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:
  o Respond directly to the questions.
  o 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.
  o 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.
  o 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your organization’s name (or your name if you are making a submission in your personal capacity)</th>
<th>Securities and Exchange Commission Philippines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name(s) of person(s) responsible for this submission (or leave blank if the same as above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name(s) of contact(s) for this submission (or leave blank if the same as above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail address(es) of contact(s)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmspreciados@sec.gov.ph">gmspreciados@sec.gov.ph</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Asia Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If “Other”, please clarify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stakeholder group to which you belong (i.e., from which perspective are you providing feedback on ED-5000). Select the most appropriate option.</td>
<td>Regulator or assurance oversight authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If “Other”, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should you choose to do so, you may include information about your organization (or yourself, as applicable).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 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 on items under paragraph 14, except for the comments below

Detailed comments (if any):

Use by all assurance practitioners:

The proposal in ED-5000 to include professionals other than accountants in assurance engagements may impact the quality and consistency of sustainability assurance. The involvement of a wide range of professionals in sustainability assurance may lead to inconsistencies in the application of standards, widen the expectation gap. There is a risk that sustainability-related financial disclosures will not align with the financial statements, if assurance practitioners do not possess the same level of competence and expertise as the auditors of financial statements. While flexibility and accommodation are important in developing this standard such that it can be profession-agnostic, the overriding factor should be of high-quality assurance services. As regulator’s point of view, regulating various kind of professionals providing assurance services may not only create undue cost and effort, but may also not achieve the overarching goal of upholding integrity in the capital markets, credibility of reports and protection of investing public. Accounting firms, with specialists/experts from other fields of science, are best positioned to deliver assurance services, with the quality management in place following ISQM standards. With the accounting firms’ developed organizational structure and breadth of experience, including strict ethics rules, it can help drive consistency and connections between financial and sustainability information, that can provide high quality of assurance leading to a more credible and reliable sustainability and financial reports.

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 no further comments)

Detailed comments (if any):
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: Agree (with no further comments)

Detailed comments (if any):

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: Yes, with further comments below

Detailed comments (if any):

ISSA 5000 requires practitioners to be members of firms subject to ethical and quality management standards that are at least as demanding as those outlined in ISQM and the IESBA Code. However, aligning these standards across various disciplines may be burdensome and costly for regulators.

In connection with our comment on paragraph 14 of Explanatory Memorandum Section 1-A, for regulators, the “at least as demanding” concept might create undue burden and confusion in assessing and determining the practitioners’ compliance with these requirements. While other professionals might have equivalent standards, contextually, they may differ from ISQM and the IESBA Code.

Local accounting firms are already equipped with the necessary resources to comply with ISQM requirements, but other assurance practitioners may need to restructure their organizations to meet the requirements of ISSA 5000.

The importance of ensuring the competence of practitioners in sustainability assurance is recognized, and the concept of “at least demanding” is consistent with ISAE 3000. However, the “at least as demanding” criteria may be challenging for non-accountants to adopt, which goes against the objective of profession-agnostic standards.

Using the same statutory auditor as the assurance provider for sustainability reports can bring benefits, as the integration between sustainability matters and financial information is expected to be substantial. This avoids duplicative work and facilitates the linkages and connection between sustainability reports and financial statements in a seamless and consistent manner.

If IAASB allows other professionals to come up with “least as demanding” quality management standards and ethical requirements, it will be burdensome for regulators to determine if they are meeting the same
level of requirements with the ISQM and IESBA Code. While local regulators and national standard setters share the responsibility in determining what is considered "at least as demanding" in their jurisdictions, determining such may create undue cost and effort.

**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:** Yes, with comments below

**Detailed comments (if any):**

The definition of sustainability information may be clearer if it would specify whether it includes both financial and non-financial information.

---

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:** Yes (with further comments below)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

We understand that both limited and reasonable assurance engagements are aimed to enhance the credibility of the sustainability information and increase the confidence of intended users. However, it is important to clearly differentiate the level of confidence being achieved in both engagements. In this, regulators play an important role in creating awareness to avoid any expectation gap that might arise in this area.
IFRS S1 and S2 require a connection between the sustainability-related financial information in the sustainability reports and the financial statements. It is important to note that financial information requires a high level of assurance (reasonable assurance). If ISSA 5000 permits limited assurance, it creates a gap between sustainability reporting and financial reporting, as the former may have a lower level of assurance compared to the latter.

In our view, if the sustainability framework adopts IFRS S1 and S2 requirements, it should receive the same high level of assurance (reasonable assurance) as financial reporting, while limited assurance should only apply to aspects not covered by IFRS S1 and S2.

Further, since global trends show that we are heading towards reasonable assurance, we suggest that crafting more specific guidance on sustainability information audits (e.g. from planning to conclusion/reporting) similar to financial statements audits, to be included in one of IAASB’s future projects.

### 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 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:** Yes, with no further comments

**Detailed comments (if any):**

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:** Yes (with no further comments)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

### 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: Yes (with further comments below)

Detailed comments (if any):

The concept of double materiality is expected to serve multiple different users (e.g. financial materiality is of investors’ interest, while impact materiality serves a wider range of interests such as society, consumers, employees, and regulators, among others). We recommend providing more application guidance on the “double materiality” concept covering both financial and impact materiality to serve as the baseline. While we understand that materiality involves professional judgment, without robust guidance could lead to varying interpretations among practitioners, stakeholders, and regulators. In our observations at local jurisdiction, for financial statement audits, audit firms have their own detailed materiality guidance. Conceptually, some firms have similar guidance, while some firms vary. Further, the ‘magnitude and likelihood’ concept was not explicitly mentioned in the ED-5000.

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 no further comments)

Detailed comments (if any):

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: Agree (with no further comments)

Detailed comments (if any):
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: Yes (with no further comments)

Detailed comments (if any):

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: Yes (with no further comments)

Detailed comments (if any):

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: Agree (with no further comments)

Detailed comments (if any):

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 no further comments)
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 no further comments)

Detailed comments (if any):

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: Agree (with no further comments)

Detailed comments (if any):

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):
**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:** Yes (with no further comments)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

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 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:** Yes (with no further comments)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

**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:  
No other matters to raise

Detailed comments (if any):

---

**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:  
Click to select from dropdown menu

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 ISSA? If not, what do you propose and why?

Overall response:  
Click to select from dropdown menu

Detailed comments (if any):