: would benefit from a review of language in the introductory sections with schematics for key parts of the process with links to relevant sections in the standard to make this a more open and inclusive document for a wider range of professionals.

There are areas of repetition that could be removed and clearly cross-referenced to reduce length without reducing content/ intent. For example, paragraphs 16 and 24 repeat.

Would be beneficial to have the application and other explanatory material section as a separate document, as this is referred to while reading the main document and for ease of reference (ie to be able to view both concurrently) it would be better to have separate documents.

Paragraph 16 & 24 - why is this necessary, contract should allow for any outcome (unqualified, qualified, adverse)

Paragraph 66 - assembly of the engagement file should be done before issue of the assurance report (not in a timely manner after) as complete file needed for engagement quality review. It is important to clarify whether the review should or shall be conducted by an engagement leader or practitioner that is independent from the engagement being reviewed. Some companies have ISO 14065 based GHG verification program that requires project independent review.

170 (j) practitioner signature is required - not clear if this has to be an individual or if this can be the firm brand/ logo. If individual can it be any member of the engagement team or of the wider firm, or does it need to be the engagement leader? In the example template reports a different definition is given 'signature in the name of the assurance firm'

Para 171 states engagement leader name should be included, but this is not specified as a requirement in the assurance report content in para 170(j). In the example statements provided the 'personal name of the

*ED-5000 | Response to request for comments*

assurance practitioner' stated, which is different from the name of the engagement leader, as practitioner can refer to the firm (according to the definition of practitioner). A491 refers to reasonable assurance, is this also applicable for limited assurance engagements?

Not clear what happens in the circumstance where a number of different assurance conclusions are included (ref A10) for different topic. If these are different conclusions, for example one qualified limited and one unqualified reasonable, with different materiality levels applied, can these be included in one assurance report? If so how should the report be titled? (ref 170 (a) & (c))

A238 - practitioner observation of entity site activities/ site equipment and interview evidence (from entity staff) are not listed as sources of information.

In several areas there is a need for assurance practitioners to make judgements on risk related to sustainability information disclosure. It would seem sensible to include a recommendation for evaluation of the Materiality assessment process, to enable an assurance to be conducted in relation to several of the key principles and to evaluate the risk of omission of information on material issues. The standard-setting action part:

- Developing a standard that provides more specificity than ISAE 3000 (Revised) and ISAE 3410 for the priority areas identified in the PP, recognizing that the degree of specificity needs to be commensurate with the overarching nature of the standard (see PP, paragraph 18(b)).

ISO standards can add guidance in that part, since ISAE is not specific enough. I should mention here and specific the reference to improve and standardize the assurance process (how many visits, samples, errors acceptancy). Iso is a bit more specific.

- PA.1: The difference in work effort between limited and reasonable assurance, including sufficiency of evidence

It should better set the boundary of each assurance criteria.

- PA.2: The suitability of the reporting criteria, including addressing concepts such as "double materiality". It is clearly CSRD focus, review the language and description. It should be "materiality" solely.
- PA.4: Evidence, including the reliability of information and what comprises sufficient appropriate evidence.
- PA.5: The entity's system of internal control and its impact on the ability of the practitioner to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence

It is missing the relevance on site visit, in some specific situations where desktop is not enough to confirm the scope, evidence and management process (ISO can be add as a reference)

In addition:

1. ED-5000, referring to control tests, if evidence is obtained in the middle of the period and the conclusions of these control tests are intended to be extended to the remaining period, which the remaining period specified to be at least a few months?

*ED-5000 | Response to request for comments*

2. ED-5000 If only internal control understanding is carried out and no control test is performed, it is intended to obtain evidence through the implementation of substantive procedures.

Whether with limited assurance and reasonable assurance, the work to be performed in relation to the substantive procedures, we recommend more detailed clarification with quantified guidance.

### Part C: Request for General Comments

The IAASB is also seeking comments on the matters set out below:

26. Translations—Recognizing that many respondents may intend to translate the final ISSA for adoption in their own environments, the IAASB welcomes comment on potential translation issues respondents note in reviewing ED-5000.

**Overall response:** [No response](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

27. Effective Date—As explained in paragraph 138 of Section 1-I – Other Matters, the IAASB believes that an appropriate effective date for the standard would be for assurance engagements on sustainability information reported for periods beginning or as at a specific date approximately 18 months after approval of the final standard. Earlier application would be permitted and encouraged. Do you agree that this would provide a sufficient period to support effective implementation of the ISA. If not, what do you propose and why?

**Overall response:** [Agree, with comments below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

It is not clear why to propose an 18-months delay. It should be possible to use ISSA 5000 once it is published on a voluntary basis. If the use of ISSA 5000 is requested by regulations, then effective date will be decided by the same regulation.