



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

Report on

2010 Inspection of KPMG
(Headquartered in Panama City, Republic of Panama)

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

April 29, 2011

PCAOB RELEASE NO. 104-2011-161



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 financial statement misstatements, including failures to comply with 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 apparent misstatements 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 whether an issuer's financial statements are misstated or fail to comply with Commission disclosure requirements, rests with the Commission. Any description, in this report, of financial statement misstatements or failures to comply with 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.



2010 INSPECTION OF KPMG

In 2010, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm KPMG ("the Firm"). The Board is issuing this report of that inspection in accordance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

The Act restricts the Board from publicly disclosing portions of an inspection report that discuss certain types of deficiencies or certain other nonpublic information.^{1/} Because the inspection did not identify instances of such deficiencies, and because the report does not otherwise disclose protected information, the Board is making the entire report available to the public.

^{1/} The Board has elsewhere described in detail its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions. 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") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from May 10, 2010 to May 19, 2010. These procedures were tailored to the nature of the Firm, certain aspects of which the inspection team understood at the outset of the inspection to be as follows:

Number of offices	1 (Panama City, Republic of Panama)
Ownership structure	Civil partnership (Sociedad civil)
Number of partners	10
Number of professional staff ^{2/}	159
Number of issuer audit clients ^{3/}	None
Number of other issuer audits in which the Firm plays a role ^{4/}	3

^{2/} "Professional staff" includes all personnel of the Firm, except partners or shareholders and administrative support personnel. 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 or are "associated persons" (as defined in the Act) of the Firm.

^{3/} The number of issuer audit clients shown here is based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information for inspection planning purposes. It does not reflect any Board determination concerning which, or how many, of the Firm's audit clients are "issuers" as defined in the Act. In some circumstances, a Board inspection may include a review of a firm's audit of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting of an issuer that ceased to be an audit client before the inspection, and any such former clients are not included in the number shown here.

^{4/} 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

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audit work.^{5/} To achieve that goal, Board inspections include reviews of certain aspects of selected audit work performed by the firm and reviews of other matters related to the firm's quality control system.

In the course of reviewing aspects of selected audit work, an inspection may identify ways in which particular audit work is deficient, including failures by the firm to identify, or to address appropriately, departures from U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP"), or, as applicable, International Financial Reporting Standards as issued by the International Accounting Standards Board ("IFRS").^{6/} It is not the purpose of an inspection, however, to review all of a firm's audit work or to identify every respect in which an audit performed by the firm, or in which the firm played a role, is deficient. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that the firm's audit work, or the relevant issuer 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 inspection procedures included a review of aspects of the Firm's auditing of the financial statements of one issuer audit client and the Firm's audit work on one other issuer audit engagement in which it played a role but was not principal auditor. The scope of this review was determined according to the Board's criteria, and the Firm was not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the scope. This review did not identify any audit performance issues that, in the inspection team's view, resulted in the Firm

audits, if any, in which the Firm plays a substantial role as defined in PCAOB Rule 1001(p)(ii).

^{5/} This focus on weaknesses and deficiencies 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.

^{6/} When it comes to the Board's attention that an issuer's financial statements appear not to present fairly, in a material respect, the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP or IFRS, the Board's practice is to report that information to the SEC, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

failing to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its audit opinion on the financial statements of the issuer audit client or to fulfill the objectives of its role in the other engagement.

B. Review of Quality Control System

In addition to evaluating the quality of the audit work performed, 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 the Firm's audit engagement teams of the work performed by foreign affiliates. The inspection team did not identify anything that it considered to be a quality control defect that warrants discussion in a Board inspection report.

END OF PART I

PART II

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.



KPMG
Apartado Postal 816-1089
Panamá 5, República de Panamá

Teléfono: (507) 208-0700
Fax: (507) 263-9852
Internet: www.kpmg.com

January 11, 2011

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

Re: Response to PCAOB Draft Report on 2010 Inspection of KPMG Panama

Dear Mr. Diacont:

Thank you for your letter of December 13, 2010 enclosing your Draft Report of Inspection and for giving us the opportunity to provide a written response to your draft report.

We believe the PCAOB's inspection process constitutes a valuable means to identify areas which we can continue to improve our professional performance on. We are committed to our goal of providing high quality audits and our continuous improvement in light of a changing environment.

We accept the results contained in your Draft Report which identified no audit performance issues that, in the inspection team's view, resulted in the Firm's failing to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support the opinion on the issuer's financial statements or to fulfill the objectives of its role in the other engagement. We have no additional comments to your draft Report of Inspection.

We wish to acknowledge the professionalism and courteous manner of the PCAOB inspection staff in conducting their inspection and thank them and the PCAOB for their efforts to support our mutual objectives of improving audit quality.

Yours sincerely,

Carlos Karamañites
Senior Partner

CK/alp