

Report on

2014 Inspection of KPMG LLP
(Headquartered in Toronto, Canada)

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

May 26, 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

2014 INSPECTION OF KPMG LLP

Preface

In 2014, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm KPMG LLP ("the Firm") pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").¹

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 seven issuer audits performed by the Firm and the Firm's audit work on two other issuer audit engagements 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.

¹ The Board's inspection was conducted in cooperation with the Canadian Public Accountability Board.

PROFILE OF THE FIRM²

Number of offices	49 ³
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Number of partners	688
Number of professional staff ⁴	3,955
Number of issuer audit clients	75
Number of other issuer audits in which the Firm plays a role ⁵	48

² 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.

³ The Firm's offices are located in Abbotsford, Burnaby, Calgary, Chatham, Chilliwack, Edmonton, Elliot Lake, Fort St. John, Fredericton, Halifax, Hamilton, Kamloops, Kanata, Kelowna, Kingston, Langley, Lethbridge, London, Moncton, Montreal, North Bay, Ottawa, Parry Sound, Prince George, Quebec City, Quesnel, Regina, Saint John, Saskatoon, Sault Ste. Marie, St. Catharines, St. John's, Stratford, Sudbury, Toronto, Vancouver, Vanderhoof, Vernon, Victoria, Waterloo, Windsor, and Winnipeg, Canada.

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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).

Other names used in audit reports

KPMG LLP Chartered Accountants;
KPMG LLP Chartered Accountants,
Licensed Public Accountants; and
KPMG LLP Chartered Professional
Accountants, Licensed Public
Accountants

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from March 17, 2014 to September 19, 2014.⁶

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included reviews of portions of seven issuer audits performed by the Firm and the Firm's audit work on two other issuer audit engagements 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 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

⁶ 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.

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 relevant issuer 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.⁷

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

Issuer A

- (1) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the operating effectiveness of controls related to the valuation allowance for certain financial assets (AS No. 5, paragraphs 44, 46 and 47); and

⁷ 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.

(2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation allowance for certain financial assets (AS No. 13, paragraph 45; AU 342, paragraph 11).

Issuer B

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

Issuer C

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

Issuer D

the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation of inventory (AS No. 13, paragraph 8).

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. Standards discussed above are cited again in the table only if the particular deficiency relates to aspects of the standard that are not discussed above.

PCAOB Auditing Standards	Issuers
AS No. 5, <i>An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>	A, B, and C
AS No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	A and D
AU Section 342, <i>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,⁸ 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.

⁸ 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.

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, 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.⁹

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

⁹ 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.

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 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.¹⁰ 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;¹¹ related firm methodology, guidance, and practices; and possible root causes.

¹⁰ Not every audit deficiency suggests a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system.

¹¹ 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

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 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

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.

PORTIONS OF THE REST OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC AND ARE OMITTED
FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

PART II

* * * *

B. Issues Related to Quality Controls

The inspection of the Firm included consideration of aspects of the Firm's system of quality control.¹²

Design of Quality Control System

Independence Policies & Procedures

* * * *

Addressing Identified Independence Impairments

In considering * * * * instances * * * * of individuals failing to meet SEC independence criteria because of financial or employment relationships, the Firm employed a flawed analysis of Rule 2-01 of SEC Regulation S-X to reach the conclusion that its independence had not been impaired.

In the majority of these cases, the Firm's analyses make reference to Rule 2-01(d), which describes certain conditions under which a covered person's lack of independence does not impair the Firm's independence, but the Firm appears not to have appropriately considered whether the necessary conditions existed. In these cases, the Firm appeared to have no basis for concluding that the individual had not known of the circumstances giving rise to the lack of independence * * * * which [is] necessary for Rule 2-01(d) to operate to prevent impairment of the firm's independence.

* * * *

¹² This report's description of quality control issues is based on the inspection team's observations during the primary inspection procedures. Any changes or improvements that the Firm may have made in its system of quality control since that time may not be reflected in this report, but will be taken into account by the Board during the 12-month remediation process following the issuance of this report.

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.¹³

¹³ 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.



KPMG LLP
Bay Adelaide Centre
Suite 4600
333 Bay Street
Toronto ON
M5H 2S5

Telephone (416) 777-8500
Fax (416) 777-8818
www.kpmg.ca

Ms. Helen A. Munter
Director - Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accountability Oversight Board
1666 K Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-2803

April 1, 2016

Re: Response to Part 1 of Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) Draft Report on
2014 Inspection of KPMG LLP

Dear Ms. Munter:

We are pleased to provide our response to Part 1 of the PCAOB's Draft Report on the 2014 Inspection of KPMG LLP dated March 9, 2016 ("Draft Report") which relates to our 2013 audits of the financial statements of certain issuers and review of our quality control policies and procedures in place at the time.

We remain committed to full cooperation with the PCAOB, and to our shared objectives of continually improving audit quality, building confidence in the auditing profession and meeting our responsibilities to investors and other participants in the capital markets systems. We believe that the PCAOB's inspection process serves to assist us in identifying areas where we can continue to improve our performance and strengthen our system of audit quality control. We appreciate the professionalism and commitment of the PCAOB staff and value the important role the PCAOB plays in improving audit quality.

We have evaluated all of the matters identified in the Draft Report and addressed each engagement-specific finding in a manner consistent with PCAOB auditing standards and KPMG policies and procedures.

We remain dedicated to evaluating and improving our system of audit quality control, and monitoring audit quality. We have implemented changes to our policies and practices in order to enhance audit quality subsequent to the 2014 inspection. We understand our responsibility to the capital markets and are committed to continually improving our firm and working constructively with PCAOB to improve audit quality.

Very truly yours,

KPMG LLP

William B. Thomas, FCPA, FCA
Chief Executive Officer & Senior Partner

Kristy Carscallen, CPA, CA
Canadian Managing Partner, Audit

KPMG LLP is a Canadian limited liability partnership and a member firm of the KPMG network of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity. KPMG Canada provides services to KPMG LLP.

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.	Issuers B and 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 B 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
Relationship of Risk to the Evidence to be Obtained		
AS No. 5.46	<p>For each control selected for testing, the evidence necessary to persuade the auditor that the control is effective depends upon the risk associated with the control. The risk associated with a control consists of the risk that the control might not be effective and, if not effective, the risk that a material weakness would result. As the risk associated with the control being tested increases, the evidence that the auditor should obtain also increases.</p> <p>Note: Although the auditor must obtain evidence about the effectiveness of controls for each relevant assertion, the auditor is not responsible for obtaining sufficient evidence to support an opinion about the effectiveness of each individual control. Rather, the auditor's objective is to express an opinion on the company's internal control over financial reporting overall. This allows the auditor to vary the evidence obtained regarding the effectiveness of individual controls selected for testing based on the risk associated with the individual control.</p>	Issuer A
AS No. 5.47	<p>Factors that affect the risk associated with a control include -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The nature and materiality of misstatements that the control is intended to prevent or detect; ▪ The inherent risk associated with the related account(s) and assertion(s); 	Issuer A

AS No. 5, *An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Whether there have been changes in the volume or nature of transactions that might adversely affect control design or operating effectiveness; ▪ Whether the account has a history of errors; ▪ The effectiveness of entity-level controls, especially controls that monitor other controls; ▪ The nature of the control and the frequency with which it operates; ▪ The degree to which the control relies on the effectiveness of other controls (e.g., the control environment or information technology general controls); ▪ The competence of the personnel who perform the control or monitor its performance and whether there have been changes in key personnel who perform the control or monitor its performance; ▪ Whether the control relies on performance by an individual or is automated (i.e., an automated control would generally be expected to be lower risk if relevant information technology general controls are effective); and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: A less complex company or business unit with simple business processes and centralized accounting operations might have relatively simple information systems that make greater use of off-the-shelf packaged software without modification. In the areas in which off-the-shelf software is used, the auditor's testing of information technology controls might focus on the application controls built into the pre-packaged software that management relies on to achieve its control objectives and the IT general controls that are important to the effective operation of those application controls. ▪ The complexity of the control and the significance of the judgments that must be made in connection with its operation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note: Generally, a conclusion that a control is not operating effectively can be supported by less evidence than is necessary to support a conclusion that a control is operating effectively. 	
--	--	--

AS No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>		
RESPONSES INVOLVING the NATURE, TIMING and EXTENT OF AUDIT PROCEDURES		
AS No. 13.8	The auditor should design and perform audit procedures in a manner that addresses the assessed risks of material misstatement for each relevant assertion of each significant account and disclosure.	Issuer D
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 A

AU Section 342, <i>Auditing Accounting Estimates</i>		
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 evaluation. 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 	Issuer A

AU Section 342, *Auditing Accounting Estimates*

	<p>factors or alternative assumptions about the factors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, <i>Using the Work of a Specialist</i>). i. Test the calculations used by management to translate the assumptions and key factors into the accounting estimate. 	
--	---	--