



1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 207-9100
Facsimile: (202) 862-8430
www.pcaobus.org

Report on
2005 Inspection of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

Issued by the
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

December 14, 2006

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. 104-2006-205



Preface to Reports Concerning Annually Inspected Firms

The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 requires the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") to conduct an annual inspection of each registered public accounting firm that regularly provides audit reports for more than 100 issuers. The Board's report on any such inspection includes this preface to provide context for information in the public portion of the report.

A Board inspection includes, among other things, a review of selected audits of financial statements and of internal control over financial reporting. If the Board inspection team identifies deficiencies in those audits, it alerts the firm to the deficiencies during the inspection process. Deficiencies that exceed a certain significance threshold are also summarized in the public portion of the Board's inspection report. The Board encourages readers to bear in mind two points concerning those reported deficiencies.

First, inclusion in an inspection report does not mean that the deficiency remained unaddressed after the inspection team brought it to the firm's attention. Under PCAOB standards, a firm must take appropriate action to assess the importance of the deficiency to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed audit opinions. Depending upon the circumstances, compliance with these 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 previously expressed audit opinions. A Board inspection does not typically include review of a firm's actions to address deficiencies identified in that inspection, but the Board expects that firms are attempting to take appropriate action, and firms frequently represent that they have taken, are taking, or will take, action. If, through subsequent inspections or other processes, the Board determines that the firm failed to take appropriate action, that failure may be grounds for a Board disciplinary sanction.

Second, the Board cautions against drawing conclusions about the comparative merits of the annually inspected firms based on the number of reported deficiencies in any given year. The total number of audits reviewed is a small portion of the total audits performed by these firms, and the frequency of deficiencies identified does not necessarily represent the frequency of deficiencies throughout the firm's practice. Moreover, if the Board discovers a potential weakness during an inspection, the Board may revise its inspection plan to target additional audits that may be affected by that weakness, and this may increase the number of deficiencies reported for that firm in that year. Such weaknesses may emerge in varying degrees at different firms in different years.



During 2005, the Board monitored the implementation of the provisions of Auditing Standard No. 2, *An Audit of Internal Control over Financial Reporting Performed in Conjunction with an Audit of Financial Statements* ("AS No. 2") by annually inspected U.S. firms. Among other things, that monitoring included Board staff meetings with these firms to discuss their methodology and to discuss opportunities to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of audits of internal control. As the Board has previously stated, the Board believes that audits performed under the difficult circumstances of the first year of implementation of AS No. 2 were often not as efficient as the standard intends, and as the Board expects them to be in future years. The primary reasons for this failure to achieve expected efficiencies are described in the Board's Report on the Initial Implementation of Auditing Standard No. 2 ("the Report").^{1/} In general, as described in the Report, in the 2005 inspections of certain firms, the Board's inspectors observed that, in a significant number of the engagements they selected for inspection of the application of AS No. 2, the auditors did not integrate their audits of internal control with their audits of the financial statements; did not use a top-down approach; and did not alter the nature, timing, and extent of their procedures to reflect the level of risk within a given area.

^{1/} See PCAOB Release No. 2005-023, Report on the Initial Implementation of Auditing Standard No. 2, *An Audit of Internal Control over Financial Reporting Performed in Conjunction with an Audit of Financial Statements* (November 30, 2005).



Notes Concerning this Report

1. Portions of this report may describe deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct of the firm that is the subject of this report. The express inclusion of certain deficiencies and potential deficiencies, however, should not be construed to support any negative inference that any other aspect of the firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct is approved or condoned by the Board or judged by the Board to comply with laws, rules, and professional standards.
2. Any references in this report to violations or potential violations of law, rules, or professional standards should be understood in the supervisory context in which this report was prepared. Any such references are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings of fact or of violations for purposes of imposing legal liability. Similarly, any description herein of a firm's cooperation in addressing issues constructively should not be construed, and is not construed by the Board, as an admission, for purposes of potential legal liability, of any violation.
3. Board inspections encompass, among other things, whether the firm has failed to identify departures from U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") or Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") disclosure requirements in its audits of financial statements. This report's descriptions of any such auditing failures necessarily involve descriptions of the related GAAP or disclosure departures. The Board, however, has no authority to prescribe the form or content of an issuer's financial statements. That authority, and the authority to make binding determinations concerning an issuer's compliance with GAAP or Commission disclosure requirements, rests with the Commission. Any description, in this report, of perceived departures from GAAP or Commission disclosure requirements should not be understood as an indication that the Commission has considered or made any determination regarding these issues unless otherwise expressly stated.



2005 INSPECTION OF PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS LLP

In 2005, the Board conducted an inspection of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP ("PwC" or "the Firm"). The Board is today issuing this report of that inspection in accordance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

The Board is making portions of the report publicly available. Specifically, the Board is releasing to the public Part I of the report, Appendix B, and portions of Appendix C. Appendix B provides an overview of the inspection process. Appendix C includes the Firm's comments, if any, on a draft of the report.^{2/}

The Board has elsewhere described in detail its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions.^{3/} A substantial portion of the Board's criticisms of a firm (specifically criticisms of the firm's quality control system), and the Board's dialogue with the firm about those criticisms, occurs out of public view, unless the firm fails to make progress to the Board's satisfaction in addressing those criticisms. In addition, the Board generally does not disclose otherwise nonpublic information, learned through inspections, about the firm or its clients. Accordingly, information in those categories generally does not appear in the publicly available portion of an inspection report.

^{2/} The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report. 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.

^{3/} See Statement Concerning the Issuance of Inspection Reports, PCAOB Release No. 104-2004-001 (August 26, 2004).

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") performed an inspection of the Firm from July 2005 to March 2006. The inspection team performed field work at the Firm's National Office and at 16 of its approximately 65 U.S. practice offices.

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audits. To achieve that goal, Board inspections include reviews of certain aspects of selected audits performed by the firm and reviews of other matters related to the firm's quality control system. Appendix B to this report provides a description of the steps the inspection team took with respect to the review of audits of financial statements and of internal control over financial reporting and the review of eight functional areas related to quality control.

In the course of reviewing aspects of selected audits, an inspection may identify ways in which a particular audit is deficient, including failures by the firm to identify, or to address appropriately, respects in which an issuer's financial statements do not present fairly the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP.^{4/} It is not the purpose of an inspection, however, to review all of a firm's audits or to identify every respect in which a reviewed audit is deficient. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that the firm's audits, or its issuer clients' financial statements or reporting on internal control, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The scope of the inspection procedures performed included reviews of aspects of selected audits of financial statements and of internal control over financial reporting performed by the Firm. Those audits and aspects were selected according to the

^{4/} When the Board becomes aware 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 GAAP, the Board's practice is to report that information to the SEC, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

Board's criteria, and the Firm was not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the selection process.

In reviewing the audits, the inspection team identified matters that it considered to be audit deficiencies. Those deficiencies included failures by the Firm to identify or appropriately address errors in the issuer's application of GAAP. The deficiencies also included failures by the Firm to perform, or to perform sufficiently, certain necessary audit procedures.

In some cases, the conclusion that the Firm failed to perform a procedure may be based on the absence of documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence, even if the Firm claims to have performed the procedure. PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 3 ("AS No. 3"), in effect for most of the audits reviewed in the inspection,^{5/} 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.^{6/} For purposes of the inspection, an observation that the Firm did not perform a procedure, obtain evidence, or reach an appropriate conclusion may be based on the absence of such documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence.

When audit deficiencies are identified after the date of the audit report, PCAOB standards require a firm to take appropriate actions to assess the importance of the deficiencies to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed opinions,^{7/} and failure to take such actions could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions. In response to the inspection team's identification of deficiencies, the Firm, in some cases, performed additional procedures or supplemented its work papers. In some instances in which the inspection team identified GAAP departures, follow-up between the Firm

^{5/} Auditing Standard No. 3, *Audit Documentation*, applies to audits with respect to fiscal years ending on or after November 15, 2004.

^{6/} See AS No. 3, paragraph 9; Appendix A to AS No. 3, paragraph A28.

^{7/} See AU 390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and AU 561, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report* (both included among the PCAOB's interim auditing standards, pursuant to PCAOB Rule 3200T).

and the issuer led to a change in the issuer's accounting or disclosure practices or led to representations related to prospective changes.^{8/}

In some cases, 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 competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements. In some of those audits, that conclusion followed from the omission, or insufficient performance, of a single procedure, while other audits included more than one such failure. The deficiencies that reached this degree of significance are described below (without identifying the issuers).^{9/} The deficiencies are discussed here on an audit-by-audit basis.

Issuer A

In this audit, the Firm failed in the following respects to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its audit opinion –

- The Firm failed to perform sufficient procedures to test revenue and accounts receivable. Specifically, the Firm did not test a sufficient sample of sales and cash receipt transactions during the three-month period between the date as of which interim audit procedures were performed and the issuer's fiscal year end to achieve an appropriate level of assurance. The Firm's sample was approximately one-tenth of the sample size that the Firm later determined was necessary. In addition, the Firm failed to test certain journal entries made during that period that significantly increased accounts receivable. Furthermore, there was no evidence in the audit documentation, and no persuasive other evidence, that the Firm had obtained corroboration of explanations provided by management for significant unexpected fluctuations

^{8/} The Board inspection process generally did not include review of such additional procedures or documentation, or of such revised accounting, although future Board inspections of the Firm may, as appropriate, include further review of any of these matters.

^{9/} 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.

that the Firm had identified when performing substantive analytical procedures over revenues.

- The Firm failed to test the fair value of warrants and stock-based compensation issued in two significant transactions during the year.^{10/}
- The Firm failed to perform adequate testing of the valuation assertion for inventory. Specifically, the Firm did not test certain items that were included in the sample it selected for testing, and did not examine sufficient invoices or perform other procedures to evaluate the issuer's application of standard costs to its inventory. In addition, the Firm did not test the assumptions and underlying data that the issuer used to determine its reserve for inventory obsolescence.

Issuer B

The issuer recorded an impairment charge related to goodwill in its third-quarter financial statements. The Firm failed to perform sufficient procedures related to the impairment charge. Specifically,

- There was no evidence in the audit documentation, and no persuasive other evidence, that the Firm had performed procedures to test the assumptions and underlying data that management used to calculate the impairment charge, including the allocation of goodwill to reporting units.
- The Firm failed to obtain evidence regarding the fair value of certain assets and liabilities of the impaired reporting unit, including evidence as to the existence and valuation of other intangible assets that existed as of the date of the impairment test.

Issuer C

In this audit, the Firm relied on monitoring controls over accounts receivable and revenue, and therefore reduced its substantive audit procedures. The Firm, however, failed to establish a sufficient basis for reliance on system-generated reports that

^{10/} The issuer has restated its financial statements related to the matter discussed here as well as other matters.

management used to carry out its monitoring control activities. The Firm did not test the related application controls or perform tests of details on the reports.

Issuer D

In this audit, the Firm failed in the following respects to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its audit opinion –

- The Firm failed to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation and existence assertions related to certain portions of the inventory. The deficiencies included:
 - a. The failure to test certain key factors used in calculating the LIFO cost of the inventory;
 - b. The failure to perform inventory price testing;
 - c. The failure to perform substantive procedures on the activity in inventory, at a location that the Firm had selected for testing, between the date as of which interim audit procedures were performed and the issuer's fiscal year end;
 - d. The failure to establish a precise expectation, and to appropriately investigate or evaluate significant differences, when performing substantive analytical procedures; and
 - e. The failure to test certain assumptions and underlying data used to calculate the inventory obsolescence reserve.
- The Firm relied on substantive analytical procedures in its tests of revenue, but failed to test the reliability and accuracy of the data it used to establish its expectations and failed to obtain corroboration of the issuer's explanations of significant differences.

Issuer E

In this audit, the Firm failed to perform sufficient procedures to test revenue, as the Firm's calculated sample size was insufficient to achieve the desired level of assurance. The sample represented approximately three-fourths of the sample size that the Firm later determined was necessary.

Issuer F

In this audit, the Firm failed to perform sufficient procedures to test inventory, fixed assets, and accounts payable. For inventory, the Firm's sample size was insufficient because it was calculated using a threshold for materiality that, as the Firm later determined, was higher than appropriate. This resulted in a sample size that was approximately one-half of the sample size that the Firm later determined was necessary. For fixed assets, the Firm failed to test a sufficient number of items to obtain the desired level of assurance (and failed to test items representing one-third of the sample size that the Firm had determined was necessary). For accounts payable, the Firm failed to identify the appropriate categories of payments subsequent to year end to test and failed to calculate the sample size correctly.

Issuer G

In this audit, the Firm failed in the following respects to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its audit opinion –

- The Firm failed to test the fair values of marketable securities, beyond obtaining a confirmation from the investment broker.
- The Firm failed to perform sufficient, in order to achieve the desired levels of assurance, tests of details to assess the completeness and accuracy assertions with respect to purchases.
- The Firm relied on reports generated by a service organization, but did not either obtain the service auditor's report on the controls at the service organization or test the data contained in the reports.

Issuer H

In this audit, the Firm failed to perform sufficient procedures on the activity in accounts receivable between the date as of which interim audit procedures were performed and the issuer's fiscal year end. The Firm's audit procedures during the three-month roll-forward period were limited to cut-off procedures and a high-level fluctuation analysis.

Issuer I

In this audit, the Firm failed in the following respects to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its audit opinion –

- The Firm failed to perform sufficient tests of the valuation of inventory, as the Firm did not test management's assumptions or the completeness of the data that management used when estimating the net realizable value of the inventory.
- The Firm limited its tests of the existence and accuracy of accounts receivable to tests of controls and analytical procedures. The analytical procedures did not qualify as substantive analytical procedures because there was no evidence in the audit documentation, and no persuasive other evidence, that the Firm had established precise enough expectations or obtained corroboration of management's explanations of certain significant differences. Further, the Firm failed to perform other substantive tests of significant receivables.
- The Firm failed to test the underlying data that the Firm's internal specialists used to develop independent estimates of the issuer's self-insurance reserves.

B. Review of Quality Control System

In addition to evaluating the quality of the audit work performed on specific audits, the inspection included review of certain of the Firm's practices, policies, and procedures related to audit quality. This review addressed 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 U.S. audit engagement teams of the work performed by foreign affiliates on foreign operations of U.S. issuer audit clients. Any defects in, or criticisms of, the Firm's quality control system are discussed in the nonpublic portion of this report



and will remain nonpublic unless the Firm fails to address them to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the date of this report.

END OF PART I



PART II, PART III, AND APPENDIX A OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC
AND ARE OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Appendix B

The Inspection Process

The inspection process was designed and performed to provide a basis for assessing the degree of compliance of the Firm with applicable requirements and standards related to auditing issuers. This process included reviews of components of selected issuer audit engagements completed by the Firm. These reviews were intended both to identify deficiencies, if any, in the conduct of those audits and to determine whether the results of those audits indicated deficiencies in the design or operation of the Firm's system of quality control over audits. In addition, the inspection included reviews of the design of, and in some cases the application of, policies and procedures related to certain functional areas of the Firm that could be expected to influence audit quality.

1. Review of Selected Audit Engagements

The inspection team reviewed aspects of selected audits performed by the Firm. The inspection team chose the engagements according to the Board's criteria. The Firm was not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the engagement selection process or any other aspect of the review.

For each audit engagement selected, the inspection team reviewed the issuer's financial statements and certain SEC filings. The inspection team selected certain higher-risk areas for review and, at the practice offices, inspected the engagement team's work papers and interviewed engagement personnel regarding those areas. The areas subject to review included, but were not limited to, revenues, reserves or estimated liabilities, derivatives, income taxes, related party transactions, supervision of work performed by foreign affiliates, assessment of risk by the audit team, and testing and documentation of internal controls by the audit team. The inspection team also analyzed potential adjustments to the issuer's financial statements that had been identified during the audit but not recorded in the financial statements. For certain selected engagements, the inspection team reviewed written communications between the Firm and the issuer's audit committee. With respect to certain engagements, the inspection team also interviewed the chairperson of the issuer's audit committee.

The inspection team also reviewed aspects of certain of the Firm's audits of internal control over financial reporting. For each audit engagement selected for this purpose, the inspection team reviewed the Firm's work papers and interviewed engagement personnel regarding the audit approach, including the use of a top-down

approach, the assessment of risk, the evaluation of management's assessment of internal control, and the integration of the audit of internal control over financial reporting with the audit of the financial statements. The inspection team also selected certain significant processes and, for those processes, reviewed the Firm's evaluation of the design effectiveness of controls, including the performance of walkthroughs, and the performance of tests of operating effectiveness of controls. For the selected engagements, the inspection team also reviewed the Firm's evaluation of any control deficiencies that the Firm identified during the Firm's audit of the issuer's financial statements.

When the inspection team identified a potential issue, it discussed the issue with members of the engagement team. If the inspection team was unable to resolve the issue through this discussion and any review of additional work papers or other documentation, the inspection team issued a comment form on the matter and the Firm provided a written response to the comment form. In certain instances, if the inspection team was unable to resolve the issue through these processes, the inspection team requested that the engagement team consult with the Firm's National Office. In many cases, this process resulted in resolution of the matter, either because the Firm agreed with the position the inspection team had taken and the Firm or the issuer took steps in light of the significance of the error to remedy the exception, or because the Firm was able to provide additional information that effectively addressed the inspection team's concerns.

2. Review of Eight Functional Areas

The inspection team conducted the procedures related to the review of the eight functional areas primarily at the Firm's National Office. With respect to seven of the eight functional areas, the inspection team also conducted procedures at certain of the Firm's practice offices. The inspection team performed these procedures both to identify possible defects in the Firm's system of quality control and, where applicable, to update the Board's knowledge of the Firm's policies and procedures in the eight functional areas. A more detailed description of the scope with respect to each of the eight functional areas follows.

a. Review of Partner Evaluation, Compensation, Admission, Assignment of Responsibilities, and Disciplinary Actions

The inspection team reviewed the Firm's policies and procedures related to partner evaluation, partner compensation, nomination and admission of new partners, assignment of responsibilities, disciplinary actions, and termination of partners. The

objective of the inspection procedures was to assess whether the design of these processes, as documented and communicated, could be expected to encourage an appropriate emphasis on audit quality and technical competence, as compared to marketing or other activities of the Firm.

The inspection team interviewed fifteen members of the Firm's leadership at its National Office, as well as members of leadership and audit partners in practice offices, regarding these topics. In addition, the inspection team analyzed schedules provided by the Firm that detailed information on each partner, including the partner's office location and recent evaluation history. The inspection team also reviewed a sample of partners' evaluations, including evaluations of newly admitted partners, partners who resigned or took early retirement, and partners who received bonus compensation.

b. Review of Independence Policies

The objectives of the inspection procedures in this area included evaluating the Firm's policies and procedures relating to its compliance with independence requirements with respect to the provision of non-audit services to issuer audit clients; Firm participation in business ventures, alliances, and arrangements; commissions and contingent fee arrangements; personal financial interests and the relationships of Firm professionals with issuer audit clients; and the provision of non-audit services related to issuer audit clients' compliance with Section 404 of the Act. To accomplish these objectives, the inspection team reviewed the Firm's policies, procedures, guidance, and training materials pertaining to these independence matters. The inspection team also reviewed the Firm's internal inspection program as it relates to monitoring compliance with the Firm's independence policies and procedures; tested the Firm's independence consultation process; and reviewed information concerning the Firm's existing business ventures, alliances, and arrangements, as well as the Firm's process for establishing such enterprises. The inspection team also interviewed numerous National Office and practice office personnel regarding the Firm's independence policies, practices, and procedures.

At the practice offices, the inspection team selected a sample from the engagements it reviewed and, for that sample, reviewed relevant information to identify any non-audit services performed for the issuer, including whether any of the services involved commissions or contingent fee arrangements; to determine whether the fees for the services provided were classified appropriately in the issuer's proxy statement; and to determine whether the Firm was involved in any business ventures, alliances, or arrangements with the issuer. In addition, for the sample, the inspection team read and evaluated the most recent letter pursuant to Independence Standards Board Standard

No. 1, *Independence Discussions with Audit Committees.*

c. Review of Client Acceptance and Retention Policies

The objectives of the inspection procedures in this area were to evaluate whether the Firm's client acceptance and retention policies and procedures reasonably assure that it is not associated with issuers whose management lacks integrity, that it undertakes only engagements within its professional competence, and that it appropriately considers the risks involved in accepting and retaining clients in the particular circumstances. Toward those objectives, the inspection team reviewed the Firm's policies, procedures, and forms related to client acceptance and continuance; evaluated documentation related to new clients and to clients that had recently changed auditors from the Firm; and interviewed members of the Firm's leadership.

At the practice offices, the inspection team selected a sample from the engagements it reviewed and, for that sample, evaluated whether the client acceptance or continuance documentation was completed and approved in accordance with Firm policies; interviewed the audit partners and managers on these engagements concerning the reasons for accepting the issuer as a client or continuing to serve the issuer, the approval process, and whether specific risk mitigation steps were performed and documented in response to any identified risks; and assessed whether the audit planning documentation incorporated the specific actions, if any, contemplated in response to any identified risks.

d. Review of Practices for Consultations

The objective of the inspection procedures in this area was to assess the Firm's compliance with professional requirements regarding consultations on accounting, auditing, and SEC matters. Toward this objective, the inspection team gained an understanding of and evaluated the Firm's policies and procedures relating to its consultation process. The inspection team also reviewed a sample of consultations that occurred during the inspection period to evaluate the effectiveness of the Firm's consultation process, the Firm's compliance with its policies and procedures, whether the conclusions were in accordance with professional standards, and whether the engagement teams acted in accordance with the conclusions.

e. Review of Internal Inspection Program

The objectives of the inspection procedures in this area were to evaluate the effectiveness of the Firm's annual internal inspection program in enhancing audit

quality, as well as to assess the Firm's compliance with the quality control standards adopted by the Board. To meet those objectives, the inspection team reviewed policies, procedures, guidance, and forms related to the Firm's internal inspection program, documentation of the results of the current year's inspection program, and steps the Firm took in response to those results. The inspection team also interviewed the Firm's leadership concerning the process and effectiveness of its internal inspection program.

The inspection team reviewed and tested the conduct of the internal inspection program by performing field work in two practice offices where the Firm had conducted internal inspections. These procedures included evaluating the qualifications of the Firm's inspectors, reading the inspectors' comments, reviewing the results of the inspectors' review of certain Firm-wide functional areas, and interviewing both regional leadership and selected audit personnel concerning the internal inspection program. In addition, for a sample of the engagements that the internal inspectors had reviewed at these practice offices, the inspection team reviewed documentation of the internal inspectors' review of the engagements, reviewed certain aspects of the audit work papers, and discussed with the Firm any significant differences in the results of the inspection team's review and that of the Firm's internal inspectors.

f. Review of Practices for Establishment and Communication of Audit Policies, Procedures, and Methodologies, Including Training

The objectives of the inspection procedures in this area were to update the inspection team's understanding of the Firm's processes for establishing and communicating audit policies, procedures, and methodologies, including training; to evaluate whether the design of these processes could be expected to promote audit quality and enhance compliance; and to evaluate changes in audit policies that the Firm had made since the Board's most recent inspection of the Firm.

Toward those objectives, the inspection team reviewed documentation relating to the Firm's method for developing policies and procedures, as well as internal guidance and/or training materials distributed to audit personnel with respect to recent changes in requirements and with respect to selected specific areas. The inspection team also evaluated the effectiveness of the design of the Firm's processes for monitoring developments that could affect the Firm's audit policies, procedures, and methodologies.

g. Review of Policies Related to Foreign Affiliates

The objective of the inspection procedures in this area was to evaluate the processes the Firm uses to ensure that the audit work that its foreign affiliates perform on the foreign operations of U.S. issuers is effective and in accordance with standards established by the Board. Except for one issuer where the inspection team requested access, which the Firm provided, the inspection team did not inspect the audit work of foreign affiliates; rather, the inspection procedures in this area were limited to the supervision and control exercised by the U.S. engagement team over such work.

To accomplish this objective, the inspection team reviewed the Firm's policies and procedures related to its supervision and control of work performed by foreign affiliates on the foreign operations of U.S. issuer clients; analyzed audit guidance related to planning and administering multi-location engagements; and reviewed available information relating to the most recent foreign affiliated firms' internal inspections. In addition, the inspection team interviewed members of the Firm's leadership with responsibility for oversight of the work performed by foreign affiliates on foreign operations of U.S. issuer clients. Finally, with respect to a sample of the engagements reviewed, the inspection team reviewed the U.S. engagement team's supervision and control procedures concerning the audit work that the Firm's foreign affiliates performed.

h. Review of Tone at the Top

The objective of the review of the Firm's "tone at the top" was to assess whether actions and communications by the Firm's leadership demonstrate a commitment to audit quality and compliance with the Act, the rules of the Board, the rules of the SEC, and PCAOB standards in connection with the Firm's performance of audits, issuance of audit reports, and related matters involving issuers. Toward that end, the inspection team reviewed and analyzed information at the Firm's National Office. Such information included the Firm's code of conduct; documents relating to measuring and monitoring audit quality; descriptions of the duties of, and relationships between and among, the Firm's staff and leadership; results of surveys of staff and clients; public company audit proposals; internal and external communications from management; and agendas and minutes of the Firm's Board of Partners. In addition, the inspection team interviewed numerous members of the Firm's leadership team.

The inspection team conducted interviews at 15 of the Firm's practice offices to obtain perspectives on communications from the Firm's leadership relating to audit quality and tone at the top. The inspection team interviewed members of the leadership



at certain of these offices, as well as certain audit partners and senior managers assigned to engagements that were reviewed.

APPENDIX C

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/} In any version of this report that the Board makes publicly available, any portions of the Firm's response that address nonpublic portions of the report are omitted. In some cases, the result may be that none of the Firm's response is made publicly available.



PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
400 Campus Drive
Florham Park, NJ 07932
Telephone (973) 238 4000
Facsimile (973) 238 5000
www.pwc.com

November 28, 2006

Mr. George H. Diacont
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Re: PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP Response to Draft Report on 2005 Inspection of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

Dear Mr. Diacont:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's (the "PCAOB" or the "Board") Draft Report on 2005 Inspection of PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (the "Report").

At PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (the "Firm"), the focus on audit quality continues to be our highest priority. In that context, we have carefully considered the findings included in Part I of the 2005 Inspection Report. In accordance with both our own policies and PCAOB standards, for those engagements identified in Part I of the Report, we have addressed each of the specific findings raised in the Report and, where necessary, performed additional procedures or enhanced the related audit documentation.

While we believe that we are efficiently executing quality audits, we take seriously the findings identified by the Board during the 2005 inspection of our 2004 audit engagements and we plan to incorporate the related recommendations into our ongoing audit quality efforts. As part of our commitment to high audit quality, we have continued to implement enhancements to our audit methodology and delivery, including conducting extensive training, making significant improvements to our technology, increasing our own internal review processes, and hiring more resources. Due to the cyclical nature of the inspection process, many of these enhancements were made over the past year and a half and therefore are not reflected in the results of the 2005 inspection.

We appreciate the constructive dialogue that we have had with the PCAOB Inspection Staff in connection with the inspection process. Further, we support the Board's efforts to consider, develop, and update, as appropriate, professional standards related to integrated audits of the financial statements of publicly-registered companies. Additionally, we wish to underscore that our Firm is committed to executing efficient and effective integrated audits, and we welcome your input in this regard.

* * * * *

Section B. of Appendix B of the Report summarizes the Board's review of eight functional areas of the Firm, and Part II of the Report summarizes the Board's findings in these areas. As we commented above, audit quality



remains our Firm's highest priority and, to that end, we will continue to fully consider the Board's observations and recommendations. We recognize that a commitment to high audit quality means consistently executing audits that apply our own policies and PCAOB standards. We look forward to an ongoing candid and constructive dialogue with the Inspection Staff, on both the Report's findings and the many substantive actions we have taken and will continue to take.

* * * * *

We appreciate having this opportunity to formally express our views. We would be pleased to discuss any aspect of our response or to address any other questions you may have.

Sincerely,

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP