



1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 207-9100
Facsimile: (202) 862-8433
www.pcaobus.org

Report on

2015 Inspection of Crowe Horwath LLP
(Headquartered in Oak Brook Terrace, Illinois)

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

July 28, 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. 104-2016-107

2015 INSPECTION OF CROWE HORWATH LLP

Preface

In 2015, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Crowe Horwath LLP ("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 auditing issuers. For a description of the procedures the Board's inspectors may perform to fulfill this responsibility, see Part I.D of this report (which also contains additional information concerning PCAOB inspections generally). The inspection included reviews of portions of selected issuer audits. These reviews were intended to identify whether deficiencies existed in the reviewed work, and whether such deficiencies indicated defects or potential defects in the Firm's system of quality control over audits. 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, portions of Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C. Appendix A 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. Appendix B presents the text of the paragraphs of the auditing standards that are referenced in Part I.A in relation to the description of auditing deficiencies there.

Note on this report's citations to auditing standards: On March 31, 2015, the PCAOB adopted a reorganization of its auditing standards using a topical structure and a single, integrated numbering system. See *Reorganization of PCAOB Auditing Standards and Related Amendments to PCAOB Standards and Rules*, PCAOB Release No. 2015-002 (Mar. 31, 2015). The reorganization will be effective as of December 31, 2016, but the reorganized numbering system may be used before that date. In this report, citations to PCAOB auditing standards use the numbering system and titles of standards that were in effect at the time of the primary inspection procedures. A table cross-referencing the section numbers of those standards included in Part I of this report as reorganized is included at Appendix C.

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures¹ for the inspection from August 2015 to October 2015. The inspection team performed field work at the Firm's National Office and on reports issued from 11 of its approximately 30 U.S. practice offices.

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included reviews of portions of 14 issuer audits performed by the Firm. 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 B 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 the 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 of the 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

¹ For this purpose, the time span for "primary procedures" includes 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. The time span does not include (1) inspection planning, which may commence months before the primary procedures, and (2) inspection follow-up procedures, wrap-up, analysis of results, and the preparation of the inspection report, which generally extend beyond the primary procedures.

were presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable 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 these audits, 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.²

The audit deficiencies that reached this level of significance are described in Part I.A.1 through I.A.3, below.

² 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 an inspection may include a review of the adequacy of a firm's compliance with these requirements, either with respect to previously identified deficiencies or deficiencies identified during that inspection. Failure by a firm to take appropriate actions, or a firm's misrepresentations in responding to an inspection report about whether it has taken such actions, could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions.

Effects on Audit Opinions

Of the three issuer audits that appear in Part I.A, deficiencies in all three audits relate to testing controls for purposes of the ICFR opinion, and deficiencies in one audit relate to the substantive testing performed for purposes of the opinion on the financial statements as noted in the table below.

	Number of Audits
Deficiencies included in Part I.A related to both the financial statement audit and the ICFR audit	1
Deficiencies included in Part I.A related to the ICFR audit only	2
Total	3

Most Frequently Identified Audit Deficiencies

The only type of deficiency described in Part I.A of this report with respect to multiple audits involves the failure to sufficiently test the design and/or operating effectiveness of controls that the Firm selected for testing. This type of deficiency is described in Part I.A in connection with three audits, Issuers A, B, and C.

Audit Deficiencies

A.1. Issuer A

In this audit, the Firm failed in the following respects to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its audit opinion on the effectiveness of ICFR -

- The Firm's procedures to test controls over the valuation of inventories were insufficient. The Firm identified six financially significant systems supporting the inventories process. For one of the controls tested, the Firm's testing of the operating effectiveness over two of the issuer's inventory systems was substantive in nature and did not constitute a direct test of the control as it obtained the transaction detail and tested the ending balance for mathematical accuracy for one inventory system and for the other inventory system, it obtained and examined standard cost detail reports. For the issuer's other four inventory systems, no procedures were performed.

In addition, the Firm failed to sufficiently test the operating effectiveness of Information Technology General Controls ("ITGCs") for one of the six inventory systems as it failed to test the appropriateness of access granted to users on the system. (AS No. 5, paragraphs 42, 44, and B9)

- The Firm selected for testing three management review controls over the valuation of the assets acquired and liabilities assumed as a result of business combination activity. The Firm's testing of one of these controls was insufficient. Specifically, the Firm's procedures to test this one control were substantive in nature and did not constitute a direct test of the control as the procedures were limited to holding discussions with management and observing evidence that the reviews occurred. The Firm, however, failed to determine whether the control was designed and operated at a sufficient level of precision to identify a material misstatement because it failed to evaluate the criteria used to identify items for investigation and/or determine whether specific items that were investigated were resolved. (AS No. 5, paragraphs 42, 44, and B9)

A.2. Issuer B

In this audit, the Firm failed to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its audit opinion on the effectiveness of ICFR, as its procedures to test the operating effectiveness of controls over the occurrence of revenue were insufficient. Specifically, for one of the two controls tested, the Firm's procedures were limited to observing an electronic stamp as evidence that the control had operated. The Firm, however, failed to test whether any of the actions required by the control had been performed. (AS No. 5, paragraph 44)

A.3. Issuer C

In this audit, the Firm failed in the following respects to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its audit opinion on the financial statements and on the effectiveness of ICFR -

- The Firm identified a significant risk related to the valuation of deferred taxes. The Firm identified and tested two controls related to income taxes - (1) management's review of the calculation of income tax expense, deferred taxes, valuation allowance, and tax contingency (the "tax calculation") and (2) board of directors' review of the realization of the deferred tax asset balance. The Firm's testing of these controls was insufficient. Specifically:

- The Firm's testing of the design and operating effectiveness of the management review control over the tax calculation was limited to obtaining evidence that the control operated. The Firm failed to determine whether the review was designed and operated at a sufficient level of precision to identify a material misstatement in the tax calculation as it failed to evaluate the criteria used to identify items for investigation and/or determine whether specific items that were investigated were resolved. (AS No. 5, paragraphs 42 and 44)
- The Firm's procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of the board of directors' review of the realization of the deferred tax assets ("DTA") were limited to observing evidence that the review occurred. The Firm failed to determine whether the review was designed and operated at a sufficient level of precision to identify a material misstatement in the DTA valuation allowance as it failed to evaluate the criteria used to identify items for investigation and/or determine whether specific items that were investigated were resolved. (AS No. 5, paragraphs 42 and 44)
- The Firm failed to identify and test any controls over the accuracy and completeness of the information used in the operation of the above noted controls. (AS No. 5, paragraph 39)
- The Firm failed to perform sufficient procedures to test the existence of loans receivable. Specifically, the Firm extended to the year-end date its audit conclusion from its testing at an interim date without performing any procedures related to doing so. (AS No. 13, paragraph 45)

B. Auditing Standards

Each deficiency described in Part I.A above could relate to several provisions of the standards that govern the conduct of audits. The paragraphs of the standards that are cited for each deficiency are those that most directly relate to the deficiency. The deficiencies also may relate, however, to other paragraphs of those standards and to other auditing standards, including those concerning due professional care, responses to risk assessments, and audit evidence.

Many audit deficiencies involve a lack of due professional care. AU 230, *Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work*, 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 AS

No. 13, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*, 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. AS No. 15, *Audit Evidence*, 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 providing support for the related conclusions.

The paragraphs of the standards that are described immediately above are not cited in Part I.A, unless those paragraphs are the most directly related to the relevant deficiency.

B.1. List of Specific Auditing Standards Referenced in Part I.A

The table below lists the specific auditing standards that are referenced in Part I.A of this report, cross-referenced to the issuer audits for which each standard is cited. For each auditing standard, the table also provides the number of distinct deficiencies for which the standard is cited for each of the relevant issuer audits. This information identifies only the number of times that the standard is referenced, regardless of whether the reference includes multiple paragraphs or relates to multiple financial statement accounts.

PCAOB Auditing Standards	Audits	Number of Deficiencies per Audit
AS No. 5, <i>An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>	Issuer A Issuer B Issuer C	2 1 1
AS No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	Issuer C	1

B.2. Financial Statement Accounts or Auditing Areas Related to Identified Audit Deficiencies

The table below lists the financial statement accounts or auditing areas related to each deficiency included in Part I.A of this report and identifies the audits described in Part I.A where deficiencies relating to the respective areas were observed.

	AS No. 5	AS No. 13
Business combinations	A	
Income taxes	C	
Inventory and related reserves	A	
Loans, including ALL		C
Revenue, including accounts receivable, deferred revenue, and allowances	B	

B.3. Audit Deficiencies by Industry

The table below lists the industries³ of the issuers for which audit deficiencies were discussed in Part I.A of this report, and cross-references the issuer to the specific auditing standards related to the deficiencies.


	AS No.5	AS No. 13
Financial Services	C	C
Health Care	B	
Industrials	A	

³ The majority of industry sector data is based on Global Industry Classification Standard ("GICS") data obtained from Standard & Poor's ("S&P"). In instances where GICS for an issuer was not available from S&P, classifications are assigned based upon North American Industry Classification System data.

C. Data Related to the Issuer Audits Selected for Inspection

C.1. Industries of Issuers Inspected

The chart below categorizes the 14 issuers whose audits were inspected in 2015, based on the issuer's industry.⁴




C.2. Revenue Ranges of Issuers Inspected

The chart below categorizes, based upon revenue, the 13⁵ issuers whose audits were inspected in 2015.⁶ This presentation of revenue data is intended to provide information about the size of issuer audits that were inspected and is not indicative of whether the inspection included a review of the Firm's auditing of revenue in the issuer audits selected for review.

⁴ See Footnote 4 for additional information on how industry sectors were classified.

⁵ The chart excludes one of the issuers whose audit was inspected because it is a benefit plan that has no revenue data.

⁶ The revenue amounts reflected in the chart are for the issuers' fiscal year end that corresponds to the audit inspected by the PCAOB. The revenue amounts were obtained from S&P and reflect a standardized approach to presenting revenue amounts.



Revenue (in US\$)	Number of Audits inspected	Percentage
<100 million	5	39%
>100 million	8	61%

D. Information Concerning PCAOB Inspections that is Generally Applicable to Annually 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 audits. 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.

D.1. Reviews of Audit Work

Inspections include reviews of portions of selected audits of financial statements and, where applicable, audits of ICFR. For these audits, the inspection team selects certain portions of the audits 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 audits, and the specific portions of those audits, 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,⁷ as well as a firm's failure to perform, or to perform sufficiently, certain necessary audit procedures. An inspection of an annually inspected firm does not involve the review of all of the firm's audits, nor is it designed to identify every deficiency in the reviewed audits. 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*, 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 do not constitute persuasive other evidence. In reaching its conclusions, an inspection team considers whether audit documentation or any other evidence that a firm might provide to the inspection team supports the 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,

⁷ 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 the applicable financial reporting framework, 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.

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.⁸

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 audits and areas of inspection focus are most often selected on a risk-weighted basis and not randomly. Areas of focus vary among selected audits, 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.

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

QC 20, *System of Quality Control for a CPA Firm's Accounting and Auditing Practice*, 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 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 audits. Audit deficiencies, whether alone or when aggregated, may indicate areas where a firm's system has failed to provide reasonable

⁸ The discussion in this report of any deficiency observed in a particular audit 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.

assurance of quality in the performance of audits. Even deficiencies that do not result in an insufficiently supported audit opinion may indicate a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system.⁹ 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 audits 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;¹⁰ 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. The inspection team customizes the procedures it performs with respect to the firm's practices, policies, and processes related to audit quality, bearing in mind the firm's structure, procedures performed in prior inspections, past and current inspection observations, an assessment of risk related to each area, and other factors. The areas generally considered for review include (1) management structure and processes, including the tone at the top; (2) practices for partner management, including allocation of partner resources and partner evaluation, compensation, admission, and disciplinary actions; (3) policies and procedures for considering and addressing the risks involved in accepting and retaining issuer audit engagements, including the application of the firm's risk-rating system; (4) processes related to the firm's use of audit work that the firm's foreign affiliates perform on the foreign operations of the firm's U.S. issuer audits; and (5) the firm's processes for monitoring audit performance, including processes for identifying and assessing indicators of deficiencies in audit performance, independence policies and procedures, and processes for responding to defects or potential defects in quality control. A description of the procedures generally applied to these areas is below.

⁹ Not every audit deficiency suggests a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system, and this report does not discuss every audit deficiency the inspection team identified.

¹⁰ 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.

D.2.a. Review of Management Structure and Processes, Including the Tone at the Top

Procedures in this area are designed to focus on (1) how management is structured and operates the firm's business, and the implications that the management structure and processes have on audit performance and (2) whether actions and communications by the firm's leadership – the tone at the top – demonstrate a commitment to audit quality. To assess this area, the inspection team may interview members of the firm's leadership and review significant management reports and documents, as well as information regarding financial metrics and other processes that the firm uses to plan and evaluate its business.

D.2.b. Review of Practices for Partner Management, Including Allocation of Partner Resources and Partner Evaluation, Compensation, Admission, and Disciplinary Actions

Procedures in this area are designed to focus on (1) whether the firm's processes related to partner evaluation, compensation, admission, termination, and disciplinary actions could be expected to encourage an appropriate emphasis on audit quality and technical competence, as distinct from marketing or other activities of the firm; (2) the firm's processes for allocating its partner resources; and (3) the accountability and responsibilities of the different levels of firm management with respect to partner management. The inspection team may interview members of the firm's management and review documentation related to certain of these topics. In addition, the inspection team's evaluation may include the results of interviews of audit partners regarding their responsibilities and allocation of time. Further, the inspection team may review a sample of partners' personnel files.

D.2.c. Review of Policies and Procedures for Considering and Addressing the Risks Involved in Accepting and Retaining Issuer Audit Engagements, Including the Application of the Firm's Risk-Rating System

The inspection team may consider the firm's documented policies and procedures in this area. In addition, the inspection team may select certain issuer audits to (1) evaluate compliance with the firm's policies and procedures for identifying and assessing the risks involved in accepting or continuing the issuer audit engagements and (2) observe whether the audit procedures were responsive to the risks identified during the firm's process.

D.2.d. Review of Processes Related to a Firm's Use of Audit Work that the Firm's Foreign Affiliates Perform on the Foreign Operations of the Firm's U.S. Issuer Audits

The inspection team may review the firm's policies and procedures related to its supervision and control of work performed by foreign affiliates on the firm's U.S. issuer audits, review available information relating to the most recent internal inspections of foreign affiliated firms, interview members of the firm's leadership, and review the U.S. engagement teams' supervision concerning, and procedures for control of, the audit work that the firm's foreign affiliates performed on a sample of audits.

D.2.e. Review of a Firm's Processes for Monitoring Audit Performance, Including Processes for Identifying and Assessing Indicators of Deficiencies in Audit Performance, Independence Policies and Procedures, and Processes for Responding to Defects or Potential Defects in Quality Control

D.2.e.i. Review of Processes for Identifying and Assessing Indicators of Deficiencies in Audit Performance

Procedures in this area are designed to identify and assess the monitoring processes that the firm uses to monitor audit quality for individual engagements and for the firm as a whole. The inspection team may interview members of the firm's management and review documents relating to the firm's identification and evaluation of, and response to, possible indicators of deficiencies in audit performance. In addition, the inspection team may review documents related to the design, operation, and evaluation of findings of the firm's internal inspection program, and may compare the results of its review of audit work to those from the internal inspection's review of the same audit work.

D.2.e.ii. Review of Response to Defects or Potential Defects in Quality Control

The inspection team may review steps the firm has taken to address possible quality control deficiencies and assess the design and effectiveness of the underlying processes. In addition, the inspection team may inspect audits of issuers whose audits had been reviewed during previous PCAOB inspections of the firm to ascertain whether the audit procedures in areas with previous deficiencies have improved.

D.2.e.iii. Review of Certain Other Policies and Procedures Related to Monitoring Audit Quality

The inspection team may assess policies, procedures, and guidance related to aspects of independence requirements and the firm's consultation processes, as well as the firm's compliance with these requirements and processes. In addition, the inspection team may review documents, including certain newly issued policies and procedures, and interview firm management to consider the firm's methods for developing audit policies, procedures, and methodologies, including internal guidance and training materials.

END OF PART I

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

APPENDIX A

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.¹¹

¹¹ 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.



Crowe Horwath LLP
(Independent Member Crowe Horwath International)
One Mid America Plaza, Suite 700
Post Office Box 3697
Oak Brook, Illinois 60522-3697
Tel: 630.574.7878
Fax: 630.574.1608
www.crowehorwath.com

May 31, 2016

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

Re: Response to Part I of the Draft Report on the 2015 Inspection of Crowe Horwath LLP

Dear Ms. Munter:

Crowe Horwath LLP appreciates the opportunity to respond to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB") draft report on the 2015 Inspection of Crowe Horwath LLP (the "Report").

We believe the PCAOB's inspection process serves an important role in improving audit quality for the benefit of investors and the public interest. We take seriously the matters identified by the PCAOB, which we analyze and use in our ongoing efforts to strengthen our quality control processes and audit performance. We also wish to acknowledge the professionalism of the PCAOB's inspectors and staff in their interactions with our personnel.

We have carefully considered each matter identified in Part I of the Report, and have taken actions to address each matter in accordance with PCAOB standards and our policies. These actions include performing additional procedures when appropriate, and including additional documentation in our files to more completely describe and support procedures, evidential material, and our conclusions.

Crowe Horwath LLP is committed to performing high quality audits, and we have designed our quality control and monitoring systems to drive continual improvement. We look forward to continued dialogue with the PCAOB to advance the shared goal of audit quality.

Sincerely,

Crowe Horwath LLP

Crowe Horwath LLP

APPENDIX B

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 C
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>	Issuers A and C

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>	Issuers A, B, and C
APPENDIX B - Special Topics		
INTEGRATION OF AUDITS		
AS No. 5.B9	<p>To obtain evidence about whether a selected control is effective, the control must be tested directly; the effectiveness of a control cannot be inferred from the absence of misstatements detected by substantive procedures. The absence of misstatements detected by substantive procedures, however, should inform the auditor's risk assessments in determining the testing necessary to conclude on the effectiveness of a control.</p>	Issuer A

AS No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>		
Substantive Procedures		
TIMING OF SUBSTANTIVE PROCEDURES		
AS No. 13.45	When substantive procedures are performed at an interim date, the auditor should cover the remaining period by performing substantive procedures, or substantive procedures combined with tests of controls, that provide a reasonable basis for extending the audit conclusions from the interim date to the period end. Such procedures should include (a) comparing relevant information about the account balance at the interim date with comparable information at the end of the period to identify amounts that appear unusual and investigating such amounts and (b) performing audit procedures to test the remaining period.	Issuer C

APPENDIX C

REORGANIZED STANDARDS REFERENCED IN REPORT

On March 31, 2015, the PCAOB adopted the reorganization of its auditing standards using a topical structure and a single, integrated numbering system. See *Reorganization of PCAOB Auditing Standards and Related Amendments to PCAOB Standards and Rules*, PCAOB Release No. 2015-002 (Mar. 31, 2015). On September 17, 2015, the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") approved the PCAOB's adoption of the reorganization. The reorganized standards will be effective as of December 31, 2016. The citations to PCAOB auditing standards included in this report use the numbering system and titles of standards that were in effect at the time of the primary inspection procedures. This table provides the section numbers of those standards included in Part I of this report as reorganized, as well as the titles of the standards both before and after the reorganization. The complete standards are available on the PCAOB's website at <http://pcaobus.org/STANDARDS/Pages/default.aspx>.

Auditing Standards – before the reorganization		Auditing Standards – as reorganized	
AS No. 3	<i>Audit Documentation</i>	AS 1215	<i>Audit Documentation</i>
AS No. 5	<i>An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>	AS 2201	<i>An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>
AS No. 13	<i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	AS 2301	<i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>
AS No. 15	<i>Audit Evidence</i>	AS 1105	<i>Audit Evidence</i>
AU 230	<i>Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work</i>	AS 1015	<i>Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work</i>