

## RESPONSE TEMPLATE FOR THE ED OF PROPOSED NARROW-SCOPE AMENDMENTS TO IAASB STANDARDS ARISING FROM THE IESBA'S USING THE WORK OF AN EXTERNAL EXPERT PROJECT

### Guide for Respondents

Comments are requested by **July 24, 2025**.

This template is for providing comments on the Exposure Draft (ED) of proposed Narrow-Scope Amendments to International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board® (IAASB®) Standards Arising from the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants' (IESBA) Using the Work of an External Expert project, in response to the questions set out in the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) to the ED. 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 the ED, 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 the ED that your response relates to, for example, by reference to sections, headings or specific paragraphs in the ED.
  - 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 [web page](#) to upload the completed template.

**Responses to IAASB's Request for Comments in the EM for the ED, Proposed Narrow-Scope Amendments to IAASB Standards Arising from the IESBA's Using the Work of an External Expert Project**

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

Your organization's name (or your name if you are making a submission in your personal capacity)	The Malaysian Institute of Certified Public Accountants (MICPA)
Name(s) of person(s) responsible for this submission (or leave blank if the same as above)	Ms. Chiam Pei Pei
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:peipei@micpa.com.my">peipei@micpa.com.my</a>
Geographical profile that best represents your situation (i.e., from which geographical perspective are you providing feedback on the ED). Select the most appropriate option.	<u>Asia Pacific</u>
	If "Other", please clarify
The stakeholder group to which you belong (i.e., from which perspective are you providing feedback on the ED). Select the most appropriate option.	<u>Professional accountancy or other professional organization (PAO or similar)</u>
	If "Other", please specify
Should you choose to do so, you may include information about your organization (or yourself, as applicable).	

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 the ED).

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

## PART B: Responses to Questions in the EM for the ED

*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 Question

#### *Public Interest Responsiveness*

1. Do you agree that the proposed narrow-scope amendments are responsive to the public interest, considering the qualitative standard-setting characteristics and standard-setting actions in the project proposal? If not, why not?

(See EM, Section 1-A)

**Overall response:** Agree, with comments below

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

We agree with the proposal as the amendments strengthen the guidance on evaluating competence, capabilities, and objectivity, and explicitly incorporate ethical responsibilities from the IESBA Code.

### Specific Questions

#### *Proposed Narrow-Scope Amendments to ISA 620<sup>1</sup>*

2. Do you agree that the proposed narrow-scope amendments to ISA 620 are appropriate to maintain interoperability with the new provisions in the Code related to using the work of an external expert?

(See EM, Section 1-C)

**Overall response:** Agree, with comments below

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

We agree with the proposal, as the amendments do not change the core requirements as stated in ISA 620.

If you do not agree, what alternatives do you suggest (please identify the specific paragraphs and be specific as to why you believe the proposals are not appropriate, and why you believe your alternatives would be more appropriate)?

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

N/A

<sup>1</sup> International Standard on Auditing (ISA) 620, *Using the Work of an Auditor's Expert*

*Proposed Narrow-Scope Amendments to ISRE 2400 (Revised),<sup>2</sup> ISAE 3000 (Revised)<sup>3</sup> and ISRS 4400 (Revised)<sup>4</sup>*

3.1 Do you agree that the proposed narrow-scope amendments to ISRE 2400 (Revised) are consistent with the proposed amendments to ISA 620, and are appropriate to maintain interoperability with the new provisions in the Code related to using the work of an external expert?

(See EM, Section 1-D)

**Overall response:** Agree, with comments below

**Detailed comments (if any):**

The proposed amendments to ISRE 2400 (Revised) are consistent with the proposed amendments to ISA 620, as both incorporate cross-references to ethical requirements and prohibit practitioners from using the work of an external expert when ethical conditions are not met.

The amendments are also appropriate to maintain interoperability with the new provisions in the IESBA Code, which set ethical expectations for all professional accountants in public practice.

If you do not agree, what alternatives do you suggest (please identify the specific paragraphs and be specific as to why you believe the proposals are not appropriate, and why you believe your alternatives would be more appropriate)?

**Detailed comments (if any):**

N/A

3.2 Do you agree that the proposed narrow-scope amendments to ISAE 3000 (Revised) are consistent with the proposed amendments to ISA 620, and are appropriate to maintain interoperability with the new provisions in the Code related to using the work of an external expert?

(See EM, Section 1-E)

**Overall response:** Agree, with comments below

**Detailed comments (if any):**

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

<sup>3</sup> International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 (Revised), *Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information*

<sup>4</sup> International Standards on Related Services (ISRS) 4400 (Revised), *Agreed-upon Procedures Engagements*

The proposed amendments to ISAE 3000 (Revised) are consistent with the proposed amendments to ISA 620, as both incorporate cross-references to ethical requirements and prohibit practitioners from using the work of an external expert when ethical conditions are not met.

The amendments are appropriate to maintain interoperability with the new provisions in the IESBA Code, as these provisions apply not only to audits, but also to assurance engagements governed by ISAE 3000 (Revised). Practitioners performing assurance engagements are therefore expected to follow the same ethical requirements when using external experts.

If you do not agree, what alternatives do you suggest (please identify the specific paragraphs and be specific as to why you believe the proposals are not appropriate, and why you believe your alternatives would be more appropriate)?

**Detailed comments (if any):**

N/A

3.3 Do you agree that the proposed narrow-scope amendments to ISRS 4400 (Revised) are consistent with the proposed amendments to ISA 620, and are appropriate to maintain interoperability with the new provisions in the Code related to using the work of an external expert?

(See EM, Section 1-F)

**Overall response:** Agree, with comments below

**Detailed comments (if any):**

The proposed amendments to ISRS4400 (Revised) are consistent with the proposed amendments to ISA 620, as both prohibit practitioners from using the work of an external expert when ethical conditions are not met.

The amendments are appropriate to maintain interoperability with the new provisions in the Code, as they clarify the practitioner's responsibility to evaluate the expert's competence, capabilities, and objectivity, consider any threats to objectivity, and avoid using the expert's work if such threats cannot be addressed in accordance with the Code.

If you do not agree, what alternatives do you suggest (please identify the specific paragraphs and be specific as to why you believe the proposals are not appropriate, and why you believe your alternatives would be more appropriate)?

**Detailed comments (if any):**

N/A

*Other Matters*

4. Are there any other matters you would like to raise in relation to the ED? If so, please clearly indicate the standard(s), and the specific requirement(s) or application material, to which your comment(s) relate.

**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:

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

**Overall response:**     [See comments on translation below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

We do not foresee major translation challenges with the proposed narrow-scope amendments, as the terminology used is consistent with the existing framework of the IAASB standards and IESBA Code.

6. Effective Date—Given the public interest benefit of aligning the effective date of these proposed narrow-scope amendments with the effective date of the revised Code provisions related to using the work of an external expert, the IAASB believes that an appropriate implementation period would be approximately 12 months after the PIOB's process of certification of the final narrow-scope amendments. The IAASB welcomes comments on whether this would provide a sufficient period to support effective implementation of the narrow-scope amendments.

*(See EM, Section 1-G)*

**Overall response:**     [See comments on effective date below](#)

**Detailed comments (if any):**

We are supportive of the proposed effective date.