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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, 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.
2011 INSPECTION OF PRICE WATERHOUSE (BANGALORE)

In 2011, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Price Waterhouse (Bangalore) ("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 December 7, 2011 to December 16, 2011. 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:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of offices</td>
<td>8 (Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Chennai, Gurgaon, Hyderabad, Kolkata, Mumbai, and Pune, Republic of India)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership structure</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of partners</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of professional staff</td>
<td>Approximately 6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of issuer audit clients</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3/ The number of "professional staff" shown here excludes partners and represents the number of staff, other than administrative staff, included in the network of firms in India with which the Firm is associated. The Firm has reported that the number of partners included in this network of firms in India with which the Firm is associated was 165. The information on partners and professional staff described here is provided 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.

4/ 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 ("ICFR") 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.
Number of other issuer audits in which the Firm plays a role\(^5\)

15

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audit work.\(^6\) 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").\(^7\) 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 or reporting on internal control, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

In addition, inclusion of a deficiency in an inspection report does not mean that the deficiency remained unaddressed after the inspection team brought it to the firm's

---

\(^5\) 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).

\(^6\) 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.

\(^7\) 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.
attention. Under PCAOB standards, when audit deficiencies are discovered after the
date of the audit report, a firm must take appropriate action to assess the importance of
the deficiencies to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed audit
opinions.\textsuperscript{8} 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 firm also should consider
whether there are actions the firm should take to alert another auditor that has
expressed an opinion on financial statements that the firm played a role in auditing. 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.

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included a review of aspects of the Firm's audit work
on two 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. This review did
not identify any audit performance issues that, in the inspection team's view, resulted in
the Firm failing to obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to fulfill the objectives of
its role in the engagements.

\textsuperscript{8} 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 PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over
5"), ¶ 98.
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.9/

9/ 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.
Price Waterhouse
Chartered Accountants

05 July 2012

Ms. Helen A. Munter
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
U.S.A.

Dear Ms Munter

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight's Board ("PCAOB" or the "Board") Draft Report on the 2011 Inspection of Price Waterhouse (Bangalore) (the "Firm"). This letter addresses Part I of the Draft Report - Inspection Procedures and Certain Observations. Our comments are as follows:

The Draft Report contains certain information regarding the Firm on page 2. In particular, it states that, at the outset of the inspection, the number of partners of the Firm was 20 and the number of professional staff was approximately 6,300. The ratio of partners to non partners misrepresents the true structure of the Firm. Although a footnote indicates that the number of professional staff represents the number of staff, other than administrative staff, employed by all the entities in India (regardless of whether PCAOB-registered), the number of partners referred to in the Draft Report is limited to the 20 partners in the Firm. At the time of the inspection, all of the PwC network member entities in India included 165 partners. Alternatively, the number of partners at PCAOB registered firms was 53, while the professional employees of those registered firms numbered approximately 1,750. Regardless of how the Board opts to describe the number of professionals associated with the Firm, we believe the figures should be presented on a comparable basis.

We would be pleased to discuss any aspect of our response or any further questions you may have.

Yours faithfully,

For Price Waterhouse (Bangalore)
Registered Office: Bangalore
FRN: 007568S

Sharmila A. Karve
Partner

Price Waterhouse, 252 Veer Savarkar Marg, Shivaji Park, Dadar (West), Mumbai - 400 028
T: +91 (22) 6669 1000, F: +91 (22) 6654 7800, +91 (22) 6654 7801

Head office: 5th Floor, Tower 'D', The Milennia, 1 & 2 Murphy Road, Ulsoor, Bangalore - 560 008