Audit Quality Is Designed Before Fieldwork Begins

"By the time the engagement team arrives on site, the quality ceiling has already been set. The question is whether anyone noticed."

The Execution Assumption

There is a common assumption in how audit quality is discussed — inside firms, in training programmes, in regulatory guidance — that quality is primarily an execution problem.

Files are weak because procedures were not performed rigorously enough. Evidence is insufficient because testing was not thorough enough. Conclusions are unsupported because documentation was not completed carefully enough.

This assumption is not wrong. But it is incomplete. And the incompleteness matters, because it directs remediation effort toward the wrong stage of the engagement.

The evidence from inspection findings — NFRA's, and regulators globally — tells a more specific story. The weaknesses that surface during fieldwork and become visible under inspection are, in the majority of cases, not created during fieldwork. They are created during planning.

By the time the engagement team arrives on site, the quality ceiling has already been set.

What Planning Actually Determines

Audit planning is frequently treated as an administrative precursor to the real work. Strategy documents are completed. Risk assessments are populated. Materiality is calculated. The audit programme is assembled. The team is briefed.

And then fieldwork begins — which is where most firms believe the audit actually happens.

This framing misunderstands what planning determines.

Planning determines which risks the engagement will take seriously and which it will treat as standard. It determines which areas will receive tailored procedures and which will receive programme defaults. It determines how much scepticism the team is primed to bring to management's most significant assertions. It determines whether the engagement partner has thought deeply about this specific entity's vulnerabilities — or whether last year's file has been rolled forward with updated dates.

In short, planning determines the intellectual architecture of the audit. Everything that follows — every procedure performed, every evidence obtained, every conclusion documented — operates within the constraints that planning established.

> ***"A weak plan does not merely produce a weak audit. It produces a weak audit that looks complete."***

The Mechanical Risk Assessment Problem

Of all the planning failures that NFRA inspection findings expose, the most consequential is the mechanical risk assessment.

Risk assessment is the stage at which the auditor translates understanding of the entity into identified risks of material misstatement. Performed well, it is the most intellectually demanding part of the audit. It requires genuine understanding of the entity's business model, its industry conditions, its internal control environment, and the specific pressures and incentives that might cause financial statements to misrepresent reality.

In practice, risk assessment frequently becomes something different. Risks are identified in generic terms — revenue recognition, related party transactions, going concern — without the specific articulation of why those risks exist for this entity, in this period, under these conditions. Prior year risk assessments are rolled forward. Standard templates are populated. The output looks like a risk assessment. It does not function as one.

The consequence is visible in what follows. When risk is identified generically, audit response is designed generically. Procedures address the category rather than the specific driver. The linkage between what was found during risk assessment and what was designed in response is absent or mechanical.

> *"This is not an execution failure. The team executed what the plan required. The plan required the wrong things — because the risk assessment did not identify the right ones."*

The Strategy That Is a Form

The audit strategy should be the document that answers a specific question: given what we know about this entity, what is the most effective and efficient approach to obtaining sufficient appropriate evidence on the assertions that matter most?

In many engagements, the audit strategy answers a different question: what does the strategy document need to contain?

The distinction is between a strategy that drives the audit and a strategy that records it. A strategy that drives the audit identifies the two or three areas where the risk of material misstatement is genuinely elevated for this entity — and explains specifically why. It identifies where standard procedures will be insufficient and what tailored response is required. It identifies where the engagement partner intends to focus personal attention and why those areas deserve it.

A strategy that records the audit populates the required fields, references the applicable standards, and produces a document that satisfies the completion requirement without influencing a single subsequent decision.

> ***"The audit that follows a genuine strategy is different from the audit that follows a completed form. The files look similar. The quality is not."***

Materiality, Partner Obligation, and the Design of Quality

Materiality as Judgement, Not Calculation

Materiality is the third planning decision that determines audit quality before fieldwork begins — and the one most frequently reduced to arithmetic.

The calculation is straightforward. A percentage is applied to a benchmark. A number is produced. Performance materiality is set. The calculation is completed.

What the calculation does not address is the judgement that should precede it. Which benchmark is most relevant for this entity's stakeholders? Are there qualitative factors — covenant thresholds, regulatory capital requirements, market expectations — that make misstatements significant at amounts below the quantitative threshold? Are there areas where even a small misstatement would alter a user's understanding in ways that the number alone does not capture?

Materiality set through calculation rather than judgement produces a threshold that is technically defensible but functionally incomplete. It tells the team what size of misstatement to look for. It does not tell them what significance means for this entity, in this period, for these stakeholders.

> ***"The engagement that begins with genuine materiality judgement approaches evidence differently from one that begins with a calculated threshold. The difference is not always visible in the number. It is always visible in how the number is applied."***

The Engagement Partner's Planning Obligation

All three planning failures — mechanical risk assessment, strategy as form, materiality as calculation — share a common root: the engagement partner's intellectual engagement with the planning stage.

Planning that is delegated entirely to the senior or manager and reviewed at the end is planning that has not been led. The engagement partner who reviews the completed risk assessment rather than shaping the risk assessment in progress has not performed the planning function. They have performed the approval function — which is different, and which produces different results.

The engagement partner who leads planning brings specific questions to it. What is different about this entity this year that changes where risk resides? What does management have the greatest incentive to misrepresent, and what would that misrepresentation look like? Where is the gap between what our standard programme tests and what this specific engagement requires?

> *"These questions cannot be answered by a completed form. They can only be answered by a partner who has thought about this specific entity with the depth that the planning stage requires."*

Why This Changes Where Remediation Should Focus

The practical implication of this argument for firms that take audit quality seriously is significant.

If audit quality is primarily an execution problem, remediation focuses on fieldwork — better training, tighter supervision, more thorough review of working papers.

If audit quality is primarily a design problem, remediation focuses on planning — better risk assessment methodology, more demanding partner involvement at strategy stage, more rigorous materiality judgement, stronger linkage between what planning identifies and what execution delivers.

Both matter. But the leverage is different. A firm that improves execution within a weak plan produces better-documented weak audits. A firm that improves planning produces audits where execution has something worth executing.

> ***"The quality ceiling is set in planning. Raising it requires working at the planning stage — not only at the execution stage where its consequences become visible."***

The Three Planning Failures — A Summary

Mechanical Risk Assessment

Risks identified in generic terms without entity-specific articulation. Prior year assessments rolled forward. The output looks like a risk assessment. It does not function as one. Audit response is designed generically — addressing the category rather than the specific driver.

Strategy as Form

The strategy document satisfies the completion requirement without influencing a single subsequent decision. It records the audit rather than driving it. No tailored response. No partner-led identification of where standard procedures are insufficient.

Materiality as Calculation

A percentage applied to a benchmark. A number produced. The judgement that should precede the calculation — which benchmark, which qualitative factors, what significance means for these stakeholders — is absent. The threshold is technically defensible. It is functionally incomplete.

The Quality Standard

The Diagnostic Question

For any engagement partner reviewing their practice, the question is specific:

In the last five files you reviewed at conclusion — could you see the risk assessment driving the audit response? Could you identify, for each significant area, the specific reason that area was assessed as it was — and the specific procedures designed in response to that specific assessment?

If the answer is no, the planning stage has not performed its function. The audit that followed may be complete. It is unlikely to be defensible.

> ***"Audit quality is not built during fieldwork. It is designed before fieldwork begins — or it is not built at all."***

What the Quality Ceiling Looks Like

The quality ceiling set during planning is invisible in the completed file. Both the audit that was planned with genuine intellectual rigour and the audit that was planned by rolling forward last year's documents will produce files that look complete. Both will contain risk assessments, strategies, materiality calculations, and signed-off programmes.

The difference is visible only in what those documents drove. In the rigorous audit, the risk assessment explains why specific procedures were designed for specific assertions. The strategy identifies where the partner focused personal attention and why. The materiality reflects a judgement about what matters to these stakeholders, not merely a percentage applied to a benchmark.

In the mechanical audit, the documents exist. They do not drive. The procedures that follow are the procedures that always follow — because the planning stage did not identify any reason to do otherwise.

> *"The quality ceiling is not visible in the file. It is visible in the financial statements the file was designed to support."*

Building Quality Into Planning

> ### Lead the Risk Assessment:
>
> The engagement partner shapes the risk assessment in progress — not reviews it at completion. The question is not whether risks have been identified. It is whether the identified risks are specific to this entity, this period, and these conditions.

> ### Write a Strategy That Drives:
>
> The audit strategy identifies the two or three areas of genuinely elevated risk for this entity and explains specifically why. It identifies where standard procedures are insufficient and what tailored response is required. It is a document that influences subsequent decisions — not one that records them.

> ### Exercise Materiality Judgement:
>
> The materiality threshold reflects a judgement about what significance means for this entity's stakeholders — not merely a calculation. Qualitative factors are considered. The number is the output of judgement, not a substitute for it.

> ### Test the Linkage:
>
> At conclusion, the engagement partner should be able to trace a direct line from each identified risk to the procedures designed in response. Where that line cannot be drawn, the planning stage did not perform its function — regardless of what the completed documents contain.

> ***"The question is not whether the plan was completed. It is whether the plan drove the audit."***

CA Pranav Jain, FCA | Co-Founder, Anveshana Consulting Private Limited | anveshana@anveshanaconsulting.com *This article is part of Anveshana's Audit Quality Insights series.*