

Report on

2014 Inspection of PricewaterhouseCoopers, S.C.
(Headquartered in Mexico City, United Mexican States)

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

March 17, 2016

THIS IS A PUBLIC VERSION OF A PCAOB INSPECTION REPORT

**PORTIONS OF THE COMPLETE REPORT ARE OMITTED
FROM THIS DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH
SECTIONS 104(g)(2) AND 105(b)(5)(A)
OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002**

PCAOB RELEASE NO. 104-2016-088

2014 INSPECTION OF PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS, S.C.

Preface

In 2014, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm PricewaterhouseCoopers, S.C. ("the Firm") pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

Inspections are designed and performed to provide a basis for assessing the degree of compliance by a firm with applicable requirements related to issuer audit work. For a description of the procedures the Board's inspectors may perform to fulfill this responsibility, see Part I.C of this report (which also contains additional information concerning PCAOB inspections generally). Overall, the inspection process included reviews of portions of two issuer audits performed by the Firm and the Firm's audit work on one other issuer audit engagement in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor. These reviews were intended to identify whether deficiencies existed in those portions of the inspected audit work, and whether such deficiencies indicated defects or potential defects in the Firm's system of quality control over audit work. In addition, the inspection included a review of policies and procedures related to certain quality control processes of the Firm that could be expected to affect audit quality.

The Board is issuing this report in accordance with the requirements of the Act. The Board is releasing to the public Part I of the report and portions of Part IV of the report. Part IV of the report consists of the Firm's comments, if any, on a draft of the report. If the nonpublic portions of the report discuss criticisms of or potential defects in the firm's system of quality control, those discussions also could eventually be made public, but only to the extent the firm fails to address the criticisms to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the issuance of the report.

PROFILE OF THE FIRM¹

Number of offices	20 (Cancun, Chihuahua, Ciudad Juarez, Guadalajara, Hermosillo, Leon, Merida, Mexico City, Monterrey, Puebla, Queretaro, San Luis Potosi, Satelite, Tampico, Tijuana, Torreon, Veracruz, and Villahermosa, United Mexican States)
Ownership structure	Partnership
Number of partners	230
Number of professional staff ²	2,762
Number of issuer audit clients	5
Number of other issuer audits in which the Firm plays a role ³	49
Other names used in audit reports	PwC Mexico

¹ The information presented here is as understood by the inspection team, generally as of the outset of the inspection, based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information. Additional information, including additional detail on audit reports issued by the Firm, is available in the Firm's filings with the Board, available at http://pcaobus.org/Registration/rasr/Pages/RASR_Search.aspx.

² The number of partners and professional staff is provided here as an indication of the size of the Firm, and does not necessarily represent the number of the Firm's professionals who participate in audits of issuers.

³ The number of other issuer audits encompasses audit work performed by the Firm in engagements for which the Firm was not the principal auditor, including audits, if any, in which the Firm plays a substantial role as defined in PCAOB Rule 1001(p)(ii).

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from December 8, 2014 to December 19, 2014.⁴

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included reviews of portions of two issuer audits performed by the Firm and the Firm's audit work on one other issuer audit engagement in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor. The inspection team identified matters that it considered to be deficiencies in the performance of the work it reviewed.

The descriptions of the deficiencies in Part I.A of this report include, at the end of the description of each deficiency, references to specific paragraphs of the auditing standards that relate to those deficiencies. The text of those paragraphs is set forth in Appendix A to this report. The references in this sub-Part include only standards that primarily relate to the deficiencies; they do not present a comprehensive list of every auditing standard that applies to the deficiencies. Further, certain broadly applicable aspects of the auditing standards that may be relevant to a deficiency, such as provisions requiring due professional care, including the exercise of professional skepticism; the accumulation of sufficient appropriate audit evidence; and the performance of procedures that address risks, are not included in any references to the auditing standards in this sub-Part, unless the lack of compliance with these standards is the primary reason for the deficiency. These broadly applicable provisions are described in Part I.B of this report.

Certain deficiencies identified were of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm, at the time it issued its audit report, had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion that the financial statements were presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable

⁴ For this purpose, "primary procedures" include field work, other review of audit work papers, and the evaluation of the Firm's quality control policies and procedures through review of documentation and interviews of Firm personnel. Primary procedures do not include (1) inspection planning, which is performed prior to primary procedures, and (2) inspection follow-up procedures, wrap-up, analysis of results, and the preparation of the inspection report, which extend beyond the primary procedures.

financial reporting framework and/or its opinion about whether the issuer had maintained, in all material respects, effective internal control over financial reporting ("ICFR"). In other words, in this audit, the auditor issued an opinion without satisfying its fundamental obligation to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements were free of material misstatement and/or the issuer maintained effective ICFR.

The fact that one or more deficiencies in an audit reach this level of significance does not necessarily indicate that the financial statements are misstated or that there are undisclosed material weaknesses in ICFR. It is often not possible for the inspection team, based only on the information available from the auditor, to reach a conclusion on those points.

Whether or not associated with a disclosed financial reporting misstatement, an auditor's failure to obtain the reasonable assurance that the auditor is required to obtain is a serious matter. It is a failure to accomplish the essential purpose of the audit, and it means that, based on the audit work performed, the audit opinion should not have been issued.⁵

The audit deficiencies that reached this level of significance are described below—

Issuer A

- (1) the failure to perform procedures to evaluate whether certain identified misstatements were material (AS No. 14, paragraph 17);
- (2) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to evaluate the effect of identified misstatements on the effectiveness of controls (AS No. 5 paragraph B8);
- (3) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the valuation

⁵ Inclusion in an inspection report does not mean that the deficiency remained unaddressed after the inspection team brought it to the Firm's attention. Depending upon the circumstances, compliance with PCAOB standards may require the Firm to perform additional audit procedures, or to inform a client of the need for changes to its financial statements or reporting on internal control, or to take steps to prevent reliance on its previously expressed audit opinions. The Board expects that firms will comply with these standards, and the inspections staff may include in its procedures monitoring or assessing a firm's compliance.

and presentation and disclosure of certain investments (AS No. 5, paragraphs 39, 42 and 44);

(4) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation of certain investments (AU 328, paragraphs .23, .26 and .28);

(5) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the valuation of accounts receivable (AS No. 5, paragraphs 39, 42 and 44); and

(6) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation of accounts receivable (AU 342, paragraph .11).

B. Auditing Standards

Each deficiency described above could relate to several applicable provisions of the standards that govern the conduct of audit work, including both the paragraphs of the standards that are cited at the end of each description of the deficiency included in Part I.A of this report and one or more of the specific paragraphs discussed below.

Many audit deficiencies involve a lack of due professional care. AU 230, *Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work* ("AU 230"), paragraphs .02, .05, and .06, requires the independent auditor to plan and perform his or her work with due professional care and sets forth aspects of that requirement. AU 230, paragraphs .07 through .09, and Auditing Standard ("AS") No. 13, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement* ("AS No. 13"), paragraph 7, specify that due professional care requires the exercise of professional skepticism. These standards state that professional skepticism is an attitude that includes a questioning mind and a critical assessment of the appropriateness and sufficiency of audit evidence.

AS No. 13, paragraphs 3, 5, and 8, requires the auditor to design and implement audit responses that address the risks of material misstatement, and AS No. 15, *Audit Evidence* ("AS No. 15"), paragraph 4, requires the auditor to plan and perform audit procedures to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to provide a reasonable basis for the audit opinion. Sufficiency is the measure of the quantity of audit evidence, and the quantity needed is affected by the risk of material misstatement (in the audit of financial statements) or the risk associated with the control (in the audit of ICFR) and the quality of the audit evidence obtained. The appropriateness of evidence is measured by its quality; to be appropriate, evidence must be both relevant and reliable in support of the related conclusions.

The table below lists the specific auditing standards that are referenced for each deficiency included in Part I.A of this report. See the descriptions of the deficiencies in Part I.A for identification of the specific paragraphs, in addition to those noted above, that relate to the individual deficiencies.

PCAOB Auditing Standards	Issuer
<i>AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>	A
<i>AS No. 14, Evaluating Audit Results</i>	A
<i>AU 328, Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</i>	A
<i>AU 342, Auditing Accounting Estimates</i>	A

C. Information Concerning PCAOB Inspections Generally Applicable to Triennially Inspected Firms

Board inspections include reviews of certain portions of selected audit work performed by the inspected firm and reviews of certain aspects of the firm's quality control system. The inspections are designed to identify deficiencies in audit work and defects or potential defects in the firm's system of quality control related to the firm's audit work. The focus on deficiencies, defects, and potential defects necessarily carries through to reports on inspections and, accordingly, Board inspection reports are not intended to serve as balanced report cards or overall rating tools. Further, the inclusion in an inspection report of certain deficiencies, defects, and potential defects should not be construed as an indication that the Board has made any determination about other aspects of the inspected firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct not included within the report.

C.1. Reviews of Audit Work

Inspections include reviews of portions of selected audits of financial statements and, where applicable, audits of ICFR and the firm's audit work on other issuer audit engagements in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor. For these audit engagements, the inspection team selects certain portions of the engagements for

inspection, and it reviews the engagement team's work papers and interviews engagement personnel regarding those portions. If the inspection team identifies a potential issue that it is unable to resolve through discussion with the firm and any review of additional work papers or other documentation, the inspection team ordinarily provides the firm with a written comment form on the matter and the firm is allowed the opportunity to provide a written response to the comment form. If the response does not resolve the inspection team's concerns, the matter is considered a deficiency and is evaluated for inclusion in the inspection report.

The inspection team selects the audit engagements, and the specific portions of those audit engagements, that it will review, and the inspected firm is not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the selections. Audit deficiencies that the inspection team may identify include a firm's failure to identify, or to address appropriately, financial statement misstatements, including failures to comply with disclosure requirements,⁶ as well as a firm's failures to perform, or to perform sufficiently, certain necessary audit procedures. The inspection may not involve the review of all of a firm's audit work, nor is it designed to identify every deficiency in the reviewed audit engagements. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that a firm's audit work, or the relevant issuers' financial statements or reporting on ICFR, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

In some cases, the conclusion that a firm did not perform a procedure may be based on the absence of documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence, even if the firm claimed to have performed the procedure. AS No. 3, *Audit Documentation* ("AS No. 3"), provides that, in various circumstances including PCAOB inspections, a firm that has not adequately documented that it performed a procedure, obtained evidence, or reached an appropriate conclusion, must demonstrate with persuasive other evidence that it did so, and that oral assertions and explanations alone

⁶ When it comes to the Board's attention that an issuer's financial statements appear not to present fairly, in a material respect, the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with applicable accounting principles, the Board's practice is to report that information to the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "the Commission"), which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements. Any description in this report of financial statement misstatements or failures to comply with SEC disclosure requirements should not be understood as an indication that the SEC has considered or made any determination regarding these issues unless otherwise expressly stated.

do not constitute persuasive other evidence. In reaching its conclusions, the inspection team considers whether audit documentation or any persuasive other evidence that a firm might provide to the inspection team supports a firm's contention that it performed a procedure, obtained evidence, or reached an appropriate conclusion. In the case of every matter cited in the public portion of a final inspection report, the inspection team has carefully considered any contention by the firm that it did so but just did not document its work, and the inspection team has concluded that the available evidence does not support the contention that the firm sufficiently performed the necessary work.

Identified deficiencies in the audit work that exceed a significance threshold (which is described in Part I.A of the inspection report) are summarized in the public portion of the inspection report.⁷

The Board cautions against extrapolating from the results presented in the public portion of a report to broader conclusions about the frequency of deficiencies throughout the firm's practice. Individual audit engagements and areas of inspection focus are most often selected on a risk-weighted basis and not randomly. Areas of focus vary among selected audit engagements, but often involve audit work on the most difficult or inherently uncertain areas of financial statements. Thus, the audit work is generally selected for inspection based on factors that, in the inspection team's view, heighten the possibility that auditing deficiencies are present, rather than through a process intended to identify a representative sample.

C.2. Review of a Firm's Quality Control System

QC 20, *System of Quality Control for a CPA Firm's Accounting and Auditing Practice* ("QC 20"), provides that an auditing firm has a responsibility to ensure that its personnel comply with the applicable professional standards. This standard specifies that a firm's system of quality control should encompass the following elements: (1) independence, integrity, and objectivity; (2) personnel management; (3) acceptance and

⁷ The discussion in this report of any deficiency observed in a particular audit engagement reflects information reported to the Board by the inspection team and does not reflect any determination by the Board as to whether the Firm has engaged in any conduct for which it could be sanctioned through the Board's disciplinary process. In addition, any references in this report to violations or potential violations of law, rules, or professional standards are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings for purposes of imposing legal liability.

continuance of issuer audit engagements; (4) engagement performance; and (5) monitoring.

The inspection team's assessment of a firm's quality control system is derived both from the results of its procedures specifically focused on the firm's quality control policies and procedures, and also from inferences that can be drawn from deficiencies in the performance of individual audit engagements. Audit deficiencies, whether alone or when aggregated, may indicate areas where a firm's system has failed to provide reasonable assurance of quality in the performance of audit work. Even deficiencies that do not result in an insufficiently supported audit opinion or a failure to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to fulfill the objectives of its role in an audit may indicate a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system.⁸ If identified deficiencies, when accumulated and evaluated, indicate defects or potential defects in the firm's system of quality control, the nonpublic portion of this report would include a discussion of those issues. When evaluating whether identified deficiencies in individual audit engagements indicate a defect or potential defect in a firm's system of quality control, the inspection team considers the nature, significance, and frequency of deficiencies;⁹ related firm methodology, guidance, and practices; and possible root causes.

Inspections also include a review of certain of the firm's practices, policies, and processes related to audit quality, which constitute a part of the firm's quality control system. This review addresses practices, policies, and procedures concerning audit performance and the following eight functional areas (1) tone at the top; (2) practices for partner evaluation, compensation, admission, assignment of responsibilities, and disciplinary actions; (3) independence implications of non-audit services; business ventures, alliances, and arrangements; personal financial interests; and commissions and contingent fees; (4) practices for client acceptance and retention; (5) practices for consultations on accounting, auditing, and SEC matters; (6) the Firm's internal

⁸ Not every audit deficiency suggests a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system.

⁹ An evaluation of the frequency of a type of deficiency may include consideration of how often the inspection team reviewed audit work that presented the opportunity for similar deficiencies to occur. In some cases, even a type of deficiency that is observed infrequently in a particular inspection may, because of some combination of its nature, its significance, and the frequency with which it has been observed in previous inspections of the firm, be cause for concern about a quality control defect or potential defect.

inspection program; (7) practices for establishment and communication of audit policies, procedures, and methodologies, including training; and (8) the supervision by the Firm's audit engagement teams of the work performed by foreign affiliates.

END OF PART I

PARTS II AND III OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC
AND ARE OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the Firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the Firm's response, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.¹⁰

¹⁰ The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available. In addition, pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report at all. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm's response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.



Ms. Helen A. Munter
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mexico City, January 27, 2016.

Re: Response to Draft Report on the 2014 Inspection of PricewaterhouseCoopers, S. C.

Dear Ms. Munter:

On behalf of PricewaterhouseCoopers, S. C. (the "Firm"), we are pleased to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB" or the "Board") Draft Report on the 2014 Inspection of our Firm's 2013 audits (the "Report").

We continue to support the PCAOB in its mission, and are committed to furthering the public interest through the preparation of informative, accurate and independent audit reports. Consistently performing high-quality audits remains the top priority of the Firm in order to serve the investing community and bring value to the capital markets. In this regard, we recognize the value of the inspection process and have taken all of the Board's observations into account in formulating our various actions to continuously improve audit quality. We will address the matters raised in the Report in a diligent, conscientious and thoughtful manner.

We have evaluated each of the observations set forth in Part I - Inspection Procedures and Certain Observations of the Report and have taken appropriate actions under both PCAOB standards and our policies. Our evaluation included those steps that we considered necessary to comply with AU 390, Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date, and where applicable, AU 561, Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report and AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated With An Audit of Financial Statements.

We look forward to continuing our dialogue with the PCAOB and would be pleased to discuss any aspect of this response or any other questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Carlos Méndez
Territory Senior Partner
PricewaterhouseCoopers, S.C

Manuel Sañudo
Risk Management Partner and
Chief Quality Officer
PricewaterhouseCoopers, S. C.

Javier Buzo
Territory Assurance Leader
PricewaterhouseCoopers, S.C.

APPENDIX A

AUDITING STANDARDS REFERENCED IN PART I

This appendix provides the text of the auditing standard paragraphs that are referenced in Part I.A of this report. Footnotes that are included in this appendix, and any other Notes, are from the original auditing standards that are referenced. While this appendix contains the specific portions of the relevant standards cited with respect to the deficiencies in Part I.A of this report, other portions of the standards (including those described in Part I.B of this report) may provide additional context, descriptions, related requirements, or explanations; the complete standards are available on the PCAOB's website at <http://pcaobus.org/STANDARDS/Pages/default.aspx>.

AS No. 5, <i>An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>		
USING A TOP-DOWN APPROACH		
Selecting Controls to Test		
AS No. 5.39	The auditor should test those controls that are important to the auditor's conclusion about whether the company's controls sufficiently address the assessed risk of misstatement to each relevant assertion.	Issuer A
TESTING CONTROLS		
Testing Design Effectiveness		
AS No. 5.42	<p>The auditor should test the design effectiveness of controls by determining whether the company's controls, if they are operated as prescribed by persons possessing the necessary authority and competence to perform the control effectively, satisfy the company's control objectives and can effectively prevent or detect errors or fraud that could result in material misstatements in the financial statements.</p> <p>Note: A smaller, less complex company might achieve its control objectives in a different manner from a larger, more complex organization. For example, a smaller, less complex company might have fewer employees in the accounting function, limiting opportunities to segregate duties and leading the company to implement alternative controls to achieve its control objectives. In such circumstances, the auditor should evaluate whether those alternative controls are effective.</p>	Issuer A

AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements		
Testing Operating Effectiveness		
AS No. 5.44	<p>The auditor should test the operating effectiveness of a control by determining whether the control is operating as designed and whether the person performing the control possesses the necessary authority and competence to perform the control effectively.</p> <p>Note: In some situations, particularly in smaller companies, a company might use a third party to provide assistance with certain financial reporting functions. When assessing the competence of personnel responsible for a company's financial reporting and associated controls, the auditor may take into account the combined competence of company personnel and other parties that assist with functions related to financial reporting.</p>	Issuer A
APPENDIX B - Special Topics		
INTEGRATION OF AUDITS		
AS No. 5.B8	<p><i>Effect of Substantive Procedures on the Auditor's Conclusions About the Operating Effectiveness of Controls.</i> In an audit of internal control over financial reporting, the auditor should evaluate the effect of the findings of the substantive auditing procedures performed in the audit of financial statements on the effectiveness of internal control over financial reporting. This evaluation should include, at a minimum –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The auditor's risk assessments in connection with the selection and application of substantive procedures, especially those related to fraud. • Findings with respect to illegal acts and related party transactions. • Indications of management bias in making accounting estimates and in selecting accounting principles. • Misstatements detected by substantive procedures. The extent of such misstatements might alter the auditor's judgment about the effectiveness of controls. 	Issuer A

AS No. 14, Evaluating Audit Results		
Evaluating the Results of the Audit of Financial Statements		
AS No. 14.17	<p><i>Evaluation of the Effect of Uncorrected Misstatements.</i> The auditor should evaluate whether uncorrected misstatements are material, individually or in combination with other misstatements. In making this evaluation, the auditor should evaluate the misstatements in relation to the specific accounts and disclosures involved and to the financial statements as a whole, taking into account relevant quantitative and qualitative factors.^{7/} (See Appendix B.)</p> <p>Note: In interpreting the federal securities laws, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that a fact is material if there is "a substantial likelihood that the ...fact would have been viewed by the reasonable investor as having significantly altered the 'total mix' of information made available."^{8/} As the Supreme Court has noted, determinations of materiality require "delicate assessments of the inferences a 'reasonable shareholder' would draw from a given set of facts and the significance of those inferences to him"^{9/}</p> <p>Note: As a result of the interaction of quantitative and qualitative considerations in materiality judgments, uncorrected misstatements of relatively small amounts could have a material effect on the financial statements. For example, an illegal payment of an otherwise immaterial amount could be material if there is a reasonable possibility^{10/} that it could lead to a material contingent liability or a material loss of revenue.^{11/} Also, a misstatement made intentionally could be material for qualitative reasons, even if relatively small in amount.</p> <p>Note: If the reevaluation of the established materiality level or levels, as set forth in Auditing Standard No. 11,^{12/} results in a lower amount for the materiality level or levels, the auditor should take into account that lower materiality level or levels in the evaluation of uncorrected misstatements.</p>	Issuer A

AS No. 14, *Evaluating Audit Results*

Footnotes to AS No. 14.17

^{7/} If the financial statements contain material misstatements, AU sec. 508, *Reports on Audited Financial Statements*, indicates that the auditor should issue a qualified or an adverse opinion on the financial statements. AU sec. 508.35 discusses situations in which the financial statements are materially affected by a departure from the applicable financial reporting framework.

^{8/} *TSC Industries v. Northway, Inc.*, 426 U.S. 438, 449 (1976). See also *Basic, Inc. v. Levinson*, 485 U.S. 224 (1988).

^{9/} *TSC Industries*, 426 U.S. at 450.

^{10/} There is a reasonable possibility of an event, as used in this standard, when the likelihood of the event is either "reasonably possible" or "probable," as those terms are used in the FASB Accounting Standards Codification, Contingencies Topic, paragraph 450-20-25-1.

^{11/} AU sec. 317, *Illegal Acts by Clients*.

^{12/} Paragraphs 11-12 of Auditing Standard No. 11.

AU 328, *Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures*

Testing The Entity's Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures		
AU 328.23	Based on the auditor's assessment of the risk of material misstatement, the auditor should test the entity's fair value measurements and disclosures. Because of the wide range of possible fair value measurements, from relatively simple to complex, and the varying levels of risk of material misstatement associated with the process for determining fair values, the auditor's planned audit procedures can vary significantly in nature, timing, and extent. For example, substantive tests of the fair value measurements may involve (a) testing management's significant assumptions, the valuation model, and the underlying data (see paragraphs .26 through .39), (b) developing independent fair value estimates for corroborative purposes (see paragraph .40), or (c) reviewing subsequent events and transactions (see paragraphs .41 and .42).	Issuer A

AU 328, Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures		
Testing Management's Significant Assumptions, the Valuation Model, and the Underlying Data		
AU 328.26	<p>The auditor's understanding of the reliability of the process used by management to determine fair value is an important element in support of the resulting amounts and therefore affects the nature, timing, and extent of audit procedures. When testing the entity's fair value measurements and disclosures, the auditor evaluates whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Management's assumptions are reasonable and reflect, or are not inconsistent with, market information (see paragraph .06). b. The fair value measurement was determined using an appropriate model, if applicable. c. Management used relevant information that was reasonably available at the time. 	Issuer A
AU 328.28	<p>Where applicable, the auditor should evaluate whether the significant assumptions used by management in measuring fair value, taken individually and as a whole, provide a reasonable basis for the fair value measurements and disclosures in the entity's financial statements.</p>	Issuer A

AU 342, Auditing Accounting Estimates		
Evaluating Accounting Estimates		
Evaluating Reasonableness		
AU 342.11	<p>Review and test management's process. In many situations, the auditor assesses the reasonableness of an accounting estimate by performing procedures to test the process used by management to make the estimate. The following are procedures the auditor may consider performing when using this approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify whether there are controls over the preparation of accounting estimates and supporting data that may be useful in the 	Issuer A

AU 342, Auditing Accounting Estimates

	<p>evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Identify the sources of data and factors that management used in forming the assumptions, and consider whether such data and factors are relevant, reliable, and sufficient for the purpose based on information gathered in other audit tests. c. Consider whether there are additional key factors or alternative assumptions about the factors. d. Evaluate whether the assumptions are consistent with each other, the supporting data, relevant historical data, and industry data. e. Analyze historical data used in developing the assumptions to assess whether the data is comparable and consistent with data of the period under audit, and consider whether such data is sufficiently reliable for the purpose. f. Consider whether changes in the business or industry may cause other factors to become significant to the assumptions. g. Review available documentation of the assumptions used in developing the accounting estimates and inquire about any other plans, goals, and objectives of the entity, as well as consider their relationship to the assumptions. h. Consider using the work of a specialist regarding certain assumptions (section 336, Using the Work of a Specialist). i. Test the calculations used by management to translate the assumptions and key factors into the accounting estimate. 	
--	--	--