

## Section 290

### Independence – Assurance Engagements

290.1 In the case of an assurance engagement it is in the public interest and, therefore, required by this Code of Ethics, that members of **assurance teams**,<sup>\*</sup> firms and, when applicable, **network firm**<sup>\*</sup>s be independent of assurance clients.

290.1a Assurance engagements are designed to enhance intended users' degree of confidence about the outcome of the evaluation or measurement of a subject matter against criteria. The International Framework for Assurance Engagements (the Assurance Framework) issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board describes the elements and objectives of an assurance engagement, and identifies engagements to which International Standards on Auditing (ISAs), International Standards on Review Engagements (ISREs) and International Standards on Assurance Engagements (ISAEs) apply. For a description of the elements and objectives of an assurance engagement reference should be made to the Assurance Framework.

290.1b As further explained in the Assurance Framework, in an assurance engagement the professional accountant in public practice expresses a conclusion designed to enhance the degree of confidence of the intended users other than the responsible party about the outcome of the evaluation or measurement of a subject matter against criteria.

290.1c The outcome of the evaluation or measurement of a subject matter is the information that results from applying the criteria to the subject matter. The term "subject matter information" is used to mean the outcome of the evaluation or measurement of subject matter. For example:

- The recognition, measurement, presentation and disclosure represented in the financial statements (subject matter information) result from applying a financial reporting framework for recognition, measurement, presentation and disclosure, such as International Financial Reporting Standards, (criteria) to an entity's financial position, financial performance and cash flows (subject matter).
- An assertion about the effectiveness of internal control (subject matter information) results from applying a framework for evaluating the effectiveness of internal control, such as COSO<sup>1</sup> or CoCo<sup>2</sup>, (criteria) to internal control, a process (subject matter).

290.1d Assurance engagements may be assertion-based or direct reporting. In either case they involve three separate parties: a public accountant in public practice, a responsible party and intended users.

---

<sup>\*</sup> See Definitions.

<sup>1</sup> ~~"Internal Control – Integrated Framework" The Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission.~~

<sup>2</sup> ~~"Guidance on Assessing Control – The CoCo Principles" Criteria of Control Board, The Canadian Institute of Chartered Accountants.~~

June 2005 – Rome, Italy

290.1e In an assertion-based assurance engagement, the evaluation or measurement of the subject matter is performed by the responsible party, and the subject matter information is in the form of an assertion by the responsible party that is made available to the intended users. The subject matter information is provided to the intended users in the assurance report.

290.1f In a direct reporting assurance engagement the professional accountant in public practice either directly performs the evaluation or measurement of the subject matter, or obtains a representation from the responsible party that has performed the evaluation or measurement that is not available to the intended users. The subject matter information is provided to the intended users in the assurance report.

290.2 Independence requires:

*Independence of Mind*

The state of mind that permits the expression of a conclusion without being affected by influences that compromise professional judgment, allowing an individual to act with integrity, and exercise objectivity and professional skepticism.

*Independence in Appearance*

The avoidance of facts and circumstances that are so significant that a reasonable and informed third party, having knowledge of all relevant information, including safeguards applied, would reasonably conclude a firm's, or a member of the assurance team's, integrity, objectivity or professional skepticism had been compromised.

290.3 The use of the word "independence" on its own may create misunderstandings. Standing alone, the word may lead observers to suppose that a person exercising professional judgment ought to be free from all economic, financial and other relationships. This is impossible, as every member of society has relationships with others. Therefore, the significance of economic, financial and other relationships should also be evaluated in the light of what a reasonable and informed third party having knowledge of all relevant information would reasonably conclude to be unacceptable.

290.4 Many different circumstances, or combination of circumstances, may be relevant and accordingly it is impossible to define every situation that creates threats to independence and specify the appropriate mitigating action that should be taken. In addition, the nature of assurance engagements may differ and consequently different threats may exist, requiring the application of different safeguards. A conceptual framework that requires firms and members of assurance teams to identify, evaluate and address threats to independence, rather than merely comply with a set of specific rules which may be arbitrary, is, therefore, in the public interest.

*A Conceptual Approach to Independence*

290.5 ~~This section provides a conceptual framework for identifying, evaluating and responding to threats to independence. The framework requires members of assurance teams, firms and network firms to identify threats to independence, evaluate the~~

~~significance of those threats, and, if the threats are other than clearly insignificant, identify and apply safeguards to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. Judgment is needed to determine which safeguards are to be applied. Some safeguards may eliminate the threat while others may reduce the threat to an acceptable level. This section requires M~~members of assurance teams, firms and network firms are required to apply the conceptual framework contained in Section 100 to the particular circumstances under consideration. In addition to identifying relationships between the firm, network firms, members of the assurance team and the assurance client, consideration should be given to whether relationships between individuals outside of the assurance team and the assurance client create threats to independence.

- 290.6 The examples presented in this section are intended to illustrate the application of the conceptual framework and are not intended to be, nor should they be interpreted as, an exhaustive list of all circumstances that may create threats to independence. Consequently, it is not sufficient for a member of an assurance team, a firm or a network firm merely to comply with the examples presented, rather they should apply the framework to the particular circumstances they face.
- 290.7 The nature of the threats to independence and the applicable safeguards necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level differ depending on the characteristics of the individual assurance engagement: whether it is a financial statement audit engagement or another type of assurance engagement; and in the latter case, the purpose, subject matter information and intended users of the report. A firm should, therefore, evaluate the relevant circumstances, the nature of the assurance engagement and the threats to independence in deciding whether it is appropriate to accept or continue an engagement, as well as the nature of the safeguards required and whether a particular individual should be a member of the assurance team.

### Assertion-based Assurance Engagements

#### *Financial Statement Audit Engagements*

- 290.8 Financial statement audit engagements are relevant to a wide range of potential users; consequently, in addition to independence of mind, independence in appearance is of particular significance. Accordingly, for financial statement audit clients, the members of the assurance team, the firm and network firms are required to be independent of the financial statement audit client. Such independence requirements include prohibitions regarding certain relationships between members of the assurance team and directors, officers and employees of the client in a position to exert direct and significant influence over the subject matter information (the **financial statements**<sup>\*</sup>). Also, consideration should be given to whether threats to independence are created by relationships with employees of the client in a position to exert direct and significant

---

<sup>\*</sup> See Definitions.

influence over the subject matter (the financial position, financial performance and cash flows).

### *Other Assertion-based Assurance Engagements*

290.9 In an ~~assurance~~assertion-based assurance engagement where the client is not a **financial statement audit client**<sup>\*</sup>, the members of the assurance team and the firm are required to be independent of the assurance client (the responsible party, which is responsible for the subject matter information and may be responsible for the subject matter). Such independence requirements include prohibitions regarding certain relationships between members of the assurance team and directors, officers and employees of the client in a position to exert direct and significant influence over the subject matter information. Also, consideration should be given to whether threats to independence are created by relationships with employees of the client in a position to exert direct and significant influence over the subject matter of the engagement. Consideration should also be given to any threats that the firm has reason to believe may be created by network firm interests and relationships.

290.9b In the majority of assertion-based assurance engagements, that are not financial statement audit engagements, the responsible party is responsible for the subject matter information and the subject matter. However, in some engagements the responsible party may not be responsible for the subject matter. For example, when a professional accountant in public practice is engaged to perform an assurance engagement regarding a report that an environmental consultant has prepared about a company's sustainability practices, for distribution to intended users, the environmental consultant is the responsible party for the subject matter information but the company is responsible for the subject matter (the sustainability practices).

290.10 In ~~some assurance~~those assertion-based assurance engagements that are not financial statement audit engagements, ~~there are two responsible parties where the responsible party is responsible for the subject matter information but not the subject matter. In such engagements,~~ the members of the assurance team and the firm are required to be independent of ~~the assurance client~~ (the party responsible for the subject matter information (the assurance client)). In addition, consideration should be given to any threats the firm has reason to believe may be created by interests and relationships between a member of the assurance team, the firm, a network firm and the party responsible for the subject matter.

### *Direct Reporting Assurance Engagements*

290.10a In a direct reporting assurance engagement the members of the assurance team and the firm are required to be independent of the assurance client (the party responsible for the subject matter).

### *Restricted Use Reports*

290.11 In the case of an assurance report in respect of a non-financial statement audit client expressly restricted for use by identified users, the users of the report are considered to

June 2005 – Rome, Italy

be knowledgeable as to the purpose, subject matter information and limitations of the report through their participation in establishing the nature and scope of the firm's instructions to deliver the services, including the criteria against which the subject matter are to be evaluated or measured. This knowledge and the enhanced ability of the firm to communicate about safeguards with all users of the report increase the effectiveness of safeguards to independence in appearance. These circumstances may be taken into account by the firm in evaluating the threats to independence and considering the applicable safeguards necessary to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level. At a minimum, it will be necessary to apply the provisions of this section in evaluating the independence of members of the assurance team and their immediate and close family. Further, if the firm had a material financial interest, whether direct or indirect, in the assurance client, the self-interest threat created would be so significant no safeguard could reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Limited consideration of any threats created by network firm interests and relationships may be sufficient.

### *Multiple responsible parties*

290.11a In some assurance engagements, whether assertion-based or direct reporting, that are not financial statement audit engagements, there might be several responsible parties. In such engagements, in determining whether it is necessary to apply the provisions in this section to each responsible party, the firm may take into account whether an interest or relationship between the firm, or a member of the assurance team, and a particular responsible party would create a threat to independence that is other than clearly insignificant in the context of the subject matter information. This will take into account factors such as:

- The materiality of the subject matter information (or the subject matter) for which the particular responsible party is responsible; and
- The degree of public interest associated with the engagement.

If the firm determines that the threat to independence created by any such interest or relationship with a particular responsible party would be clearly insignificant it may not be necessary to apply all of the provisions of this section to that responsible party.

### *Other Considerations*

290.12 The threats and safeguards identified in this section are generally discussed in the context of interests or relationships between the firm, network firms, members of the assurance team and the assurance client. In the case of a financial statement audit client that is a listed entity, the firm and any network firms are required to consider the interests and relationships that involve that client's related entities. Ideally those entities and the interests and relationships should be identified in advance. For all other assurance clients, when the assurance team has reason to believe that a **related entity**\* of such an assurance client is relevant to the evaluation of the firm's independence of

---

\* See Definitions.

the client, the assurance team should consider that related entity when evaluating independence and applying appropriate safeguards.

- 290.13 The evaluation of threats to independence and subsequent action should be supported by evidence obtained before accepting the engagement and while it is being performed. The obligation to make such an evaluation and take action arises when a firm, a network firm or a member of the assurance team knows, or could reasonably be expected to know, of circumstances or relationships that might compromise independence. There may be occasions when the firm, a network firm or an individual inadvertently violates this section. If such an inadvertent violation occurs, it would generally not compromise independence with respect to an assurance client provided the firm has appropriate quality control policies and procedures in place to promote independence and, once discovered, the violation is corrected promptly and any necessary safeguards are applied.
- 290.14 Throughout this section, reference is made to significant and clearly insignificant threats in the evaluation of independence. In considering the significance of any particular matter, qualitative as well as quantitative factors should be taken into account. A matter should be considered clearly insignificant only if it is deemed to be both trivial and inconsequential.

June 2005 – Rome, Italy

**Introduction**

290.100 The following examples describe specific circumstances and relationships that may create threats to independence. The examples describe the potential threats created and the safeguards that may be appropriate to eliminate the threats or reduce them to an acceptable level in each circumstance. The examples are not all-inclusive. In practice, the firm, network firms and the members of the assurance team will be required to assess the implications of similar, but different, circumstances and relationships and to determine whether safeguards, including the safeguards in paragraphs 200.12 through 200.15 can be applied to satisfactorily address the threats to independence.

290.101 Some of the examples deal with financial statement audit clients while others deal with assurance engagements for clients that are not financial statement audit clients. The examples illustrate how safeguards should be applied to fulfill the requirement for the members of the assurance team, the firm and network firms to be independent of a financial statement audit client, and for the members of the assurance team and the firm to be independent of an assurance client that is not a financial statement audit client. The examples do not include assurance reports to a non-financial statement audit client expressly restricted for use by identified users. As stated in paragraph 290.11 for such engagements, members of the assurance team and their immediate and close family are required to be independent of the assurance client. Further, the firm should not have a material financial interest, direct or indirect, in the assurance client.

290.102 The examples illustrate how the framework applies to financial statement audit clients and other assurance clients. The examples should be read in conjunction with paragraphs 290.9-290.10 which explain that, in the majority of assurance engagements, there is one responsible party and that responsible party comprises the assurance client. However, in some assurance engagements there are two responsible parties. In such circumstances, consideration should be given to any threats the firm has reason to believe may be created by interests and relationships between a member of the assurance team, the firm, a network firm and the party responsible for the subject matter.

290.102a Interpretation 2005-01 to this section provides further guidance on the application of the independence requirements contained in this section to assurance engagements that are not financial statement audit engagements.

290.134 Family and personal relationships between a member of the assurance team and a director, an officer or certain employees, depending on their role, of the assurance client, may create self-interest, familiarity or intimidation threats. It is impracticable to attempt to describe in detail the significance of the threats that such relationships may create. The significance will depend upon a number of factors including the individual's responsibilities on the assurance engagement, the closeness of the relationship and the role of the family member or other individual within the assurance client. Consequently, there is a wide spectrum of circumstances that will need to be evaluated and safeguards to be applied to reduce the threat to an acceptable level.



290.135 When an immediate family member of a member of the assurance team is a director, an officer or an employee of the assurance client in a position to exert direct and significant influence over the subject matter information of the assurance engagement, or was in such a position during any period covered by the engagement, the threats to independence can only be reduced to an acceptable level by removing the individual from the assurance team. The closeness of the relationship is such that no other safeguard could reduce the threat to independence to an acceptable level. If application of this safeguard is not used, the only course of action is to withdraw from the assurance engagement. For example, in the case of an audit of financial statements, if the spouse of a member of the assurance team is an employee in a position to exert direct and significant influence over the preparation of the audit client's accounting records or financial statements, the threat to independence could only be reduced to an acceptable level by removing the individual from the assurance team.

290.136 When an immediate family member of a member the assurance team is an employee in a position to exert direct and significant influence over the subject matter of the engagement, threats to independence may be created. The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:

- The position the immediate family member holds with the client; and
- The role of the professional on the assurance team.

The significance of the threat should be evaluated and, if the threat is other than clearly insignificant, safeguards should be considered and applied as necessary to reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Such safeguards might include:

- Removing the individual from the assurance team;
- Where possible, structuring the responsibilities of the assurance team so that the professional does not deal with matters that are within the responsibility of the immediate family member; or
- Policies and procedures to empower staff to communicate to senior levels within the firm any issue of independence and objectivity that concerns them.

290.137 When a close family member of a member of the assurance team is a director, an officer, or an employee of the assurance client in a position to exert direct and significant influence over the subject matter information of the assurance engagement, threats to independence may be created. The significance of the threats will depend on factors such as:

- The position the close family member holds with the client; and
- The role of the professional on the assurance team.

The significance of the threat should be evaluated and, if the threat is other than clearly insignificant, safeguards should be considered and applied as necessary to reduce the threat to an acceptable level. Such safeguards might include:

- Removing the individual from the assurance team;



- Where possible, structuring the responsibilities of the assurance team so that the professional does not deal with matters that are within the responsibility of the close family member; or
- Policies and procedures to empower staff to communicate to senior levels within the firm any issue of independence and objectivity that concerns them.

290.138 In addition, self-interest, familiarity or intimidation threats may be created when a person who is other than an immediate or close family member of a member of the assurance team has a close relationship with the member of the assurance team and is a director, an officer or an employee of the assurance client in a position to exert direct and significant influence over the subject matter information of the assurance engagement. Therefore, members of the assurance team are responsible for identifying any such persons and for consulting in accordance with firm procedures. The evaluation of the significance of any threat created and the safeguards appropriate to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level will include considering matters such as the closeness of the relationship and the role of the individual within the assurance client.

290.139 Consideration should be given to whether self-interest, familiarity or intimidation threats may be created by a personal or family relationship between a partner or employee of the firm who is not a member of the assurance team and a director, an officer or an employee of the assurance client in a position to exert direct and significant influence over the subject matter information of the assurance engagement. Therefore partners and employees of the firm are responsible for identifying any such relationships and for consulting in accordance with firm procedures. The evaluation of the significance of any threat created and the safeguards appropriate to eliminate the threat or reduce it to an acceptable level will include considering matters such as the closeness of the relationship, the interaction of the firm professional with the assurance team, the position held within the firm, and the role of the individual within the assurance client.

## Definitions - extracts

In this Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants the following expressions have the following meanings assigned to them:

Assurance client	The <del>party</del> -responsible <u>party that is the person (or persons) who:</u> <u>(a) In a direct reporting engagement is responsible for the subject matter; or</u> <u>(b) In an assertion-based engagement is responsible for the subject matter information and may be responsible for the subject matter.</u>
------------------	--

(For an assurance client that is a financial statement audit client see the definition of financial statement audit client.)

Assurance engagement	An engagement in which a professional accountant in public practice expresses a conclusion designed to enhance the degree of confidence of the intended users other than the responsible party about the outcome of the evaluation or measurement of a subject matter against criteria.
----------------------	---

(For guidance on assurance engagements see the International Framework for Assurance Engagements issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board which describes the elements and objectives of an assurance engagement and identifies engagements to which International Standards on Auditing (ISAs), International Standards on Review Engagements (ISREs) and International Standards on Assurance Engagements (ISAEs) apply.)

Assurance team	<p>(a) All members of the engagement team for the assurance engagement;</p> <p>(b) All others within a firm who can directly influence the outcome of the assurance engagement, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) those who recommend the compensation of, or who provide direct supervisory, management or other oversight of the assurance engagement partner in connection with the performance of the assurance engagement. For the purposes of a financial statement audit engagement this includes those at all successively senior levels above the engagement partner through the firm's chief executive;</li><li>(ii) those who provide consultation regarding technical or industry specific issues, transactions or events for the assurance engagement; and</li><li>(iii) those who provide quality control for the assurance engagement, including those who perform the engagement quality control review for the assurance engagement; and</li></ul>
----------------	--

- (c) For the purposes of a financial statement audit client, all those within a network firm who can directly influence the outcome of the financial statement audit engagement.

Clearly insignificant	A matter that is deemed to be both trivial and inconsequential.
Engagement team	All personnel performing an engagement, including any experts contracted by the firm in connection with that engagement.
Financial statements	The balance sheets, income statements or profit and loss accounts, statements of changes in financial position (which may be presented in a variety of ways, for example, as a statement of cash flows or a statement of fund flows), notes and other statements and explanatory material which are identified as being part of the financial statements.
Financial statement audit client	An entity in respect of which a firm conducts a financial statement audit engagement. When the client is a listed entity, financial statement audit client will always include its related entities.
Financial statement audit engagement	A reasonable assurance engagement in which a professional accountant in public practice expresses an opinion whether financial statements are prepared in all material respects in accordance with an identified financial reporting framework, such as an engagement conducted in accordance with International Standards on Auditing. This includes a Statutory Audit, which is a financial statement audit required by legislation or other regulation.
Independence	<p>Independence is:</p> <p>(a) Independence of mind – the states of mind that permits the provision of an opinion without being affected by influences that compromise professional judgment, allowing an individual to act with integrity, and exercise objectivity and professional judgment</p> <p>(b) Independence in appearance – the avoidance of facts and circumstances that are so significant a reasonable and informed third party, having knowledge of all relevant information, including any safeguards applied, would reasonably conclude a firm's, or a member of the assurance team's, integrity, objectivity or professional skepticism had been compromised.</p>