



17 July 2024

Misha Pieters  
Director – Auditing and Assurance  
External Reporting Board,  
Level 6/154 Featherston St,  
Central Wellington 6011

Tēnā koe Misha

### **Submission on exposure draft “Review of service performance information”**

Thank you for providing us with the opportunity to comment on the proposed standard on the review of service performance information dated April 2024 (the Exposure Draft).

The Auditor-General is responsible for auditing all public sector entities in New Zealand, including public benefit entities and for-profit entities. We provide the New Zealand Parliament and the public with independent assurance that public sector entities are operating and accounting for their performance as intended.

We audit the service performance information included in general purpose financial reports of public sector entities that are “public benefit entities”. Subject to the prevailing legislation, there may be a small number of public sector entities to which the Exposure Draft is applicable.

We have no substantive issues to bring to your attention. Our responses to the consultation questions are included in the attachment to this letter.

We acknowledge the work of you and your team in preparing standards for the audit and review of service performance information. The suite of standards to frame the reporting and assurance of service performance information is a significant achievement for the External Reporting Board. Thank you for your dedication to the work. We appreciate it.

Nāku noa, nā

Todd Beardsworth  
Assistant Auditor-General  
Audit Quality Group

## Responses to consultation questions

- 1. Do you agree that the requirements to obtain an understanding are appropriate for a review engagement on service performance information?**

We agree.

- 2. Do you agree that the requirements for planning are appropriate for a review engagement on service performance information?**

We agree.

- 3. Do you agree that the requirement to consider “appropriate and meaningful” are appropriate for a review engagement?**

We agree.

- 4. Do you agree that the use of the different verb to “consider” rather than “evaluate” is clear and will promote consistency in practice?**

Use of “consider” is reasonable in the context of a review engagement.

- 5. Do you agree that the requirements for materiality are appropriate for a review engagement on service performance information?**

We agree.

- 6. Do you agree with the requirements proposed to identify where risks may arise for a review of service performance information? If not, why not?**

We agree.

- 7. Do you agree with the requirements proposed for responding to assessed risks? If not, why not?**

We agree.

- 8. Do you consider the wording of the conclusion to be clear? If not, why not, and what clarifications do you recommend?**

We consider the wording of the conclusion to be clear.

- 9. Do you agree with the proposed application date of 12 months following issue of the standard?**

We agree.

- 10. Do you have any other comments on the proposed standard? If so, please specify.**

We have no further comments.