

ISA 540 (Revised) Post-Implementation Survey

Response ID:58 Data

3. Section II: About the Respondent

1. Please provide the following information about your organization (if applicable) and other contact information:

Name(s) of contact(s) for this submission : Kia Atlas

Job title or role : Director

E-mail address(es) of contact(s) : kia.atlas@rsm.ky

2. Please select from the following options the stakeholder group to which you or your organization belongs:

Accounting Firm

Specify the type of accounting firm you represent:

Small- or medium-sized accounting firm

3. Please select from the following options the geographical region that best matches you or your organization:

Global

4. Did you undertake outreach activities with other stakeholders outside your organization to inform your responses to this survey?

No

5. You are welcome to provide any additional information you believe may be relevant to clarify the context in which you are completing the survey, or the circumstances or experiences that have informed your views or perspectives (or you can choose to leave this question blank).

4. Section III: Overall Questions

6. Please provide overall views about whether ISA 540 (Revised) has achieved its intended purpose and the objectives of the IAASB in developing the revised standard.

The standard was very clear especially with the help of flowcharts and diagrams!

7. Are you aware of the non-authoritative guidance and support tools developed to support the implementation of ISA 540 (Revised)?

Yes

7A. Do you agree that the non-authoritative guidance and support tools developed to support the implementation of ISA 540 (Revised) are useful?

3 – Agree

Comments:

5. Section IV: Perceived Benefits from ISA 540 (Revised)

8. For each perceived benefit, indicate the extent to which you agree that ISA 540 (Revised) has led to benefits or improvements.

	4 – Strongly Agree	3 – Agree	2 – Disagree	1 – Strongly Disagree	0 – No Response
(a) Enhanced exercise of professional skepticism when auditing accounting estimates.		X			
(b) Greater consideration of the skills and competencies of the engagement team, including the need to involve specialists or experts.			X		
(c) Greater attention to understanding management's process for making estimates, including the selection of methods, assumptions and data (and the consistency of selection between periods).		X			
(d) Better or more focused assessments of the risks of material misstatements for accounting estimates.		X			
(e) More focus on understanding and testing controls related to accounting estimates.		X			
(f) Increased auditor attention to disclosures related to accounting estimates, including disclosures about estimation uncertainty.		X			
(g) Enhanced interactions and communications between the auditor and management and those charged with governance related to the audit of accounting estimates.		X			
(h) Enhanced quality of financial reporting related to accounting estimates.					

9. Are there any additional benefits or positive outcomes arising from the implementation of ISA 540 (Revised) that you would like to highlight?

No

6. Section V: Potential Issues or Challenges Relating to ISA 540 (Revised)

10. ISA 540 (Revised) was designed to be capable of being applied to all accounting estimates, and for the nature, timing and extent of the risk assessment and further audit procedures to be varied in relation to the estimation uncertainty and the assessment of the risks of material misstatement. Indicate the extent to which you have experienced or are aware of any issues or challenges related to scalability and proportionality.

3 – Moderate Issues or Challenges

11. Briefly describe these or any other issues or challenges you encountered related to scalability and proportionality.

Level 3 fair values are automatically treated as complex and high risk — but in practice, not all Level 3 valuations are equally complex, and it's often unclear when a valuation specialist is truly required. There is no clear practical boundary in ISA 540 (Revised) that helps auditors determine:

1. When complexity truly justifies specialist involvement
2. When a well-trained audit team can reasonably perform the work

Therefore, this creates inconsistency across firms and regulators. Under ISA 540 (Revised), scalability is supposed to depend on complexity, subjectivity, estimation uncertainty, susceptibility to management bias. But for Level 3 instruments, the label itself drives behavior, firms may default to a defensive approach, regulators often expect specialist involvement and engagement teams struggle to justify a "non-specialist" approach. This resulted normally in over-auditing in simpler cases, defensive documentation, and inconsistent inspection outcomes.

12. In your view, are the issues or challenges due to a lack of clarity or insufficiency of the requirements or application material in the standard?

Difficult to Determine

13. What specific suggestions do you have for how the IAASB can best address the issues or challenges you have identified (e.g., standard-setting, non-authoritative guidance, or other actions)?

1. Provide Clearer Practical Indicators for Specialist Involvement

IAASB could include implementation guidance such as examples of when a specialist is likely necessary:

- >Use of complex financial engineering models
- >Significant bespoke or internally developed models
- >Highly judgmental unobservable inputs with no benchmarking
- >Model risk requiring independent validation

Then some examples of when a specialist may not be necessary:

- >Standard DCF models using observable market-derived inputs
- >Simple private equity valuations with recent transaction evidence
- >Instruments where valuation methodology is stable and historically reliable

2. Clarity that Level 3 does not automatically imply high inherent risk because risk assessment should still consider the nature of inputs, model complexity and susceptibility to bias.

3. Providing illustrative case studies on scenarios where there is a simple level 3 equity valuation (for example a Fund with latest financing beginning of their fiscal year) - no specialist needed

7. Section V: Potential Issues or Challenges Relating to ISA 540 (Revised) (continued)

14. Indicate the extent to which you have experienced or are aware of the following issues or challenges in applying ISA 540 (Revised) with respect the auditor exercising professional skepticism when auditing accounting estimates and related disclosures.

	4 – Significant Issues or Challenges	3 – Moderate Issues or Challenges	2 – Minor Issues or Challenges	1 – No Issues or Challenges	0 – No Response
(a) Appropriately challenging management's judgments used in making accounting estimates, particularly when they involve complex or subjective inputs.		X			
(b) Identifying and appropriately responding to potential indicators of management bias in the development of accounting estimates.		X			
(c) Appropriately considering all relevant audit evidence obtained, whether corroborative or contradictory.			X		

15. Briefly describe these or any other issues or challenges you encountered related to exercising professional skepticism.

One challenge encountered when exercising professional skepticism arises in situations where management performs valuations internally and includes complex or highly subjective inputs. In such cases, management often provides extensive narrative explanations to support their assumptions. While the documentation may appear thorough, there can be a concern that the volume and sophistication of the explanation does not necessarily correlate with the robustness of the underlying support.

From an auditor's perspective, this creates difficulty in distinguishing between genuinely well-reasoned judgments and explanations that are drafted defensively to withstand audit scrutiny. The presence of detailed "blurb" can create an impression of rigor, yet the underlying inputs may still lack objective corroboration or sufficient market support.

This dynamic increases the challenge of applying professional skepticism effectively. Auditors must look beyond the form and length of documentation and focus on the substance, including the consistency of assumptions with external evidence, historical accuracy of management's estimates, and sensitivity of outcomes to key inputs. However, ISA 540 (Revised) does not always provide clear practical guidance on how to evaluate the quality of management's rationale versus its quantity.

Additional implementation guidance or illustrative examples on assessing the persuasiveness and objectivity of management-prepared valuation documentation would assist auditors in applying professional skepticism more consistently and effectively.

16. In your view, are the observed issues or challenges due to a lack of clarity or insufficiency of the requirements or application material in the standard?

Difficult to Determine

17. What specific suggestions do you have for how the IAASB can best address the issues or challenges you have identified (e.g., standard-setting, non-authoritative guidance, or other actions)?

IAASB could provide implementation guidance on assessing the quality of evidence rather than the quantity. They could include indicators of persuasive vs. non-persuasive support (e.g., objective market corroboration vs internally generated rationale), offer examples where documentation appears comprehensive but lacks external validation. This would help auditors avoid being influenced by presentation rather than substance.

8. Section V: Potential Issues or Challenges Relating to ISA 540 (Revised) (continued)

18. Indicate the extent to which you have experienced the following issues or challenges in applying ISA 540 (Revised) with respect to *risk assessment procedures and identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement related to accounting estimates*.

	4 – Significant Issues or Challenges	3 – Moderate Issues or Challenges	2 – Minor Issues or Challenges	1 – No Issues or Challenges	0 – No Response
(a) The consideration of inherent risk factors and the interrelationship between them in identifying and assessing risks of material misstatement related to accounting estimates.			X		
(b) How the understanding of the entity and its environment, and the entity's internal control for accounting estimates, relates to the understanding required by ISA 315 (Revised 2019) (i.e., whether it is clear that the requirements in paragraph 13 of ISA 540 (Revised) relate specifically to accounting estimates and build on the broader requirements in ISA 315 (Revised 2019)).			X		
(c) Reviewing the outcome of previous accounting estimates or, where applicable, their subsequent re-estimation (i.e., the retrospective review of accounting estimates).				X	
(d) Understanding management's process for making accounting estimates, including how management identifies and selects relevant methods, assumptions and data, and how management understands and addresses estimation uncertainty.			X		
(e) The separate assessments of inherent and control risk relating to an accounting estimate.				X	
(f) Whether any of the assessed risks of material misstatement are significant risks.				X	

19. Briefly describe these or any other issues or challenges you encountered related to risk assessment procedures and whether such issues or challenges relate primarily to estimates that have a high degree of estimation uncertainty or complexity.

N/A

20. In your view, are the observed issues or challenges due to a lack of clarity or insufficiency of the requirements or application material in the standard?

No

21. What specific suggestions do you have for how the IAASB can best address the issues or challenges you have identified (e.g., standard-setting, non-authoritative guidance, or other actions)?

N/A

9. Section V: Potential Issues or Challenges Relating to ISA 540 (Revised) (continued)

22. Indicate the extent to which you have experienced the following issues or challenges in applying ISA 540 (Revised) with respect to *responding to the assessed risks of material misstatement*

	4 – Significant Issues or Challenges	3 – Moderate Issues or Challenges	2 – Minor Issues or Challenges	1 – No Issues or Challenges	0 – No Response
Responses to the Assessed Risks of Material Misstatement					
(a) Determining the most appropriate response(s) to the assessed risks of material misstatement at the assertion level from among the testing approaches in paragraph 18 of ISA 540 (Revised).			X		
(b) Determining whether to test the operating effectiveness of controls related to an accounting estimate.					X
(c) Appropriately applying the testing approach of obtaining audit evidence about events occurring up to the date of the auditor's report, either alone or with another testing approach(es).				X	
(d) Testing how management made the accounting estimate.		X			
(e) Developing an auditor's point estimate or range.				X	
Overall Evaluation					
(f) Determining whether the accounting estimates and related disclosures are reasonable in the context of the applicable financial reporting framework, or are misstated.			X		
(g) Evaluating identified misstatements related to accounting estimates, including when the audit evidence supports a point estimate that differs from management's point estimate or a range that does not include management's point estimate, or when the auditor's range is wide (in some cases, multiples of materiality for the financial statements as a whole).			X		

22A. Indicate the extent to which you have experienced the following issues or challenges in applying ISA 540 (Revised) with respect to *testing how management made the accounting estimates*.

	4 – Significant Issues or Challenges	3 – Moderate Issues or Challenges	2 – Minor Issues or Challenges	1 – No Issues or Challenges	0 – No Response
(a) Testing management's selection of the method, significant assumptions, and data used, including whether management's judgments give rise to indicators of possible management bias.			X		
(b) Understanding management's application of the method involving complex modelling and testing complex models, including the integrity and completeness of the data used.		X			
(c) Whether management has taken appropriate steps to understand and address estimation uncertainty, including the selection of an appropriate point estimate and developing related disclosures about estimation uncertainty.		X			

23. Briefly describe these or any other issues or challenges you encountered related to responding to risks of material misstatement and whether such issues or challenges relate primarily to estimates that have a high degree of estimation uncertainty or complexity.

Same as my previous response

24. In your view, are the observed issues or challenges due to a lack of clarity or insufficiency of the requirements or application material in the standard?

Difficult to Determine

25. What specific suggestions do you have for how the IAASB can best address the issues or challenges you have identified (e.g., standard-setting, non-authoritative guidance, or other actions)?

Same as my previous response

10. Section V: Potential Issues or Challenges Relating to ISA 540 (Revised) (continued)

26. Indicate the extent to which you have experienced the following issues or challenges in applying ISA 540 (Revised) with respect to *communication, specialized skills or knowledge, including using the work of an auditor's expert, and documentation*.

	4 – Significant Issues or Challenges	3 – Moderate Issues or Challenges	2 – Minor Issues or Challenges	1 – No Issues or Challenges	0 – No Response
Communication (a) Determining the matters, if any, to communicate related to accounting estimates, (including about significant qualitative aspects of the entity's accounting practices and significant deficiencies in internal control).		X			
Specialized Skills or Knowledge, Including Using the Work of an Auditor's Expert (b) Determining when it is appropriate to involve an auditor's expert(s) (an internal or external expert) and using the work of an auditor's expert(s) in auditing an accounting estimate(s).		X			
Documentation (c) Preparing appropriate audit documentation in accordance with the requirements in paragraph 39 of ISA 540 (Revised).		X			

27. Briefly describe these or any other issues or challenges you encountered or observed related to communications, specialized skills or knowledge (including using the work of an auditor's expert) and documentation.

Same as my previous response

28. In your view, are the observed issues or challenges due to a lack of clarity or insufficiency of the requirements or application material in the standard?

Difficult to Determine

29. What specific suggestions do you have for how the IAASB can best address the issues or challenges you have identified (e.g., standard-setting, non-authoritative guidance, or other actions)?

Same as my previous response