

**A. Request for Specific Comments**

**Glossary**

- 1. Do respondents support the proposals set out in the glossary concerning the proposed new and revised definitions? See Section III.**

**Comment:**

We agree with the proposals set out in the glossary concerning the proposed new and revised definitions.

**Evaluation of CCO for all Professional Services and Activities**

- 2. Do respondents support the approach regarding evaluating an external expert's competence, capabilities and objectivity? Are there other considerations that should be incorporated in the evaluation of CCO specific to PAIBs, PAPPs and SAPs? See Section V.**

**Comment:**

We agree with the proposal.

- 3. Do respondents agree that if an external expert is not competent, capable or objective, the Code should prohibit the PA or SAP from using their work? See paragraphs 67 to 74.**

**Comment:**

We agree with the proposal of the Code that prohibits the PA or SAP from using the work of an external expert if the external expert is not competent, capable or objective.

### Evaluation of CCO for Audit or Other Assurance Engagements

4. In the context of an audit or other assurance (including sustainability assurance) engagement, do respondents agree that the additional provisions relating to evaluating an external expert's objectivity introduce an appropriate level of rigor to address the heightened public interest expectations concerning external experts? If not, what other considerations would help to address the heightened public interest expectations? See Section (V)(A).

**Comment:**

We agree with the proposal.

### Potential Threats Arising from Using the Work of an External Expert

5. Do respondents support the provisions that guide PAs or SAPs in applying the conceptual framework when using the work of an external expert? Are there other considerations that should be included? See Section (VI)(A).

**Comment:**

We agree with the proposal.

### B. Request for General Comments

In addition to the request for specific comments above, the IESBA is also seeking comments on the matters set out below:

**Small- and Medium-Sized Entities (SMEs) and Small and Medium Practices (SMPs) – The IESBA invites comments regarding any aspect of the proposals from SMEs and SMPs.**

**Comment:**

Not applicable.

**Regulators and Audit Oversight Bodies – The IESBA invites comments on the proposals from an enforcement perspective from members of the regulatory and audit oversight communities.**

**Comment:**

Not applicable.

**Sustainability Assurance Practitioners Other than Professional Accountants – The IESBA invites comments on the clarity, understandability and usability of the proposals from SAPs outside of the accountancy profession who perform sustainability assurance engagements addressed in the proposed Part 5 of the Code.**

**Comment:**

Not applicable.

**Developing Nations – Recognizing that many developing nations have adopted or are in the process of adopting the Code, the IESBA invites respondents from these nations to comment on the proposals, and in particular on any foreseeable difficulties in applying them in their environment.**

**Comment:**

We do not foresee difficulties in applying them in our environment.

**Translations – Recognizing that many respondents may intend to translate the final changes for adoption in their own environments, the IESBA welcomes comment on potential translation issues respondents may note in reviewing the proposals.**

**Comment:**

Not applicable.