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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 or 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.
INSPECTION OF ZAO PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS AUDIT

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") has conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm ZAO PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit ("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 Board is making portions of the report publicly available. Specifically, 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.¹

The Board has elsewhere described in detail its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions.² 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.

¹ 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 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.

### PART I

**INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS**

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from June 1, 2009 to June 12, 2009. 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of offices</td>
<td>6 (Ekaterinburg, Kazan, Moscow, St. Petersburg, Togliatti, and Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russian Federation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership structure</td>
<td>Closed joint stock company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of partners</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of professional staff&lt;sup&gt;3/&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of issuer audit clients&lt;sup&gt;4/&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of other issuer audits in which the Firm plays a role&lt;sup&gt;5/&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>3/</sup> "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.

<sup>4/</sup> 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 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.

<sup>5/</sup> 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.\textsuperscript{6} 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").\textsuperscript{7} 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, 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 audit work on four issuer audit engagements in which it played a role but was not the 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.

\textsuperscript{6} This focus 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.

\textsuperscript{7} When it comes to the Board's attention that an issuer's financial statements appear not to present fairly, in a material respect, the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with 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.
The inspection team identified what it considered to be audit deficiencies. The deficiencies included deficiencies of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that, in two of the audits performed by the Firm in which the Firm played a role but was not the principal auditor, the Firm did not obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to fulfill the objectives of its role in the audits.8/ Those deficiencies were –

(1) the failure to appropriately establish audit planning materiality and appropriately allocate materiality to individual components;

(2) the failure to perform sufficient audit procedures to test accounts receivable;

(3) the failure to perform audit procedures to test credit balances in accounts receivable;

(4) the failure, in two audits, to perform sufficient audit procedures to test revenue; and

(5) the failure to perform sufficient audit procedures in connection with using the work of a specialist.

8/ In some cases, an inspection team’s observation that a firm failed to perform a procedure may be based on the absence of documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence, even if a firm claims to have performed the procedure. PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 3, Audit Documentation (“AS No. 3”), provides that, in various circumstances including PCAOB inspections, a firm that has not adequately documented that it performed a procedure, obtained evidence, or reached an appropriate conclusion must demonstrate with persuasive other evidence that it did so, and that oral assertions and explanations alone do not constitute persuasive other evidence. See AS No. 3, paragraph 9; Appendix A to AS No. 3, paragraph A28. 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.
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. 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
PARTS II AND III OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC
AND ARE OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT
PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the Firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the Firm’s response, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.\footnote{In any version of an inspection report that the Board makes publicly available, any portions of a firm’s response that address nonpublic portions of the report are omitted. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm’s response is made publicly available.}
4 October 2010

Mr. George H. Diacont
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1966 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C., 20006
U.S.A.

Re: ZAO PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit - Response to Draft Report on 2009 Inspection

Dear Mr. Diacont:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board’s ("PCAOB") Draft Report on the 2009 Inspection of our Firm’s 2008 audit work on subsidiaries of certain issuers.

We strongly support the PCAOB’s efforts. The communication and interaction between the PCAOB Inspection Staff and our Firm during and after this initial inspection were helpful and have contributed to our overall efforts to execute consistent, quality audits. As a firm that is committed to quality, we continue to enhance our extensive audit training and our internal control systems and processes. While these internal efforts continuously reinforce audit quality, we value the PCAOB’s input in this regard.

We have considered each of the findings included in Part I - Inspection Procedures and Certain Observations of your Draft Report on the 2009 Inspection. We would note that the findings included therein have been addressed in actions that we have taken and continue to take in our ongoing efforts to achieve a consistently high level of audit quality. Furthermore, as to the above-mentioned findings, where we believed it appropriate, we have performed additional audit procedures in accordance with relevant auditing standards or added clarifying documentation to the working papers. It should be noted that these additional procedures did not change our original conclusions.

We appreciate the opportunity to formally respond to the PCAOB’s Report and look forward to continuing to work with the PCAOB in support of our commitment to audit quality. We would be pleased to discuss any aspect of our response or any questions which you may have.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

ZAO PricewaterhouseCoopers Audit