



ISSUES REGISTER FOR APESB PROFESSIONAL PRONOUNCEMENTS

Current as at January 2015

Note to Stakeholders

The following is a summary of issues raised by stakeholders in relation to APESB pronouncements. Issues have been compiled by standard or guidance note, with the intended response and current status. Members of the professional accounting bodies, firms, professional bodies and other stakeholders are encouraged to report to APESB via the APESB website (www.apesb.org.au then **Standards & Guidance/Issues Register**) any new issues that needs to be addressed by APESB when a pronouncement is next updated or reviewed.

**APES 110 : Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|---|---|--|
| 110.1 | Oct-12 | During a meeting held with the NSW Audit Office, the issue of what is a Public Interest Entity (PIE) in the public sector was identified as an issue for further consideration. | This issue was considered during the February 2013 annual review process. This issue has also been noted at the January 2014 and January 2015 annual reviews. | Feb 2013 - The Board agreed to explore this matter and evaluate whether further guidance is required. Oct 2014 - Discussions were held in 2013 with representatives of the New South Wales Audit Office. The Board has communicated directly with the ACAG Chairman in April 2014 and offered APESB's assistance to define PIE for the public sector and currently waiting on a response from ACAG. |
| 110.2 | Dec-14 | The Technical Staff review identified that the Definitions section in APES 110 require revision. It is recommended that the defined term "Professional Bodies" be added to APES 110 in accordance with the legal advice received from Gadens. | Issue identified is addressed in the annual review process in Jan 2015. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the August 2015 Board meeting. |

**APES 205 : Conformity with Accounting Standards
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|--|--|---|
| 205.1 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 205 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms "Assurance Engagement", "Audit Engagement", "Client", "Financial Statements", "Firm", "Member in Public Practice", "Professional Bodies", "Professional Services" and "Review Engagement" be revised and the defined term "Professional Activity" be added to APES 205.</p> | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 205. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |

**APES 210 : Conformity with Auditing and Assurance Standards
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|---|---|--|
| 210.1 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 210 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms "Assurance Engagement", "Client", "Member in Public Practice", "Professional Services" and "Professional Standards" be revised and the defined terms "Professional Activity" and "Professional Bodies" be added to APES 210.</p> | <p>Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review and carried forward to the 2015 Annual Review of APES 210.</p> | <p>APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting.</p> |

**APES 215 : Forensic Accounting Services
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-------|--------|--|--|--|
| 215.1 | Apr-14 | <p>A stakeholder requested clarification in respect of the requirements in paragraph 5.6 (c).</p> <p>The stakeholder was not certain whether paragraph 5.6 (c) means that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If he concludes that none of his opinions, findings or conclusions were not wholly or substantially based on his specialised knowledge derived from training, study or experience, that he was required to make a positive statement; or • If it is only where he concludes that at least one of his opinions, findings or conclusions is not based wholly or substantially on his specialised knowledge, then he was required to make a specific statement. <p>Another stakeholder has queried why there is no longer a mandatory requirement in paragraph 5.6 to state the Member's training, study or experience, and whether it was an omission with the revised APES 215 in December 2013. The stakeholder noted that this requirement was in the 2008 version of APES 215, but not in the revised 2013 version. The stakeholder states that Courts will generally require this, in order to admit evidence and to give weight to an expert's evidence.</p> | <p>Issue identified was addressed at the APES 215 annual review process in October 2014.</p> | <p>During the development phase of APES 215, the taskforce believed that it is important to emphasise the limitations of a Member's expertise and to clearly disclose in the Member's report when a matter is not within a Member's expertise. It should also be noted that Court guidelines will mandate the need for an Expert Witness to state their qualifications and experience.</p> <p>Accordingly, the original paragraph 5.6 (c) which required a Member to state relevant qualifications and experience was amended to the existing paragraph to require a Member to disclose when a matter addressed in the Member's report was not within the Member's expertise.</p> <p>At the APES 215 2014 Annual Review it was recommended that paragraph 5.6 (c) in the APES 215 (2008) be re-instated and that the existing paragraph in 5.6 (c) in APES 215 (2013) be renamed as paragraph 5.6 (d) in the following manner:</p> |

**APES 215 : Forensic Accounting Services
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-------|--------|---|---|--|
| | | | | <p>5.6 Subject to any legal requirements or restrictions, a Member providing an Expert Witness Service shall clearly communicate in any Report:</p> <p>....</p> <p><u>(c) a summary of the Member's training, study and experience that are relevant to the matters on which the Member is providing expert evidence;</u></p> <p><u>(d) the extent to which any of the opinions, findings or conclusions of the Member are not based wholly or substantially on the Member's specialised knowledge derived from training, study or experience;</u></p> <p>....</p> |
| 215.2 | Apr-14 | A stakeholder identified an instance where the phrase "training, study and experience" is used in the Standard instead of "training, study <u>or</u> experience". | Agree with the stakeholder's observation. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the August 2015 Board meeting. |

**APES 215 : Forensic Accounting Services
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-------|--------|---|--|--|
| 215.3 | Sep-14 | The Technical Staff review identified editorial amendments to the definition of "Contingent Fee", "Engagement", "Independence", "Member in Public Practice" and "Professional Standards". | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 215. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the August 2015 Board meeting. |
| 215.4 | Sep-14 | A stakeholder suggested that a general review of all of the definitions in APES 215 would be helpful, in particular a review of the definitions of 'Expert Witness' and 'Other Evidence' together with the mandatory requirements of paragraph 5.6. It was suggested this review could be undertaken by a highly experienced barrister or retired judge, to give credibility to the definitions from a legal perspective. | Agree with the stakeholder's comments. | The Board has noted the suggestions made by the stakeholder and will consider performing a legal review of these terms. |

**APES 220 : Taxation Services
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|---|---|--|
| 220.1 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 220 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms “Client”, “Member in Public Practice” and “Professional Services” be revised and the defined terms “Professional Activity” and “Professional Bodies” be added to the Standard.</p> | <p>Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review and carried forward to the 2015 Annual Review of APES 220.</p> | <p>APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting.</p> |
| 220.2 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical Staff review identified minor editorial amendment to paragraph 5.4.</p> | <p>Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review and carried forward to the 2015 Annual Review of APES 220.</p> | <p>APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting.</p> |

**APES 225 : Valuation Services
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-------|--------|---|--|---|
| 225.1 | Nov-12 | A stakeholder raised minor editorial comments in relation to the following sections of the standard: Definitions – 'valuation services' should be italic; Para 3.2 – second line 'and' should not be italic; and Para 5.3 – last line 'Quality Control for Firms' should be italic. | Agree with the stakeholder's comments. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |
| 225.2 | Sep-13 | A taskforce member has raised a comment that the body of the standard should be amended by inserting a new grey-type paragraph after paragraph 4.5 to make reference to representation letters in a manner similar to paragraph 7.2 of APES GN 20 Exposure Draft. It should be added that where the Member bases their report on a representation, they are making an assumption that the matter represented is true (unless the member has independently gathered sufficient and appropriate evidence to satisfy themselves about the matter represented). | Agree with the stakeholder's comments. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |
| 225.3 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 225 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms "Client", "Contingent Fee", "Independence", "Member", "Member in Public Practice" and "Professional Services" be revised and the defined terms "Professional Activity" and "Professional Bodies" be added to APES 225.</p> | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 225. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |

**APES 230 : Financial Planning Services
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-------|--------|--|--|---|
| 230.1 | Jan-14 | <p>Members in Public Practice who provide credit advice are regulated under the National Consumer Credit Act and not the Corporations Act. APES 230 requires Members to act in the best interests of their Client, which is defined in the standard as Division 2 of Part 7.7A of the Corporations Act.</p> <p>While Members in Public Practice providing credit advice can comply with the general obligation to act in their Client's best interest, they cannot comply with the remaining obligations defined in the Division 2. However, ASIC has stated in RG 175.239 that satisfying the safe harbor of Section 961B in Division 2 is not the only way to demonstrate an individual is acting in their Client's best interest.</p> | <p>This matter has been raised in the 2014 Six Month Review of APES 230.</p> | <p><u>May 2014 Update</u></p> <p>The Board discussed the best interest obligations of the Client in APES 230 and its link to the <i>Corporations Act 2001</i>. Key stakeholders requested that the Board consider developing a principles-based definition of Best Interest duty which is not linked to the Corporations Act. The Board agreed to consider this matter and requested that the key stakeholders submit proposals for the Board's consideration.</p> <p><u>August 2014 Update</u></p> <p>The Board has considered the proposals submitted by stakeholders in respect of the Best Interest Duty definition. The Board determined not to make any amendments to APES 230 and to continue to monitor developments in the regulatory landscape (i.e. FoFA) that impact on APES 230.</p> |
| 230.2 | Apr-14 | <p>The Technical Staff review identified editorial amendments to the definition of "Member in Public Practice".</p> | <p>Required change has been raised in the 2014 Six Month Review of APES 230.</p> | <p>To be considered at the Annual Review process in 2015.</p> |

**APES 305 : Terms of Engagement
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|---|---|--|
| 305.1 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 305 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms "Client", "Member in Public Practice", "Professional Services" and "Professional Standards" be revised and the defined terms "Professional Activity" and "Professional Bodies" be added to the Standard.</p> | <p>Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review and carried forward to the 2015 Annual Review of APES 305.</p> | <p>APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting.</p> |

**APES 310 : Dealing with Client Monies
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|---|--|--|
| 310.1 | Nov-13 | A stakeholder noted the difficulties members have to open a trust account with the term 'trust account' in the title with their banks (as required by paragraph 5.1). | Issue identified was addressed in the annual review process in May 2014. | <p>The Australian Bankers Association (ABA) was consulted during the development process of APES 310 and the issues they raised and their recommendations have been incorporated in to APES 310.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there are some challenges that members need to overcome in opening these accounts.</p> <p>The requirement to open a Trust Account to hold monies received in trust which exists in paragraph 5.1 of APES 310 also existed in the previous APS 10 which was originally issued in 1997.</p> <p>Technical Staff are in the process of consulting with the ABA to explore ways of making this process smoother for Members in Public Practice.</p> |

**APES 310 : Dealing with Client Monies
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-------|--------|---|---|--|
| 310.2 | Dec-13 | <p>A stakeholder raised concern on the applicability of paragraph 6.9 that requires a member to disburse client monies within 3 business days of receipt of instructions in respect of the disbursement or in accordance with the terms of the engagement.</p> <p>Receipt of instructions is typically obtained at the time of agreeing the terms of engagement. For example, at the time of being engaged to prepare a tax return, the tax agent and the client will typically agree that a tax refund will be banked to the agent's trust account, a fee will be deducted and the balance will be transferred to the client. This makes the receipt of instructions a useless trigger for the 3 business days period, as it will usually have occurred more than 3 business days before the funds are deposited in the trust account.</p> <p>For a disbursement of funds to occur, there are a number of requirements that need to be in place. These requirements would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - receipt of the funds; - receipt of information that permits identification of the funds, to allow matching with the relevant client and confirmation that the correct amount has been received; and - receipt of instructions from the client in relation to the disbursement. <p>Although a firm might obtain the client's instructions ahead of the receipt of funds, there is often a delay in obtaining information from the ATO to permit the identification and confirmation of amounts received.</p> <p>As such, the stakeholder was of the view that the "3 business days" should be calculated from the point at which all of the information is available to the firm to make a disbursement. Paragraph 6.9 could therefore be reworded to remove the receipt of instructions as the sole trigger for the 3 business day period.</p> | <p>Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 310.</p> | <p>Issue is being considered as part of the current project to review APES 310.</p> <p>At the APES 310 2014 Annual Review it was recommended that the existing paragraph 6.10 be redrafted and a new paragraph 6.11 be considered for inclusion in the following manner:</p> <p><u>6.10 When a Member in Public Practice has received funds and all of the required information to make a disbursement, the Member shall disburse Client Monies within 3 Business Days or in accordance with the Terms of Engagement.</u></p> <p><u>6.11 The required information referred to in paragraph 6.10 may include, but are not limited to, receipt of information that permits identification of the funds to a particular Client and receipt of instructions from the Client in relation to the disbursement.</u></p> |

**APES 310 : Dealing with Client Monies
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-------|--------|--|---|---|
| 310.3 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 310 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms "Auditing and Assurance Standards", "Client", "Member in Public Practice", "Professional Services" and "Terms of Engagement" be revised and defined terms "Audit Engagement", "Engagement", and "Professional Activity" be added to APES 310.</p> | <p>Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 310.</p> | <p>APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the August 2015 Board meeting.</p> |
| 310.4 | May-14 | <p>The requirements of paragraph 7.7(d) state that a Member in Public Practice shall provide a statement detailing the application of Client Monies and interest earned in respect of all transactions, at least annually (unless previously communicated during the year). Paragraph 7.8(c) specifies that this must be done within 30 Business Days of the applicable year end.</p> <p>A stakeholder advised that his Firm provides Clients with quarterly reports that include bank account statements throughout the year. At year end however, the 30 Business Day deadline is difficult to achieve as the quarterly reporting packages that are sent to Clients are very comprehensive. This makes it challenging to finalise within the 30 Business Day timeframe. The result is that the for first 3 quarters of the year, the Firm is in compliance with APES 310 and then for the final quarter's transactions, there is a potential breach of APES 310.</p> | <p>The issue raised by the stakeholder is noted.</p> | <p>Issue to be addressed as part of the current project to review APES 310.</p> |
| 310.5 | May-14 | <p>An internal review of APES 310 found that the term 'Engagement' is used in its capitalised form in Paragraph 1.1. However, the term Engagement is not defined in the Standard.</p> | <p>Issue identified to be addressed in the annual review process in May 2015.</p> | <p>APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the August 2015 Board meeting.</p> |
| 310.6 | Oct-14 | <p>A stakeholder noted that the term "dealing" is an antiquated term that requires revision.</p> | <p>The issue raised by the stakeholder is noted.</p> | <p>Issue to be addressed as part of the current project to review APES 310.</p> |

**APES 310 : Dealing with Client Monies
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|--------|--------|---|---|---|
| 310.7 | Oct-14 | <p>Professional Body quality review processes have identified that a number of Members in Public Practice providing bookkeeping services do not realise that APES 310 must be complied with when they transact on Client Bank Accounts.</p> <p>Further the cost impost to Members for the dealing with Client Monies audit may be disproportionate to the fees generated from the services provided. The audit requirements associated with APES 310 introduce significant costs to a sole practitioner who is providing bookkeeping services in a part-time capacity.</p> <p>Members have queried whether in instances where a financial audit is performed, this audit may be extended to cover the requirements of APES 310.</p> | The issue raised by the stakeholder is noted. | Issue to be addressed as part of the current project to review APES 310. |
| 310.8 | Oct-14 | A Professional Body quality review auditor noted that it is unclear whether all Members in Public Practice understand the nature of APES 310 and when it applies to them. It was suggested that additional guidance throughout APES 310 may be beneficial in particular to Members operating in smaller practices who are not aware of the standard or that it is applicable to their circumstances. | The issue raised by the stakeholder is noted. | Issue to be addressed as part of the current project to review APES 310. |
| 310.9 | Oct-14 | A stakeholder noted that where a Member in Public Practice transacts on a Client Bank Account with the Client and the Client's authorisation is required for the transaction to occur (compared to where the Member is authorised to transact on an account in isolation), consideration needs to be given as to whether these circumstances should fall within the scope of APES 310. | The issue raised by the stakeholder is noted. | Issue to be addressed as part of the current project to review APES 310. |
| 310.10 | Oct-14 | A stakeholder noted that a number of financial institutions do not specify in their terms and conditions that there is no right of setoff when Trust Accounts are opened. This is contrast to the requirements of APES 310. Paragraph 5.4(a) of the standard requires that the terms and conditions of the Trust Account specify there is no right of set-off. | The issue raised by the stakeholder is noted. | This matter is to be discussed with the Australian Bankers Association (ABA) in early 2015. |
| 310.11 | Oct-14 | A stakeholder raised an issue in respect of unclaimed monies. APES 310 does not currently include any guidance in respect of unclaimed monies when the amount is below the threshold for unclaimed monies legislative requirements. | The issue raised by the stakeholder is noted. | Issue to be addressed as part of the current project to review APES 310. |

**APES 310 : Dealing with Client Monies
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|--|---|---|
| 310.12 | Oct-14 | <p>Professional Body quality review processes identified that some Members in Public Practice who are auditors of APES 310 are seeking clarity in respect of audit requirements. These Members consider the audit requirements in APES 310 to be too general and have experienced difficulties with understanding the specific steps required to perform the audit. It was suggested that greater clarity may be achieved by way of an appendix to the standard that contains guidelines in terms of audit procedures.</p> <p>Further Professional Body quality review processes have identified a number of instances where there is inadequate evidence of planning and other procedures required under the auditing standards.</p> | The issue raised by the stakeholder is noted. | The development of appropriate audit tools for Members is a matter for the Professional Bodies. The development of audit programs and guidelines is not within APESB's mandate and is a matter appropriately addressed by the Professional Bodies and/or the AUASB. |
| 310.13 | Oct-14 | <p>Professional Body quality review processes have found that Members in Public Practice have been able to obtain Clients' signatures on initial engagement letters. However, difficulties have been encountered when Members request access to documentation from the Client for the purposes of an APES 310 audit.</p> <p>Members are experiencing difficulties obtaining permission from their Client to allow for an APES 310 audit to occur. Members may potentially breach the confidentiality requirements of APES 110 by complying with APES 310.</p> <p>It was also noted that in some instances, documentation is kept at the Client's premises which introduces additional difficulties when providing auditors with access to work papers for audit testing.</p> | The issue raised by the stakeholder is noted. | Issue to be addressed as part of the current project to review APES 310. |

| APES 315 : Compilation of Financial Information Issues Register | | | | |
|--|--------|--|---|---|
| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
| 315.1 | Feb-10 | Stakeholders have raised a concern that the term "accounting expertise" in paragraph 4.1 of APES 315 and the example compilation report implies a sophisticated collection process of information and implies that it may be an experts report when it is not. Another related concern raised is that the wording of the suggested compilation report in APES 315 refers to the "use of accounting expertise" and that this phrase is in potential conflict with paragraph 8.2 of APES 315. The overall concern is that in a dispute the use of "accounting expertise" may be construed by others to mean that it is an expert's report. | This issue was considered by the Board during the annual review process in February 2010, February 2012 and May 2013. | <p>The IAASB released the International Standard on Related Services 4410 (Revised) Compilation Engagements in March 2012. The standard no longer makes reference to the use of "accounting expertise to collect, classify and summarise" rather refers to "applying a Member in Public Practice's expertise in accounting and/or financial reporting" which is considered more suitable. The approach taken in the international standard appears to alleviate concerns raised by the stakeholders.</p> <p>APESB is in the final process of revising APES 315, taking into consideration the international standard ISRS 4410 (Revised). The proposed revised APES 315 is presented at the January 2015 Board meeting.</p> |

| APES 315 : Compilation of Financial Information Issues Register | | | | |
|--|--------|---|---|--|
| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
| 315.2 | Dec-13 | The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 315 require revision. | Issue identified to be addressed in the current revision of APES 315. | APESB will incorporate the editorials as part of the revision of the existing APES 315. The proposed revised APES 315 is presented at the January 2015 Board meeting. |

**APES 320 : Quality Control for Firms
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-------|--------|--|--|---|
| 320.1 | Nov-11 | APES 320 <i>Quality Control for Firms</i> as currently written contains numerous sections that pertain to Assurance Practices only. Such practices are also governed by the auditing and assurance standard ASQC 1 with the result being an overlap with APES 320. | Re-write APES 320 to cover non-audit/assurance practices. | <p>At its November 2011 meeting the Board acknowledged the need for APES 320 to be re-written and directed technical staff to incorporate this project into the future work program. A taskforce has been assembled for this project.</p> <p><u>October 2014 Update</u> The Board noted the mid-tier and large firms' reluctance towards the revision of APES 320 and requested the APESB Technical Director to meet with the Professional Bodies SMPs Committees to gauge their interest in the project.</p> |
| 320.2 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 320 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms "Assurance Engagement", "Client", "Engagement Team", "Independence", "Key Audit Partner", "Member", "Member in Public Practice", "Network", "Network Firm", "Professional Bodies" and "Professional Services" be revised and new defined terms "External Expert", "Financial Statements", "Professional Activity" and "Those Charged with Governance" be added to APES 320.</p> | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 320. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the August 2015 Board meeting. |

**APES 325 : Risk Management
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|---|---|---|
| 325.1 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 325 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms "Member in Public Practice" and "Professional Services" be revised and the defined terms "Client", "Member", "Professional Activity" and "Professional Bodies" be added to APES 325.</p> | <p>Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 325.</p> | <p>APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the August 2015 Board meeting.</p> |

APES 330 : Insolvency Services
Issues Register

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-----|------|-------------------|----------|----------------|
| | | No current issues | | |

**APES 345 : Reporting on Prospective Financial Information Prepared in Connection with a Disclosure Document
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-------|--------|--|--|---|
| 345.1 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 345 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms “Acceptable Level”, “Assurance Engagement”, “Client”, “Engagement Team”, “Firm”, “Independence”, “Member in Public Practice”, “Professional Services”, “Professional Standards” and “Those Charged with Governance” be revised and the defined terms “AUASB”, “Professional Activity” and “Professional Bodies” be added to the Standard.</p> | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 345. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |
| 345.2 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that the reference to Section 290 Independence – Assurance Engagements of the Code in paragraph 3.6 relates to the previous Code and needs to be updated.</p> <p>The reference to the previous Code in paragraph 3.6 is to be amended to refer to Section 291 Independence – Other Assurance Engagements of the revised Code.</p> | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 345. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |
| 345.3 | Dec-13 | The Technical staff review identified a minor editorial amendment to the text of paragraph 5.2 of APES 345. | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 345. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the standard which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |

**APES 350 : Participation by Members in Public Practice in Due Diligence Committees in Connection with a Public Document
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|---|--|--|
| 350.1 | 2013 | Due to the withdrawal of AASB 1031 Materiality and AGS 1062 (which has been superseded by ASAE 3420 and ASAE 3450), Technical staff identified that APES 350 will require revisions to reflect changes to AASB/AUASB Standards. There are a significant number of references and matters directly quoted from AASB 1031 which will require assessment for their continued relevance in relation to APES 350. | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 350. | APESB will incorporate the editorials in the proposed revised APES 350 which is scheduled to be presented at the January 2015 Board meeting. |
| 350.2 | 2013 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES 350 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms "Assurance Engagement", "Client", "Contingent Fee", "Engagement Team", "Independence", "Member", "Member in Public Practice", "Professional Services", "Professional Standards" and "Those Charged with Governance" be revised and the defined terms "Professional Activity" and "Professional Bodies" be added to the Standard.</p> | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES 350. | APESB will incorporate the editorials in the proposed revised APES 350 which is scheduled to be presented at the January 2015 Board meeting. |

APES GN 20 : Scope and Extent of Work for Valuation Services
Issues Register

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|-----|------|-------------------|----------|----------------|
| | | No current issues | | |

**APES GN 21 : Valuation Engagements for Financial Reporting
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|--|---|--|
| GN21.1 | Jan-11 | Following issue of APES 225 <i>Valuation Services</i> in 2008 the Board recognised the need to consider whether further guidance notes are required to assist valuation practitioners and users. In 2011 the Board agreed that there is a need for further guidance to address the diverse situations under which Valuations are prepared. | Develop a pronouncement to address Valuation Engagements for Financial Reporting. | <p>The Board approved the project proposal at the November 2011 Board meeting. In completing the first draft of the proposed APES GN 21 <i>Valuations for Financial Reporting</i> a further need was identified to provide valuation practitioners guidance that would assist them in determining the appropriate type of valuation report to produce, based on the particular requirements of the engagement, and that this guidance should be issued ahead of the proposed APES GN 21. As a result, this project was delayed until APES GN 20 <i>Scope and Extent of Work for Valuation Services</i> is completed.</p> <p>As APES GN 20 was completed in December 2013, this project has been recommenced and is now a work in progress.</p> |

**APES GN 30 : Outsourced Services
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| GN30.1 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES GN 30 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined terms “Client”, “Member in Public Practice” and “Professional Services” be revised and a new defined term “Professional Activity” be added to APES GN 30.</p> | <p>Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review of APES APES GN 30.</p> | <p>APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the Guidance Note which is scheduled for the August 2015 Board meeting.</p> |

**APES GN 40 : Members in Business Guidance Note
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|--------|--------|--|--|--|
| GN40.1 | Nov-12 | A stakeholder raised a minor editorial comment in relation to Case Study 20 of the Guidance Note. In the Case outline, the reference to 'her' should be replaced with 'him'. | Details of the editorial amendment was raised in the six month review of the Guidance Note. The Board approved the editorial change to be made at the next revision of APES GN 40. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the Guidance Note which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |
| GN40.2 | Dec-13 | <p>The Technical staff review identified that due to amendments made to the IESBA International Code and subsequent changes to APES 110, the Definitions section in APES GN 40 require revision.</p> <p>It is recommended that the defined term “Professional Services” be removed and the definitions of “Acceptable Level”, “Member” "Professional Bodies" and “Those Charged with Governance” be revised. A new defined term “Professional Activity” should also be added to the Guidance Note.</p> | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review and carried forward to the 2015 Annual Review of APES GN 40. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the Guidance Note which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |
| GN40.3 | Dec-13 | The Technical staff review identified that due to the amended definition of 'Professional Services' in the Code, the term 'Professional Services' is no longer relevant to Members in Business. As a result, the removal of references to the term “Professional Services” in APES GN 40 is necessary. | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review and carried forward to the 2015 Annual Review of APES GN 40. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the Guidance Note which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |

**APES GN 40 : Members in Business Guidance Note
Issues Register**

| No. | Date | Issue | Response | Current Status |
|------------|-------------|--|--|--|
| GN40.4 | Dec-13 | The Technical staff review identified that due to the amended descriptors in sections 310 and 340 of the Code, editorial changes to paragraphs 6.3, 7.2 and 10.1 of APES GN 40 are required. | Required changes have been raised in the 2014 Annual Review and carried forward to the 2015 Annual Review of APES GN 40. | APESB will incorporate the editorials at the next revision of the Guidance Note which is scheduled for the May 2015 Board meeting. |