Proposed Auditing Standard ASA 530
Audit Sampling (Revised and Redrafted)
(Re-issuance of ASA 530)

Issued for Comment by the **Auditing and Assurance Standards Board**

Australian Government

Auditing and Assurance Standards Board

Commenting on this Exposure Draft

Comments on this Exposure Draft should be forwarded so as to arrive by no later than 23 January 2009. Comments should be addressed to:

The Chairman
Auditing and Assurance Standards Board
PO Box 204
Collins Street West
Melbourne Victoria 8007
AUSTRALIA
E-mail: edcomments@auasb.gov.au

A copy of all non-confidential submissions will be placed on public record on the AUASB website: www.auasb.gov.au.

Obtaining a Copy of this Exposure Draft

This Exposure Draft is available on the AUASB website: www.auasb.gov.au. Alternatively, any individual or organisation may obtain one printed copy of this Exposure Draft without charge until no later than 23 January 2009 by contacting:

The Auditing and Assurance Standards Board
Level 7
600 Bourke Street
Melbourne Victoria 3000
AUSTRALIA

Phone: (03) 8080 7400
Fax: (03) 8080 7450
E-mail: enquiries@auasb.gov.au

Postal Address:
PO Box 204
Collins Street West
Melbourne Victoria 8007
AUSTRALIA

COPYRIGHT

Proposed Auditing Standard ASA 530
Audit Sampling **(Revised and Redrafted) (Re-issuance of ASA 530)**

CONTENTS

PREFACE

AUTHORITY STATEMENT

PREFACE

Reasons for Issuing ED 23/08

The Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (AUASB) is proposing to re-issue Auditing Standard ASA 530 *Audit Sampling and Other Means of Testing* pursuant to the requirements of the legislative provisions and the Strategic Direction explained below.

The AUASB is an independent statutory board of the Australian Government established under section 227A of the *Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001*, as amended (ASIC Act). Under section 336 of the *Corporations Act 2001*, the AUASB may make Australian Auditing Standards for the purposes of the corporations legislation. These Auditing Standards are legislative instruments under the *Legislative Instruments Act 2003*.

The International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB), an independent standard-setting board of the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC), has undertaken a programme to redraft, in "clarity" format, the entire suite of International Standards on Auditing (ISAs). In some cases, and in accordance with normal practice, the ISAs have been revised in addition to being redrafted. The redrafted ISAs are effective for audits of financial statements for periods beginning on or after 15 December 2009.

Under the Strategic Direction given to the AUASB by the Financial Reporting Council (FRC), the AUASB is required to have regard to any programme initiated by the IAASB for the revision and enhancement of the ISAs and to make appropriate consequential amendments to the Australian Auditing Standards. Accordingly, the AUASB has decided to revise and redraft the Australian Auditing Standards using the equivalent redrafted ISAs.

Main Proposals

This proposed Auditing Standard establishes mandatory Requirements and provides Application and Other Explanatory Material regarding the use of audit sampling in performing audit procedures.

Proposed Operative Date

It is intended that this proposed Auditing Standard will be operative for financial reporting periods commencing on or after 1 January 2010.

Main changes from existing ASA 530 *Audit Sampling and Other Means of Testing* (April 2006)

The main differences between this proposed Auditing Standard and the Auditing Standard that it supersedes, ASA 530 *Audit Sampling and Other Means of Testing* (April 2006), are included in the Tables of Differences provided as an attachment to this Exposure Draft.

Request for Comments

Comments are invited on this Exposure Draft of the proposed re-issuance of Auditing Standard ASA 530, *Audit Sampling and Other Means of Testing* by no later than 23 January 2009. The AUASB is seeking comments on the main changes from the existing ASA 530. In addition, respondents are asked to consider and respond to the following questions:

1.   Have applicable laws and regulations been appropriately addressed in the proposed standard?

2.   Are there any references to relevant laws or regulations that have been omitted?

3.   Are there any laws or regulations that may, or do, prevent or impede the application of the proposed standard, or may conflict with the proposed standard?

4.   What, if any, are the additional significant costs to/benefits for auditors and the business community arising from compliance with the main changes to the Requirements of this proposed Auditing Standard? If there are significant costs, do these outweigh the benefits to the users of audit services?

5.   Are there any other significant public interest matters that
        constituents wish to raise?

The AUASB prefers that respondents express a clear opinion on whether the
main changes to the Requirements of this proposed Auditing Standard are
supported and that this opinion be supplemented by detailed comments,
whether supportive or critical, on the above matters. The AUASB regards
both supportive and critical comments as essential to a balanced review of the
Auditing Standard.

AUASB Information Note

The IAASBs "Clarity" project is not yet complete, and accordingly there
is a possibility that the equivalent underlying ISA standard to this
Exposure Draft will include conforming amendments arising from
standards not yet approved by the IAASB. While all currently known
conforming amendments are incorporated into this Exposure Draft,
readers are advised that the AUASB may decide to make further
conforming amendments, in line with those of the IAASB.

AUTHORITY STATEMENT

The Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (AUASB) makes this Auditing Standard ASA 530 *Audit Sampling* (Revised and Redrafted) pursuant to section 227B of the *Australian Securities and Investments Commission Act 2001* and section 336 of the *Corporations Act 2001*.

This Auditing Standard is to be read in conjunction with ASA 100 *Preamble to AUASB Standards*, which sets out the intentions of the AUASB on how the Australian Auditing Standards are to be understood, interpreted and applied.

AUDITING STANDARD ASA 530

Audit Sampling (Revised and Redrafted)

Application

Aus 0.1   This Auditing Standard applies to:

        (a)   an audit of a financial report for a financial year, or an audit of a financial report for a half-year, in accordance with the *Corporations Act 2001*; and

        (b)   an audit of a financial report for any other purpose.

Aus 0.2   This Auditing Standard also applies, as appropriate, to an audit of other historical financial information.

Operative Date

Aus 0.3   This Auditing Standard is operative for financial reporting periods commencing on or after 1 January 2010.

Introduction

Scope of this ASA

1.   This Auditing Standard applies when the auditor has decided to use audit sampling in performing audit procedures. It deals with the auditor's use of statistical and non-statistical sampling when designing and selecting the audit sample, performing tests of controls and tests of details, and evaluating the results from the sample.

2.   This Auditing Standard complements ASA 500 (Revised and Redrafted),[1] which deals with the auditor's responsibility to design and perform audit procedures to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to be able to draw reasonable conclusions on which to base the audit opinion. ASA 500 (Revised and Redrafted) provides guidance on the means available to the auditor for selecting items for testing, of which audit sampling is one means.

---

[1]   See ASA 500 (Revised and Redrafted) *Audit Evidence*.

Effective Date

3.   [Deleted by the AUASB. Refer Aus 0.3]

Objective

4.   The objective of the auditor when using audit sampling is to provide a reasonable basis for the auditor to draw conclusions about the population from which the sample is selected.

Definitions

5.   For the purposes of the Australian Auditing Standards, the following terms have the meanings attributed below:

(a)   Audit sampling (sampling) means the application of audit procedures to less than 100% of items within a population of audit relevance such that all sampling units have a chance of selection in order to provide the auditor with a reasonable basis on which to draw conclusions about the entire population.

(b)   Population means the entire set of data from which a sample is selected and about which the auditor wishes to draw conclusions.

(c)   Sampling risk means the risk that the auditor's conclusion based on a sample may be different from the conclusion if the entire population were subjected to the same audit procedure. Sampling risk can lead to two types of erroneous conclusions:

(i)   In the case of a test of controls, that controls are more effective than they actually are, or in the case of a test of details, that a material misstatement does not exist when in fact it does. The auditor is primarily concerned with this type of erroneous conclusion because it affects audit effectiveness and is more likely to lead to an inappropriate audit opinion.

(ii)   In the case of a test of controls, that controls are less effective than they actually are, or in the case of a test of details, that a material misstatement exists when in fact it does not. This type of erroneous conclusion affects audit efficiency as it

would usually lead to additional work to establish that initial conclusions were incorrect.

(d)   Non-sampling risk means the risk that the auditor reaches an erroneous conclusion for any reason not related to sampling risk. (Ref: Para. A1)

(e)   Anomaly means a misstatement or deviation that is demonstrably not representative of misstatements or deviations in a population.

(f)   Sampling unit means the individual items constituting a population. (Ref: Para. A2)

(g)   Statistical sampling means an approach to sampling that has the following characteristics:

    (i)   Random selection of the sample items; and

    (ii)   The use of probability theory to evaluate sample results, including measurement of sampling risk.

A sampling approach that does not have characteristics (i) and (ii) is considered non-statistical sampling.

(h)   Stratification means the process of dividing a population into sub-populations, each of which is a group of sampling units which have similar characteristics (often monetary value).

(i)   Tolerable misstatement means a monetary amount set by the auditor in respect of which the auditor seeks to obtain an appropriate level of assurance that the monetary amount set by the auditor is not exceeded by the actual misstatement in the population. (Ref: Para. A3)

(j)   Tolerable rate of deviation means a rate of deviation from prescribed internal control procedures set by the auditor in respect of which the auditor seeks to obtain an appropriate level of assurance that the rate of deviation set by the auditor is not exceeded by the actual rate of deviation in the population.

Requirements

Sample Design, Size and Selection of Items for Testing

6.   When designing an audit sample, the auditor shall consider the purpose of the audit procedure and the characteristics of the population from which the sample will be drawn. (Ref: Para. A4-A9)

7.   The auditor shall determine a sample size sufficient to reduce sampling risk to an acceptably low level. (Ref: Para. A10-A11)

8.   The auditor shall select items for the sample in such a way that each sampling unit in the population has a chance of selection. (Ref: Para. A12-A13)

Performing Audit Procedures

9.   The auditor shall perform audit procedures, appropriate to the purpose, on each item selected.

10.   If the audit procedure is not applicable to the selected item, the auditor shall perform the procedure on a replacement item. (Ref: Para. A14)

11.   If the auditor is unable to apply the designed audit procedures, or suitable alternative procedures, to a selected item, the auditor shall treat that item as a deviation from the prescribed control, in the case of tests of controls, or a misstatement, in the case of tests of details. (Ref: Para. A15-A16)

Nature and Cause of Deviations and Misstatements

12.   The auditor shall investigate the nature and cause of any deviations or misstatements identified, and evaluate their possible effect on the purpose of the audit procedure and on other areas of the audit. (Ref: Para. A17)

13.   In the extremely rare circumstances when the auditor considers a misstatement or deviation discovered in a sample to be an anomaly, the auditor shall obtain a high degree of certainty that such misstatement or deviation is not representative of the population. The auditor shall obtain this degree of certainty by performing additional audit procedures to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence that the misstatement or deviation does not affect the remainder of the population.

Projecting Misstatements

14. For tests of details, the auditor shall project misstatements found in the sample to the population. (Ref: Para. A18-A20)

Evaluating Results of Audit Sampling

15. The auditor shall evaluate:

(a) The results of the sample; and (Ref: Para. A21-A22)

(b) Whether the use of audit sampling has provided a reasonable basis for conclusions about the population that has been tested. (Ref: Para. A23)

* * *

Application and Other Explanatory Material

Definitions

Non-Sampling Risk (Ref: Para. 5(d))

A1. Examples of non-sampling risk include use of inappropriate audit procedures, or misinterpretation of audit evidence and failure to recognise a misstatement or deviation.

Sampling Unit (Ref: Para. 5(f))

A2. The sampling units might be physical items (for example, cheques listed on deposit slips, credit entries on bank statements, sales invoices or debtors' balances) or monetary units.

Tolerable Misstatement (Ref: Para. 5(i))

A3. When designing a sample, the auditor determines tolerable misstatement in order to address the risk that the aggregate of individually immaterial misstatements may cause the financial report to be materially misstated and provide a margin for possible undetected misstatements. Tolerable misstatement is the application of performance materiality, as defined in ASA 320 (Revised and Redrafted),[2] to a particular sampling procedure. Tolerable misstatement may be the same amount or an amount lower than performance materiality.

Sample Design, Size and Selection of Items for Testing

Sample Design (Ref: Para. 6)

A4. Audit sampling enables the auditor to obtain and evaluate audit evidence about some characteristic of the items selected in order to form or assist in forming a conclusion concerning the population from which the sample is drawn. Audit sampling can be applied using either non-statistical or statistical sampling approaches.

A5. When designing an audit sample, the auditor's consideration includes the specific purpose to be achieved and the combination of audit procedures that is likely to best achieve that purpose. Consideration of the nature of the audit evidence sought and possible deviation or misstatement conditions or other characteristics relating to that audit evidence will assist the auditor in defining what

---

[2] See ASA 320 (Revised and Redrafted) *Materiality in Planning and Performing an Audit* paragraph 9.

constitutes a deviation or misstatement and what population to use for sampling. In fulfilling the requirement of paragraph 8 of ASA 500 (Revised and Redrafted), when performing audit sampling, the auditor performs audit procedures to obtain evidence that the population from which the audit sample is drawn is complete.

A6.   The auditor's consideration of the purpose of the audit procedure, as required by paragraph 6, includes a clear understanding of what constitutes a deviation or misstatement so that all, and only, those conditions that are relevant to the purpose of the audit procedure are included in the evaluation of deviations or projection of misstatements. For example, in a test of details relating to the existence of accounts receivable, such as confirmation, payments made by the customer before the confirmation date but received shortly after that date by the client, are not considered a misstatement. Also, a misposting between customer accounts does not affect the total accounts receivable balance. Therefore, it may not be appropriate to consider this a misstatement in evaluating the sample results of this particular audit procedure, even though it may have an important effect on other areas of the audit, such as the assessment of the risk of fraud or the adequacy of the allowance for doubtful accounts.

A7.   In considering the characteristics of a population, for tests of controls, the auditor makes an assessment of the expected rate of deviation based on the auditor's understanding of the relevant controls or on the examination of a small number of items from the population. This assessment is made in order to design an audit sample and to determine sample size. For example, if the expected rate of deviation is unacceptably high, the auditor will ordinarily decide not to perform tests of controls. Similarly, for tests of details, the auditor makes an assessment of the expected misstatement in the population. If the expected misstatement is high, 100% examination or use of a large sample size may be appropriate when performing tests of details.

A8.   In considering the characteristics of the population from which the sample will be drawn, the auditor may determine that stratification or value-weighted selection is appropriate. Appendix 1 provides further discussion on stratification and value-weighted selection.

A9.   The decision whether to use a statistical or non-statistical sampling approach is a matter for the auditor's judgement, however, sample size is not a valid criterion to distinguish between statistical and non-statistical approaches.

Sample Size (Ref: Para. 7)

A10.   The level of sampling risk that the auditor is willing to accept affects the sample size required. The lower the risk the auditor is willing to accept, the greater the sample size will need to be.

A11.   The sample size can be determined by the application of a statistically-based formula or through the exercise of professional judgement. Appendices 2 and 3 indicate the influences that various factors typically have on the determination of sample size. When circumstances are similar, the effect on sample size of factors such as those identified in Appendices 2 and 3 will be similar regardless of whether a statistical or non-statistical approach is chosen.

Selection of Items for Testing (Ref: Para. 8)

A12.   With statistical sampling, sample items are selected in a way that each sampling unit has a known probability of being selected. With non-statistical sampling, judgement is used to select sample items. Because the purpose of sampling is to provide a reasonable basis for the auditor to draw conclusions about the population from which the sample is selected, it is important that the auditor selects a representative sample, so that bias is avoided, by choosing sample items which have characteristics typical of the population.

A13.   The principal methods of selecting samples are the use of random selection, systematic selection and haphazard selection. Each of these methods is discussed in Appendix 4.

Performing Audit Procedures (Ref: Para. 10-11)

A14.   An example of when it is necessary to perform the procedure on a replacement item is when a voided cheque is selected while testing for evidence of payment authorisation. If the auditor is satisfied that the cheque has been properly voided such that it does not constitute a deviation, an appropriately chosen replacement is examined.

A15.   An example of when the auditor is unable to apply the designed audit procedures to a selected item is when documentation relating to that item has been lost.

A16.   An example of a suitable alternative procedure might be the examination of subsequent cash receipts together with evidence of their source and the items they are intended to settle when no reply has been received in response to a positive confirmation request.

Nature and Cause of Deviations and Misstatements (Ref: Para. 12)

A17.   In analysing the deviations and misstatements identified, the auditor may observe that many have a common feature, for example, type of transaction, location, product line or period of time. In such circumstances, the auditor may decide to identify all items in the population that possess the common feature, and extend audit procedures to those items. In addition, such deviations or misstatements may be intentional, and may indicate the possibility of fraud.

Projecting Misstatements (Ref: Para. 14)

A18.   The auditor is required to project misstatements for the population to obtain a broad view of the scale of misstatement but this projection may not be sufficient to determine an amount to be recorded.

A19.   When a misstatement has been established as an anomaly, it may be excluded when projecting misstatements to the population. However, the effect of any such misstatement, if uncorrected, still needs to be considered in addition to the projection of the non-anomalous misstatements.

A20.   For tests of controls, no explicit projection of deviations is necessary since the sample deviation rate is also the projected deviation rate for the population as a whole. ASA 330 (Revised and Redrafted)[3] provides guidance when deviations from controls upon which the auditor intends to rely are detected.

Evaluating Results of Audit Sampling (Ref: Para. 15)

A21.   For tests of controls, an unexpectedly high sample deviation rate may lead to an increase in the assessed risk of material misstatement, unless further audit evidence substantiating the initial assessment is obtained. For tests of details, an unexpectedly high misstatement amount in a sample may cause the auditor to believe that a class of transactions or account balance is materially misstated, in the absence of further audit evidence that no material misstatement exists.

A22.   In the case of tests of details, the projected misstatement plus anomalous misstatement, if any, is the auditor's best estimate of misstatement in the population. When the projected misstatement plus anomalous misstatement, if any, exceeds tolerable

---

[3]   See ASA 330 (Revised and Redrafted) *The Auditor's Responses to Assessed Risks* paragraphs 17 and A41.

misstatement, the sample does not provide a reasonable basis for conclusions about the population that has been tested. The closer the projected misstatement plus anomalous misstatement is to tolerable misstatement, the more likely that actual misstatement in the population may exceed tolerable misstatement. Also, if the projected misstatement is greater than the auditor's expectations of misstatement used to determine the sample size, the auditor may conclude that there is an unacceptable sampling risk that the actual misstatement in the population exceeds the tolerable misstatement. Considering the results of other audit procedures helps the auditor to assess the risk that actual misstatement in the population exceeds tolerable misstatement, and the risk may be reduced if additional audit evidence is obtained.

A23.   If the auditor concludes that audit sampling has not provided a reasonable basis for conclusions about the population that has been tested, the auditor may:

- Request management to investigate misstatements that have been identified and the potential for further misstatements and to make any necessary adjustments; or

- Tailor the nature, timing and extent of those further audit procedures to best achieve the required assurance. For example, in the case of tests of controls, the auditor might extend the sample size, test an alternative control or modify related substantive procedures.

Conformity with International Standards on Auditing

This Auditing Standard conforms with International Standard on Auditing ISA 530 *Audit Sampling* (Redrafted), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB), an independent standard-setting board of the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC).

Paragraphs that have been added to this Auditing Standard (and do not appear in the text of the equivalent ISA) are identified with the prefix "Aus".

Compliance with this Auditing Standard enables compliance with ISA 530.

<div style="text-align: right">

Appendix 1

(Ref: Para. A8)

</div>

Stratification and Value-Weighted Selection

In considering the characteristics of the population from which the sample will be drawn, the auditor may determine that stratification or value-weighted selection is appropriate. This Appendix provides guidance to the auditor on the use of stratification and value-weighted sampling techniques.

Stratification

1. Audit efficiency may be improved if the auditor stratifies a population by dividing it into discrete sub-populations which have an identifying characteristic. The objective of stratification is to reduce the variability of items within each stratum and therefore allow sample size to be reduced without increasing sampling risk.

2. When performing tests of details, the population is often stratified by monetary value. This allows greater audit effort to be directed to the larger value items, as these items may contain the greatest potential misstatement in terms of overstatement. Similarly, a population may be stratified according to a particular characteristic that indicates a higher risk of misstatement, for example, when testing the allowance for doubtful accounts in the valuation of accounts receivable, balances may be stratified by age.

3. The results of audit procedures applied to a sample of items within a stratum can only be projected to the items that make up that stratum. To draw a conclusion on the entire population, the auditor will need to consider the risk of material misstatement in relation to whatever other strata make up the entire population. For example, 20% of the items in a population may make up 90% of the value of an account balance. The auditor may decide to examine a sample of these items. The auditor evaluates the results of this sample and reaches a conclusion on the 90% of value separately from the remaining 10% (on which a further sample or other means of gathering audit evidence will be used, or which may be considered immaterial).

4. If a class of transactions or account balance has been divided into strata, the misstatement is projected for each stratum separately. Projected misstatements for each stratum are then combined when considering the possible effect of misstatements on the total class of transactions or account balance.

Value-Weighted Selection

5.   When performing tests of details it may be efficient to identify the sampling unit as the individual monetary units that make up the population. Having selected specific monetary units from within the population, for example, the accounts receivable balance, the auditor may then examine the particular items, for example, individual balances, that contain those monetary units. One benefit of this approach to defining the sampling unit is that audit effort is directed to the larger value items because they have a greater chance of selection, and can result in smaller sample sizes. This approach may be used in conjunction with the systematic method of sample selection (described in Appendix 4) and is most efficient when selecting items using random selection.

<div align="right">

Appendix 2

(Ref: Para. A11)
</div>

Examples of Factors Influencing Sample Size for Tests of Controls

The following are factors that the auditor may consider when determining the sample size for tests of controls. These factors, which need to be considered together, assume the auditor does not modify the nature or timing of tests of controls or otherwise modify the approach to substantive procedures in response to assessed risks.

FACTOR	EFFECT ON SAMPLE SIZE	
1. An increase in the extent to which the auditor's risk assessment takes into account relevant controls	Increase	The more assurance the auditor intends to obtain from the operating effectiveness of controls, the lower the auditor's assessment of the risk of material misstatement will be, and the larger the sample size will need to be. When the auditor's assessment of the risk of material misstatement at the assertion level includes an expectation of the operating effectiveness of controls, the auditor is required to perform tests of controls. Other things being equal, the greater the reliance the auditor places on the operating effectiveness of controls in the risk assessment, the greater is the extent of the auditor's tests of controls (and therefore, the sample size is increased).
2. An increase in the tolerable rate of deviation	Decrease	The lower the tolerable rate of deviation, the larger the sample size needs to be.
3. An increase in the	Increase	The higher the expected rate of

FACTOR	EFFECT ON SAMPLE SIZE	
expected rate of deviation of the population to be tested		deviation, the larger the sample size needs to be so that the auditor is in a position to make a reasonable estimate of the actual rate of deviation. Factors relevant to the auditor's consideration of the expected rate of deviation include the auditor's understanding of the business (in particular, risk assessment procedures undertaken to obtain an understanding of internal control), changes in personnel or in internal control, the results of audit procedures applied in prior periods and the results of other audit procedures. High expected control deviation rates ordinarily warrant little, if any, reduction of the assessed risk of material misstatement.
4. An increase in the auditor's desired level of assurance that the tolerable rate of deviation is not exceeded by the actual rate of deviation in the population	Increase	The greater the level of assurance that the auditor desires that the results of the sample are in fact indicative of the actual incidence of deviation in the population, the larger the sample size needs to be.
5. An increase in the number of sampling units in the population	Negligible effect	For large populations, the actual size of the population has little, if any, effect on sample size. For small populations however, audit sampling may not be as efficient as alternative means of obtaining sufficient appropriate audit evidence.

Appendix 3

(Ref: Para. A11)

Examples of Factors Influencing Sample Size for Tests of Details

The following are factors that the auditor may consider when determining the sample size for tests of details. These factors, which need to be considered together, assume the auditor does not modify the approach to tests of controls or otherwise modify the nature or timing of substantive procedures in response to the assessed risks.

FACTOR	EFFECT ON SAMPLE SIZE	
1. An increase in the auditor's assessment of the risk of material misstatement	Increase	The higher the auditor's assessment of the risk of material misstatement, the larger the sample size needs to be. The auditor's assessment of the risk of material misstatement is affected by inherent risk and control risk. For example, if the auditor does not perform tests of controls, the auditor's risk assessment cannot be reduced for the effective operation of internal controls with respect to the particular assertion. Therefore, in order to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level, the auditor needs a low detection risk and will rely more on substantive procedures. The more audit evidence that is obtained from tests of details (that is, the lower the detection risk), the larger the sample size will need to be
2. An increase in the use of other substantive procedures	Decrease	The more the auditor is relying on other substantive procedures (tests of details or substantive analytical procedures) to reduce to an

FACTOR	EFFECT ON SAMPLE SIZE	
directed at the same assertion		acceptable level the detection risk regarding a particular population, the less assurance the auditor will require from sampling and, therefore, the smaller the sample size can be
3. An increase in the auditor's desired level of assurance that tolerable misstatement is not exceeded by actual misstatement in the population	Increase	The greater the level of assurance that the auditor requires that the results of the sample are in fact indicative of the actual amount of misstatement in the population, the larger the sample size needs to be.
4. An increase in tolerable misstatement	Decrease	The lower the tolerable misstatement, the larger the sample size needs to be
5. An increase in the amount of misstatement the auditor expects to find in the population	Increase	The greater the amount of misstatement the auditor expects to find in the population, the larger the sample size needs to be in order to make a reasonable estimate of the actual amount of misstatement in the population. Factors relevant to the auditor's consideration of the expected misstatement amount include the extent to which item values are determined subjectively, the results of risk assessment procedures, the results of tests of control, the results of audit procedures applied in prior periods, and the results of other substantive procedures

FACTOR	EFFECT ON SAMPLE SIZE	
6. Stratification of the population when appropriate	Decrease	When there is a wide range (variability) in the monetary size of items in the population, it may be useful to stratify the population. When a population can be appropriately stratified, the aggregate of the sample sizes from the strata generally will be less than the sample size that would have been required to attain a given level of sampling risk, had one sample been drawn from the whole population
7. The number of sampling units in the population	Negligible effect	For large populations, the actual size of the population has little, if any, effect on sample size. Thus, for small populations, audit sampling is often not as efficient as alternative means of obtaining sufficient appropriate audit evidence. [However, when using monetary unit sampling, an increase in the monetary value of the population increases sample size, unless this is offset by a proportional increase in materiality for the financial report as a whole (and, if applicable, materiality level or levels for particular classes of transactions, account balances or disclosures)].

<div align="right">

Appendix 4

(Ref: Para. A13)

</div>

Sample Selection Methods

There are many methods of selecting samples. The principal methods are as follows:

(a)   Random selection (applied through random number generators, for example, random number tables).

(b)   Systematic selection, in which the number of sampling units in the population is divided by the sample size to give a sampling interval, for example 50, and having determined a starting point within the first 50, each 50th sampling unit thereafter is selected. Although the starting point may be determined haphazardly, the sample is more likely to be truly random if it is determined by use of a computerised random number generator or random number tables. When using systematic selection, the auditor would need to determine that sampling units within the population are not structured in such a way that the sampling interval corresponds with a particular pattern in the population.

(c)   Monetary Unit Sampling is a type of value-weighted selection (as described in Appendix 1) in which sample size, selection and evaluation results in a conclusion in monetary amounts.

(d)   Haphazard selection, in which the auditor selects the sample without following a structured technique. Although no structured technique is used, the auditor would nonetheless avoid any conscious bias or predictability (for example, avoiding difficult to locate items, or always choosing or avoiding the first or last entries on a page) and thus attempt to ensure that all items in the population have a chance of selection. Haphazard selection is not appropriate when using statistical sampling.

(e)   Block selection involves selection of a block(s) of contiguous items from within the population. Block selection cannot ordinarily be used in audit sampling because most populations are structured such that items in a sequence can be expected to have similar characteristics to each other, but different characteristics from items elsewhere in the population. Although in some circumstances it may be an appropriate audit procedure to examine a block of items, it would rarely be an appropriate sample selection technique when the

auditor intends to draw valid inferences about the entire population based on the sample.

Tables of Differences — ASA 530 (Revised and Redrafted) and Extant ASA 530

Underlying Standard
ISA 530 *Audit Sampling* (Redrafted) is used as the underlying Auditing Standard for the purpose of re-drafting this proposed Auditing Standard. The underlying Auditing Standard will be amended for the following matters:

- Australian Laws and Regulations (including the *Corporations Act 2001*);

- Changes considered necessary because this Auditing Standard is a legislative instrument; and

- Changes considered necessary in the public interest.

Summary of Main Differences — ASA 530 (Revised and Redrafted) and Extant ASA 530
The table below details the main differences (excluding editorial amendments) between this proposed Auditing Standard and extant ASA 530.

ASA 530 (Revised and Redrafted) Requirements not in Extant ASA

Item #	ASA (Revised and Redrafted) Para. #	ASA (Revised and Redrafted) Requirements	Commentary
Objective			
1	4	The objective of the auditor when using audit sampling is to provide a reasonable basis for the auditor to draw conclusions about the population from which the sample is selected.	New Objective.
Definitions			
2	5	…(a) …(h) (i) Tolerable misstatement means a monetary amount set by the auditor in respect of which the auditor seeks to obtain an appropriate level of assurance that the monetary	Definitions included in ASA 530 (Revised and Redrafted) para 5 are equivalent to definitions in Extant ASA 530, with some differences in terminology. Equivalent in meaning to Extant ASA 530 para 7 which defines "*error*" (i.e. includes misstatements) and Extant ASA 530 para 15 which defines "*tolerable error*".

Item #	ASA (Revised and Redrafted) Para. #	ASA (Revised and Redrafted) Requirements	Commentary
		amount set by the auditor is not exceeded by the actual misstatement in the population. (Ref: Para A3)	
		(j) Tolerable rate of deviation means a rate of deviation from prescribed internal control procedures set by the auditor in respect of which the auditor seeks to obtain an appropriate level of assurance that the rate of deviation set by the auditor is not exceeded by the actual rate of deviation in the population.	Equivalent in meaning to Extant ASA 530 para 7 which defines "*error*" (i.e. includes control deviations) and Extant ASA 530 para 15 which defines "*tolerable error*".
Performing Audit Procedures			
4	10	If the audit procedure is not applicable to the selected item, the auditor shall perform the procedure on a replacement item. (Ref: Para. A14)	(1) Elevation of extant ASA Explanatory Guidance. [Extant ASA 530 para 52 first sentence – equivalent Explanatory Guidance]
	11	If the auditor is unable to apply the designed audit procedures, or suitable alternative procedures, to a selected item, the auditor shall treat that item as a deviation from the prescribed control, in the case of tests of controls, or a misstatement, in the case of tests of details. (Ref: Para. A15-A16)	(1) Elevation of extant ASA Explanatory Guidance. [Extant ASA 530 para 53 second sentence – equivalent Explanatory Guidance]
Nature and Cause of Deviations and Misstatements			
	13	In the extremely rare circumstances when the auditor considers a misstatement or deviation discovered in a sample to be an anomaly, the auditor shall obtain a high degree of certainty that such misstatement or deviation is not representative of the population. The auditor shall obtain this degree of certainty by performing additional audit procedures to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence that the misstatement or deviation does not affect the remainder of the population.	Elevation of extant ASA Explanatory Guidance. [Extant ASA 530 para 55 – equivalent Explanatory Guidance]

Extant ASA Requirements not in ASA 530 (Revised and Redrafted)

Item #	Extant ASA Para. #	Extant ASA Requirement	Commentary
Not Retained in ASA 530 [Revised and Redrafted]			
Introduction			
1	5	When designing audit procedures, the auditor shall determine appropriate means for selecting items for testing so as to gather sufficient appropriate audit evidence to meet the objectives of the audit procedures.	Extant ASA Requirement covered in Requirements in other Auditing Standards. [ASA 200 (Revised and Redrafted) para 17 will require *sufficient appropriate audit evidence to reduce risk to an acceptably low level* in the conduct of an audit]. [ASA 500 (Revised and Redrafted) para 13 will require the auditor to determine the means of selecting items for testing that are effective in meeting the purpose of the audit procedure].
Definitions			
2	7	For purposes of this Auditing Standard, "error" means either control deviations, when performing tests of controls, or misstatements, when performing tests of details. Similarly, total error is used to mean either the rate of deviation or total misstatement.	*Tolerable misstatement* and *tolerable rate of deviation* are defined in ASA 530 (Revised and Redrafted) and are sufficient to cover this definition.
3	15	"Tolerable error" means the maximum error in a population that the auditor is willing to accept.	*Tolerable misstatement* and *tolerable rate of deviation* are defined in ASA 530 (Revised and Redrafted) and are sufficient to cover this definition.
Risk Considerations in Obtaining Audit Evidence			
4	22	In obtaining audit evidence, the auditor shall use professional judgement to assess the risk of material misstatement and design further audit procedures to ensure this risk is reduced to an acceptably low level.	Extant ASA Requirement covered in other Auditing Standards. [ASA 200 (Revised and Redrafted) para 16 and para 17 will require *professional judgement* and *sufficient appropriate audit*

Item #	Extant ASA Para. #	Extant ASA Requirement	Commentary
			evidence to reduce risk to an acceptably low level in the conduct of an audit]. [ASA 315 (Revised and Redrafted) para 5 requires the auditor to perform risk assessment procedures]. [ASA 330 (Revised and Redrafted) para 5 requires the auditor to "design and implement overall responses to the assessed risks of material misstatement…" and para 6 requires the auditor to "design and perform further audit procedures …"].
Selecting Items for Testing to Gather Audit Evidence			
5	25	When designing audit procedures, the auditor shall determine appropriate means of selecting items for testing.	Extant ASA Requirement covered in another Auditing Standard. [ASA 500 (Revised and Redrafted) para 13—will contain equivalent Requirement].

ASA 530 (Revised and Redrafted) Appendix not in Extant Appendices

Item #	ISA/ASA Para. #	Appendix	Commentary
Part A – ISA			
Stratification and Value Weighted Selection			
1	Appendix 1	Stratification and Value-Weighted Selection	Appendix in ISA included as a new Appendix in ASA (Revised and Redrafted). This material was previously included in the extant ASA as explanatory guidance. [ASA 530 (Revised and Redrafted) para 41-44 contains equivalent Guidance].