

Ref.: 1890/DKE/IAI/V/2024

Jakarta, May 8, 2024

Ken Siong Program and Senior Director International Ethics Standards Boards for Accountants 529 Fifth Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor New York, NY 10017 U.S.A

**Ref:** Comments on IESBA "Exposure Draft Proposed International Ethics Standards for Sustainability Assurance (including International Independence Standards) (IESSA) and Other Revisions to the Code Relating to Sustainability Assurance and Reporting

We hereby respond to the Exposure Draft: Proposed International Ethics Standards for Sustainable Assurance including International Independence Standards and Other Revisions to the Code Relating to Sustainability Assurance and Reporting.

In general, we agree with the proposal in the exposure draft, emphasizing the definition of 'sustainability information' as attached.

Should you have further concerns regarding our responses, please do not hesitate to contact us at <u>iai-info@iaiglobal.or.id</u>

Yours sincerely,



#### <u>Djonieri</u>

Chairman The Indonesian Ethics Standards Board The Institute of Indonesia Chartered Accountants



Appendix 1/1 Ref: 1890/DKE/IAI/V/2024

Comments on IESBA "Exposure Draft Proposed International Ethics Standards for Sustainability Assurance (including International Independence Standards) (IESSA) and Other Revisions to the Code Relating to Sustainability Assurance and Reporting

|      | QUESTION  | COMMENT  |
|------|---|--|
| Mai  | n Objectives of the IESSA   |  |
| 1.   | Do you agree that the proposals in Chapter 1<br>of the ED are:<br>(a) Equivalent to the ethics and  | Yes  |
|      | <ul> <li>independence standards for audit<br/>engagements in the extant Code? [See<br/>paragraphs 19 and 20 of this document]</li> <li>(b) Profession-agnostic and framework-</li> </ul>  |  |
|      | neutral? [See paragraphs 21 and 22 of this document]  |  |
| 2.   | Do you agree that the proposals in Chapter 1<br>of the ED are responsive to the public interest,<br>considering the Public Interest Framework's<br>qualitative characteristics? [See paragraph 23<br>of this document]  | Yes  |
| Defi | nition of Sustainability Information  |  |
| 3.   | Do you support the definition of<br>"sustainability information" in Chapter 2 of<br>the ED? [See paragraphs 24 to 26 of this<br>document]   | Yes, with a focus on environmental aspects<br>so that it is in line with the sustainability<br>standards issued by the ISSB. |
| Scor | be of Proposed IESSA in Part 5  |  |
| 4.   | The IESBA is proposing that the ethics<br>standards in the new Part 5 (Chapter 1 of the<br>ED) cover not only all sustainability<br>assurance engagements provided to<br>sustainability assurance clients but also all<br>other services provided to the same<br>sustainability assurance clients. Do you agree<br>with the proposed scope for the ethics<br>standards in Part 5? [See paragraphs 30 to 36<br>of this document] | Yes  |
| 5.   | The IESBA is proposing that the International<br>Independence Standards in Part 5 apply to<br>sustainability assurance engagements that<br>have the same level of public interest as audits<br>of financial statements. Do you agree with the<br>proposed criteria for such engagements in<br>paragraph 5400.3a? [See paragraphs 38 to 43<br>of this document]  | Yes  |



| Stru | icture of Part 5  |     |
|------|---|-----|
| 6.   | Do you support including Section 5270 in<br>Chapter 1 of the ED? [See paragraphs 46 to  | Yes |
|      | 48 of this document]  |     |
| NO   | CLAR  |     |
| 7.   | Do you support the provisions added in extant<br>Section 360 (paragraphs R360.18a to 360.18a<br>A2 in Chapter 3 of the ED) and in Section<br>5360 (paragraphs R5360.18a to 5360.18a A2<br>in Chapter 1 of the ED) for the auditor and the<br>sustainability assurance practitioner to<br>consider communicating (actual or suspected)<br>NOCLAR to each other? [See paragraphs 56 | Yes |
|      | to 67 of this document]   |     |
| 8.   | Do you support expanding the scope of the<br>extant requirement for PAIBs? (See<br>paragraphs R260.15 and 260.15 A1 in<br>Chapter 3 of the ED) [See paragraph 68 of this<br>document]   | Yes |
| Dete | ermination of PIEs  |     |
| 9.   | For sustainability assurance engagements<br>addressed by Part 5, do you agree with the<br>proposal to use the determination of a PIE for<br>purposes of the audit of the entity's financial<br>statements? [See paragraphs 80 to 85 of this<br>document]  | Yes |
| Gro  | up Sustainability Assurance Engagements   |     |
| 010  | ap sustainasing assurance ingasements   |     |



| 10    | The   | IECD               | A is more asing that the Intermedianal | Vac |
|-------|-------|--------------------|--|-----|
| 10.   |       |                    | A is proposing that the International  | Yes |
|       | -     | -                  | nce Standards in Part 5 specifically   |     |
|       |       |                    | he independence considerations         |     |
|       |       |                    | to group sustainability assurance      |     |
|       | -     | -                  | nts. [See paragraphs 86 to 92 of this  |     |
|       |       | ment               |  |     |
|       | (a)   | Do                 | you support the IIS in Part 5          |     |
|       |       | speci              | ifically addressing group              |     |
|       |       | susta              | inability assurance engagements?       |     |
|       |       | Cons               | sidering how practice might            |     |
|       |       | deve               | lop with respect to group              |     |
|       |       | susta              | inability assurance engagements,       |     |
|       |       |                    | practical issues or challenges do      |     |
|       |       |                    | anticipate regarding the application   |     |
|       |       | •                  | oposed Section 5405?                   |     |
|       | (b)   | -                  | you support addressing group           |     |
|       | X-)   | •                  | inability assurance engagements in     |     |
|       |       |                    | IS in Part 5:                          |     |
|       |       | (i)                | Do you support that the                |     |
|       |       | (1)                | independence provisions                |     |
|       |       |                    | applicable to group sustainability     |     |
|       |       |                    | assurance engagements be at the        |     |
|       |       |                    | same level, and achieve the same       |     |
|       |       |                    | objectives, as those applicable to a   |     |
|       |       |                    | group audit engagement (see            |     |
|       |       |                    | Section 5405)?                         |     |
|       |       | (::)               | ,                                      |     |
|       |       | (ii)               | Do you agree with the proposed         |     |
|       |       |                    | requirements regarding                 |     |
|       |       |                    | communication between the              |     |
|       |       |                    | group sustainability assurance         |     |
|       |       |                    | firm and component sustainability      |     |
|       |       |                    | assurance firms regarding the          |     |
|       |       |                    | relevant ethics, including             |     |
|       |       |                    | independence, provisions               |     |
|       |       |                    | applicable to the group                |     |
|       |       |                    | sustainability assurance               |     |
|       |       |                    | engagement? [See paragraph 88          |     |
|       |       |                    | of this document]                      |     |
|       |       | (iii)              | Do you agree with the proposed         |     |
|       |       |                    | defined terms in the context of        |     |
|       |       |                    | group sustainability assurance         |     |
|       |       |                    | engagements (for example,              |     |
|       |       |                    | "group sustainability assurance        |     |
|       |       |                    | engagement" and "component")?          |     |
| Using | g the | Work               | of Another Practitioner                |     |
| 11.   | Secti | ion $\overline{5}$ | 406 addresses the independence         | Yes |
|       | cons  | iderat             | ions applicable when the               |     |
|       | susta | inabi              | lity assurance practitioner plans to   |     |
|       |       |                    | ork of another practitioner who is     |     |



|               | not under the former's direction, supervision<br>and review but who carries out assurance<br>work at a sustainability assurance client. Do<br>you agree with the proposed independence<br>provisions set out in Section 5406? [See<br>paragraphs 93 to 101 of this document]   |     |
|---------------|--|-----|
| Assu<br>Enti  | rance at, or With Respect to, a Value Chain<br>ty  |     |
| 12.           | Do you support the proposed definition of<br>"value chain" in the context of sustainability<br>assurance engagements? [See paragraphs 102<br>and 103 of this document]   | Yes |
| 13.           | Do you support the provisions in Section 5407<br>addressing the independence considerations<br>when assurance work is performed at, or with<br>respect to, a value chain entity? [See<br>paragraphs 104 to 110 of this document]   | Yes |
| 14.           | <ul> <li>Where a firm uses the work of a sustainability assurance practitioner who performs the assurance work at a value chain entity but retains sole responsibility for the assurance report on the sustainability information of the sustainability assurance client:</li> <li>(a) Do you agree that certain interests, relationships or circumstances between the firm, a network firm or a member of the sustainability assurance team and a value chain entity might create threats to the firm's independence?</li> <li>(b) If yes, do you support the approach and guidance proposed for identifying, evaluating, and addressing the threats that might be created by interests, relationships or circumstances with a value chain entity in Section 5700? What other guidance, if any, might Part 5 provide? [See paragraphs 111 to 114 of this document]</li> </ul> | Yes |
| Prov<br>Clier | riding NAS to Sustainability Assurance   |     |
| 15.           | The International Independence Standards in<br>Part 5 set out requirements and application<br>material addressing the provision of NAS by<br>a sustainability assurance practitioner to a  | Yes |



|      |   | <b>_</b>                                  |
|------|---|---|
|      | sustainability assurance client. Do you agree   |   |
|      | with the provisions in Section 5600 (for  |   |
|      | example, the "self-review threat prohibition,"  |   |
|      | determination of materiality as a factor, and   |   |
|      | communication with TCWG)? [See  |   |
|      | paragraphs 115 and 116 of this document]  |   |
| 16.  | Subsections 5601 to 5610 address specific   |   |
|      | types of NAS. [See paragraphs 118 to 120 of   |   |
|      | this document]  |   |
|      | (a) Do you agree with the coverage of such  | Yes                                       |
|      | services and the provisions in the  |   |
|      | Subsections?  |   |
|      | (b) Are there any other NAS that Part 5   | No  |
|      | should specifically address in the  |   |
|      | context of sustainability assurance   |   |
|      | engagements?  |   |
| Indo | 6.6   |   |
|      | pendence Matters Arising When a Firm<br>orms Both Audit and Sustainability              |   |
|      |   |   |
|      | rance Engagements for the Same Client   | X7  |
| 17.  | Do you agree with, or have other views  | Yes                                       |
|      | regarding, the proposed approach in Part 5 to   |   |
|      | address the independence issues that could  |   |
|      | arise when the sustainability assurance   |   |
|      | practitioner also audits the client's financial   |   |
|      | statements (with special regard to the  |   |
|      | proportion of fees for the audit and  |   |
|      | sustainability assurance engagements, and   |   |
|      | long association with the client)? [See   |   |
|      | paragraphs 123 to 131 of this document]   |   |
| Othe | er Matters  |   |
| 18.  | Do you believe that the additional guidance   | Yes                                       |
|      | from a sustainability assurance perspective   |   |
|      | (including sustainability-specific examples of  |   |
|      | matters such as threats) in Chapter 1 of the ED   |   |
|      | is adequate and clear? If not, what suggestions   |   |
|      | for improvement do you have?  |   |
| 19.  | Are there any other matters you would like to   | No  |
|      | raise concerning the remaining proposals in   |   |
|      | Chapters 1 to 3 of the ED?  |   |
| Sust | ainability Reporting  |   |
| -    | be of Sustainability Reporting Revisions and  |   |
| _    | bonsiveness to the Public Interest  |   |
| 20.  | Do you have any views on how the IESBA  | Preparation of sustainability information |
| 20.  | could approach its new strategic work stream  | and its assurance involves professional   |
|      | ••••••  | -   |
|      | on expanding the scope of the Code to all preparers of sustainability information? [See | accountants and other professionals who   |
|      | preparers of sustainability information? [See   | must apply the same professional ethical  |
|      | paragraphs 133 to 135 of this document]   | provisions. This requires communication   |
|      |   | with the relevant regulators.             |



| 21.   | Do you agree that the proposals in Chapter 4<br>of the ED are responsive to the public interest,<br>considering the Public Interest Framework's<br>qualitative characteristics? [See paragraph<br>138 of this document]  | Yes |
|-------|--|-----|
| Prop  | osed Revisions to the Extant Code  |     |
| 22.   | <ul> <li>Do you agree that the proposed revisions to<br/>Parts 1 to 3 of the extant Code in Chapter 4 of<br/>the ED are clear and adequate from a<br/>sustainability reporting perspective,<br/>including:</li> <li>(a) Proposed revisions to Section 220? [See<br/>paragraphs 139 to 141 of this document]</li> <li>(b) Proposed examples on conduct to<br/>mislead in sustainability reporting,<br/>value chain and forward-looking<br/>information? [See paragraphs 143 to<br/>153 of this document]</li> <li>(c) Other proposed revisions? [See</li> </ul> | Yes |
| 22    | paragraph 155 of this document]  | NT- |
| 23.   | Are there any other matters you would like to<br>raise concerning the proposals in Chapter 4 of<br>the ED?   | No  |
| Effec | ctive Date   |     |
| 24.   | Do you support the IESBA's proposal to align<br>the effective date of the final provisions with<br>the effective date of ISSA 5000 on the<br>assumption that the IESBA will approve the<br>final pronouncement by December 2024?   | Yes |