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Preface

In 2014, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Ernst & Young 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 two issuer audits performed by the Firm and the Firm’s audit work on one other issuer audit engagement 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 Audit Quality Review Team of the Financial Reporting Council of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
PROFILE OF THE FIRM

Number of offices 23

Ownership structure Limited liability partnership

Number of partners 583

Number of professional staff 9,276

Number of issuer audit clients 9

Number of other issuer audits in which the Firm plays a role 193

---

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.


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).
PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from September 15, 2014 to September 26, 2014 and from October 13, 2014 to October 24, 2014.\(^6\)

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included reviews of portions of two issuer audits performed by the Firm and the Firm’s audit work on one other issuer audit engagement 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 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 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

the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over revenue, accounts receivables and property, plant, and equipment and, in the financial statement audit, as a result of the unsupported level of reliance on controls, the failure to perform sufficient substantive procedures to test revenue, accounts receivables and property, plant, and equipment (AS No. 5, paragraphs 42 and 44; AS No. 13, paragraphs 16, 18 and 37).

\(^7\) 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.
Issuer B

(1) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over revenue, cash, accounts receivables, and inventory (AS No. 5, paragraphs 18, 42, 44, and B10; AU 322, paragraphs .24, .25, and .26); and

(2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test revenue, cash, accounts receivables, and inventory (AS No. 9, paragraphs 11 and 12; 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCAOB Auditing Standards</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 5, <em>An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</em></td>
<td>A and B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 9, <em>Audit Planning</em></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 13, <em>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</em></td>
<td>A and B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU 322, <em>The Auditor’s Consideration of the Internal Audit Function in an Audit of Financial Statements</em></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Inspectors 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, 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. 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.

---

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.
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.\footnote{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 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.

\footnote{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.}
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.\(^\text{10}\) 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;\(^\text{11}\) related firm methodology, guidance, and practices; and possible root causes.

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

\(^{10}\) 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 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.
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
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.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{12}\) 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.
Ms. Helen A. Muntix
Director, Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1966 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-2903

4 March 2016
Tel. 800-792-0002
Fax. 202-863-0756
Email: helen.muntix@pcasb.com

Dear Ms. Muntix,

Response to Part 1 of the Draft Report on the 2014 Inspection of Ernst & Young LLP

We are pleased to provide our initial response to Part 1 of the draft inspection report (the Report) from the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (the Board or PCAOB) pertaining to the 2014 inspection of Ernst & Young LLP.

Our overriding objective is to make certain that all aspects of our auditing and quality control processes are of the highest quality for the continued benefit of the capital markets in which the public participates and on which they rely. The PCAOB's inspection process assists us in achieving that objective.

We respect the PCAOB's inspection process and understand that judgments are involved in performing audits, as well as in subsequent inspections of those audits. We have thoroughly evaluated all matters described in Part I, Inspection Procedures and Certain Observations of the Report, and have taken actions, where appropriate, in accordance with PCAOB standards and our policies. Those actions did not change our original audit conclusions, nor did the actions affect our reports on the issuers' financial statements.

We will continue to work with the Director of the Division of Registration and Inspections and her staff over the twelve-month period following the issuance of the final inspection report. We are committed to working with the PCAOB to continue to strengthen our audit quality control system.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our response to the Report and look forward to continuing to work with the PCAOB on matters of interest to our U.S. SEC issuer auditing practice.
We request that the attachment to this cover letter not be made public.

Yours faithfully

[Signature]

Ernst & Young LLP
United Kingdom

Cc [Redacted], FRC

* As a matter of policy, the PCAOB makes reasonable efforts to redact from firms' responses to draft inspection reports personal identifying information about individuals not associated with the firm.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLANNING THE AUDIT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Using the Work of Others</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 5.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For purposes of using the work of others, competence means the attainment and maintenance of a level of understanding and knowledge that enables that person to perform ably the tasks assigned to them, and objectivity means the ability to perform those tasks impartially and with intellectual honesty. To assess competence, the auditor should evaluate factors about the person’s qualifications and ability to perform the work the auditor plans to use. To assess objectivity, the auditor should evaluate whether factors are present that either inhibit or promote a person’s ability to perform with the necessary degree of objectivity the work.
### AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>the auditor plans to use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: The auditor should not use the work of persons who have a low degree of objectivity, regardless of their level of competence. Likewise, the auditor should not use the work of persons who have a low level of competence regardless of their degree of objectivity. Personnel whose core function is to serve as a testing or compliance authority at the company, such as internal auditors, normally are expected to have greater competence and objectivity in performing the type of work that will be useful to the auditor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TESTING CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing Design Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing Operating Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuers A and B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements

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.

### APPENDIX B - Special Topics

**MULTIPLE LOCATIONS SCOPING DECISIONS**

**AS No. 5.B10**

In determining the locations or business units at which to perform tests of controls, the auditor should assess the risk of material misstatement to the financial statements associated with the location or business unit and correlate the amount of audit attention devoted to the location or business unit with the degree of risk.

Note: The auditor may eliminate from further consideration locations or business units that, individually or when aggregated with others, do not present a reasonable possibility of material misstatement to the company's consolidated financial statements.

Issuer B

### AS No. 9, Audit Planning

**Planning an Audit**

**MULTI-LOCATION ENGAGEMENTS**

**AS No. 9.11**

In an audit of the financial statements of a company with operations in multiple locations or business units, the auditor should determine the extent to which audit procedures should be performed at selected locations or business units to obtain sufficient appropriate evidence to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the consolidated financial statements are free of material misstatement. This includes determining the locations or business units at which to perform audit procedures, as

Issuer B
### AS No. 9, Audit Planning

well as the nature, timing, and extent of the procedures to be performed at those individual locations or business units. The auditor should assess the risks of material misstatement to the consolidated financial statements associated with the location or business unit and correlate the amount of audit attention devoted to the location or business unit with the degree of risk of material misstatement associated with that location or business unit.

#### Footnote to AS No. 9.11

13/ The term “business units” includes subsidiaries, divisions, branches, components, or investments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS No. 9.12</th>
<th>Factors that are relevant to the assessment of the risks of material misstatement associated with a particular location or business unit and the determination of the necessary audit procedures include:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>The nature and amount of assets, liabilities, and transactions executed at the location or business unit, including, e.g., significant transactions executed at the location or business unit that are outside the normal course of business for the company, or that otherwise appear to be unusual given the auditor's understanding of the company and its environment; 14/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>The materiality of the location or business unit; 15/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>The specific risks associated with the location or business unit that present a reasonable possibility 16/ of material misstatement to the company's consolidated financial statements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Whether the risks of material misstatement associated with the location or business unit apply to other locations or business units such that, in combination, they present a reasonable possibility of material misstatement to the company's consolidated financial statements;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AS No. 9, Audit Planning

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>The degree of centralization of records or information processing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>The effectiveness of the control environment, particularly with respect to management's control over the exercise of authority delegated to others and its ability to effectively supervise activities at the location or business unit; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>The frequency, timing, and scope of monitoring activities by the company or others at the location or business unit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** When performing an audit of internal control over financial reporting, refer to Appendix B, Special Topics, of Auditing Standard No. 5 for considerations when a company has multiple locations or business units.

---

**Footnotes to AS No. 9.12**

14/ Paragraph .66 of AU sec. 316, *Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit.*

15/ Paragraph 10 of Auditing Standard No. 11 describes the consideration of materiality in planning and performing audit procedures at an individual location or business unit.

16/ There is a reasonable possibility of an event, as used in this standard, when the likelihood of the event is either "reasonably possible" or "probable," as those terms are used in the FASB Accounting Standards Codification, Contingencies Topic, paragraph 450-20-25-1.

17/ Paragraphs B10-B16 of Auditing Standard No. 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS No. 13, <em>The Auditor’s Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responses Involving the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Audit Procedures</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS No. 13.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TESTING CONTROLS IN AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS No. 13.16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes to AS No. 13.16**

12/ Reliance on controls that is supported by sufficient and appropriate audit evidence allows the auditor to assess control risk at less than the maximum, which results in a lower assessed risk of material misstatement. In turn, this allows the auditor to modify the nature, timing, and extent of planned substantive procedures.

13/ Terms defined in Appendix A, *Definitions*, are set in **boldface type** the first time they appear.

| AS No. 13.18 | *Evidence about the Effectiveness of Controls in the Audit of Financial Statements.* In designing and performing tests of controls for the audit of financial statements, the evidence necessary to support the auditor’s control risk assessment depends on the degree of reliance the auditor plans to place on the effectiveness of a control. The auditor should obtain more persuasive audit evidence from tests of controls the greater the reliance the auditor places on the effectiveness of a control. The auditor also should obtain more persuasive evidence about the effectiveness of controls for each | Issuer A |
relevant assertion for which the audit approach consists primarily of tests of controls, including situations in which substantive procedures alone cannot provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 13.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**AU 322, The Auditor's Consideration of the Internal Audit Function in an Audit of Financial Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluating and Testing the Effectiveness of Internal Auditors’ Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU 322.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AU 322.25</th>
<th>In developing the evaluation procedures, the auditor should consider such factors as whether the internal auditors’—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scope of work is appropriate to meet the objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Audit programs are adequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working papers adequately document work performed, including evidence of supervision and review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conclusions are appropriate in the circumstances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issuer A

Issuer B
**AU 322, The Auditor’s Consideration of the Internal Audit Function in an Audit of Financial Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AU 322.26</th>
<th>In making the evaluation, the auditor should test some of the internal auditors' work related to the significant financial statement assertions. These tests may be accomplished by either (a) examining some of the controls, transactions, or balances that the internal auditors examined or (b) examining similar controls, transactions, or balances not actually examined by the internal auditors. In reaching conclusions about the internal auditors' work, the auditor should compare the results of his or her tests with the results of the internal auditors' work. The extent of this testing will depend on the circumstances and should be sufficient to enable the auditor to make an evaluation of the overall quality and effectiveness of the internal audit work being considered by the auditor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Reports are consistent with the results of the work performed.