

SA 320 (AAS 13)

AUDIT MATERIALITY

*(Effective for all audits relating to
accounting periods beginning on or after April 1, 1996)*

Contents

	Paragraph(s)
Introduction.....	1-2
Materiality.....	3-8
The Relationship between Materiality and Audit Risk.....	9-10
Materiality and Audit Risk in Evaluating Audit Evidence.....	11-16
Effective Date.....	17

Standard on Auditing (SA) 320*, “Audit Materiality” should be read in the context of the “Preface to the Standards on Quality Control, Auditing, Review, Other Assurance and Related Services”¹, which sets out the authority of SAs.

* Issued in January, 1997.

¹ Published in the July 2007 issue of the Journal.

Introduction

1. The purpose of this Standard is to establish standards on the concept of materiality and its relationship with audit risk.
2. The auditor should consider materiality and its relationship with audit risk when conducting an audit.

Materiality

3. Information is material if its misstatement (i.e., omission or erroneous statement) could influence the economic decisions of users taken on the basis of the financial information. Materiality depends on the size and nature of the item, judged in the particular circumstances of its misstatement. Thus, materiality provides a threshold or cut-off point rather than being a primary qualitative characteristic which the information must have if it is to be useful.
4. The objective of an audit of financial information prepared within a framework of recognised accounting policies and practices and relevant statutory requirements, if any, is to enable the auditor to express an opinion on such financial information. The assessment of what is material is a matter of professional judgement.
5. The concept of materiality recognises that some matters, either individually or in the aggregate, are relatively important for true and fair presentation of financial information in conformity with recognised accounting policies and practices. The auditor considers materiality at both the overall financial information level and in relation to individual account balances and classes of transactions. Materiality may also be influenced by other considerations, such as the legal and regulatory requirements, non-compliance with which may have a significant bearing on the financial information, and considerations relating to individual account balances and relationships. This process may result in different levels of materiality depending on the matter being audited.
6. Although the auditor ordinarily establishes an acceptable materiality level to detect quantitatively material misstatements, both the amount (quantity) and nature (quality) of misstatements need to be considered. An example of a qualitative misstatement would be the inadequate or improper description of an accounting policy when it is likely that a user of the financial statements would be misled by the description.

Handbook of Auditing Pronouncements-I

7. The auditor needs to consider the possibility of misstatements of relatively small amounts that, cumulatively, could have a material effect on the financial information. For example, an error in a month-end (or other periodic) procedure could be an indication of a potential material misstatement if that error is repeated each month or each period, as the case may be.

8. Materiality should be considered by the auditor when –

- (a) determining the nature, timing and extent of audit procedures;
- (b) evaluating the effect of misstatements.

The Relationship between Materiality and Audit Risk

9. When planning the audit, the auditor considers what would make the financial information materially misstated. The auditor's preliminary assessment of materiality, related to specific account balances and classes of transactions, helps the auditor decide such questions as what items to examine and whether to use sampling and analytical procedures. This enables the auditor to select audit procedures that, in combination, can be expected to support the audit opinion at an acceptably low degree of audit risk.

10. There is an inverse relationship between materiality and the degree of audit risk, that is, the higher the materiality level, the lower the audit risk and vice versa. For example, the risk that a particular account balance or class of transactions could be misstated by an extremely large amount might be very low, but the risk that it could be misstated by an extremely small amount might be very high. The auditor takes the inverse relationship between materiality and audit risk into account when determining the nature, timing and extent of audit procedures. For example, if, after planning for specific audit procedures, the auditor determines that the acceptable materiality level is lower, audit risk is increased. The auditor would compensate for this by either:

- (a) reducing the assessed degree of control risk, where this is possible, and supporting the reduced degree by carrying out extended or additional tests of control; or
- (b) reducing detection risk by modifying the nature, timing and extent of planned substantive procedures.

Materiality and Audit Risk in Evaluating Audit Evidence

11. The auditor's assessment of materiality and audit risk may be different at the time of initially planning the engagement from that at the time of evaluating the results of his audit procedures. This could be because of a change in circumstances or a change in the auditor's knowledge as a result of the audit. For example, if the audit is planned prior to period end, the auditor will anticipate the results of operations and the financial position. If actual results of operations and financial position are substantially different, the assessment of materiality and audit risk may also change. Additionally, the auditor may, in planning the audit work, intentionally set the acceptable cut off level for verifying individual transactions at a lower level than is intended to be used to evaluate the results of the audit. This may be done to cover a larger number of items and thereby reduce the likelihood of undiscovered misstatements and to provide the auditor with the margin of safety when evaluating the effect of misstatements discovered during the audit.

12. In forming his opinion on the financial information, the auditor should consider whether the effect of aggregate uncorrected misstatements on the financial information is material. Qualitative considerations also influence an auditor in reaching a conclusion as to whether the misstatements are material.

13. The aggregate of uncorrected misstatements comprises:

- (a) specific misstatements identified by the auditor, including the net effect of uncorrected misstatements identified during the audit of previous periods; and
- (b) the auditor's best estimate of other misstatements which cannot be specifically identified (that is, projected errors).

14. When the auditor tests an account balance or class of transactions by an analytical procedure, he ordinarily would not specifically identify misstatements but would only obtain an indication of whether misstatements might exist in the balance or class and possibly its approximate magnitude. If the analytical procedure indicates that misstatements might exist, but not its approximate amount, the auditor ordinarily would have to employ other procedures to enable him to estimate the aggregate misstatement in the balance or class.

Handbook of Auditing Pronouncements-I

15. When an auditor uses audit sampling to test an account balance or class of transactions, he projects the amount of known misstatements identified by him in his sample to the items in the balance or class from which his sample was selected. That projected misstatement, along with the results of other substantive tests, contributes to the auditor's assessment of aggregate misstatement in the balance or class.

16. If the aggregate of the uncorrected misstatements that the auditor has identified approaches the materiality level, or if auditor determines that the aggregate of uncorrected misstatements causes the financial information to be materially misstated, he should consider requesting the management to adjust the financial information or extending his audit procedures. In any event, the management may want to adjust the financial information for known misstatements. The adjustment of financial information may involve, for example, application of appropriate accounting principles, other adjustments in amounts, or the addition of appropriate disclosure of inadequately disclosed matters. If the management refuses to adjust the financial information and the results of extended audit procedures do not enable the auditor to conclude that the aggregate of uncorrected misstatements is not material, the auditor should express a qualified or adverse opinion, as appropriate.

Effective Date

17. This Standard on Auditing becomes operative for all audits relating to accounting periods beginning on or after April 1, 1996.