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Preface

In 2016, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Deloitte & Touche ("the Firm") pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

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). The inspection included reviews of portions of one issuer audit performed by the Firm and the Firm's audit work on two other issuer audit engagements in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor. These reviews were intended to identify whether deficiencies existed in the reviewed 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. Appendix A presents the text of the paragraphs of the auditing standards that are referenced in Part I.A. in relation to the description of auditing deficiencies there.

Note on this report's citations to auditing standards: On March 31, 2015, the PCAOB adopted a reorganization of its auditing standards using a topical structure and a single, integrated numbering system. See Reorganization of PCAOB Auditing Standards and Related Amendments to PCAOB Standards and Rules, PCAOB Release No. 2015-002 (Mar. 31, 2015). The reorganization will be effective as of December 31, 2016, but the reorganized numbering system may be used before that date. In this report, citations to PCAOB auditing standards use the numbering system and titles of standards that were in effect at the time of the primary inspection procedures. A table cross-referencing the section numbers of those standards included in Part I of this report as reorganized is included at Appendix B.
PROFILE OF THE FIRM

Offices 9 (Cape Town, Durban, East London, Johannesburg, Pietermaritzburg, Port Elizabeth, Pretoria, Richards Bay, and Stellenbosch, Republic of South Africa)

Ownership structure Partnership

Partners / professional staff 264 / 3,626

Issuer audit clients 1

Other issuer audits in which the Firm plays a role 17

---

1 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.

2 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. The number of partners cited above represents the number of individuals with an ownership interest in the Firm.

3 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).
Lead partners on issuer audit work⁴ 13

Other names used in audit reports  Deloitte & Touche (South Africa)

---

⁴ The number of lead partners on issuer audit work represents the total number of Firm personnel (not necessarily limited to personnel with an ownership interest) who had primary responsibility for an issuer audit (as defined in AS No. 10, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*) or for the Firm’s role in an issuer audit during the twelve-month period preceding the outset of the inspection.
PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board’s staff (“the inspection team”) conducted primary procedures for the inspection from March 7, 2016 to March 18, 2016. 5

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included a review of portions of one issuer audit performed by the Firm and the Firm’s audit work on two other issuer audit engagements 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, in two audits in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor, had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to fulfill the

---

5 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.
objectives of its role in the audit. The deficiencies that reached this level of significance are described below—

Issuer A

the failure, in connection with the Firm’s role in an audit of internal control over financial reporting (“ICFR”), to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the occurrence, completeness, and allocation of revenue (AS No. 5, paragraphs 39, 42, and 44).

Issuer B

the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the existence of inventory, including the failure to perform procedures to extend the audit conclusions from the date of the Firm’s interim testing to year end (AS No. 13, paragraph 45; AU 331, paragraph .12).

B. Auditing Standards

Each deficiency described above could relate to several applicable provisions of the standards that govern the conduct of audit work. The paragraphs of the standards that are cited for each deficiency are those paragraphs that most directly relate to the deficiency. The deficiencies also relate, however, to other paragraphs of those standards and to other auditing standards, including those concerning due professional care, responses to risk assessments, and audit evidence.

Many audit deficiencies involve a lack of due professional care. AU 230, *Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work*, 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 AS No. 13, *The Auditor’s Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*, 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, 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 providing support for the related conclusions.

The paragraphs of the standards that are described immediately above are not cited in Part I.A, unless those paragraphs are the most directly related to the relevant deficiency.

B.1. List of Specific Auditing Standards Referenced in Part I.A.

The table below lists the specific auditing standards that are referenced in Part I.A of this report, cross-referenced to the issuer audits for which each standard is cited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCAOB Auditing Standards</th>
<th>Issuers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 13, The Auditor’s Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU 331, Inventories</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Information Concerning PCAOB Inspections that is Generally Applicable to Triennially Inspected Firms

A Board inspection includes a review of certain portions of selected audit work performed by the inspected firm and a review 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

Inspections 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 audits, the inspection team selects certain portions of the audits 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 audits, and the specific portions of those audits, 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 failure to perform, or to perform sufficiently, certain necessary audit procedures.

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 the applicable financial reporting framework, 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.
An inspection may not involve the review of all of the firm's audit work, nor is it designed to identify every deficiency in the reviewed audits. 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.

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, an inspection team considers whether audit documentation or any other evidence that a firm might provide to the inspection team supports the 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.\(^7\)

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

---

\(^7\) 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.
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.

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*, 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.\(^8\) 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;\(^9\)
related firm methodology, guidance, and practices; and possible root causes.

---

\(^8\) Not every audit deficiency suggests a defect or potential defect in a firm’s
quality control system, and this report may not discuss every audit deficiency the
inspection team identified.

\(^9\) 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
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 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.\(^\text{10}\)

\(^{10}\) 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.
September 7, 2016

Ms. Helen Munter
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006

Re: Deloitte & Touche – Response to Part I of the Draft Report

Dear Ms Munter:

Deloitte & Touche (“Deloitte” or the “Firm”) is pleased to submit this response to the draft Report on the 2016 Inspection of the Firm (the Draft Report) of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (the PCAOB or the Board). We believe that the PCAOB’s inspection process serves an important role in the achievement of our shared objectives of improving audit quality and serving investors and the public interest. We are committed to continuing to work with the PCAOB to further strengthen trust in the integrity of the independent audit.

We have evaluated the matters identified by the Board’s inspection team for each of the issuer audits described in Part I of the Draft Report and are taking appropriate actions in accordance with PCAOB standards to comply with our professional responsibilities under 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.

Executing high quality audits is our number one priority. We are confident that the investments we have made and are continuing to make in our audit processes, policies, and quality controls are resulting in significant enhancements to our audit quality.

Please contact Liezl da Plessis at lidadaplessis@deloitte.co.za or +27 12 482 0126 with any questions about this response.

Sincerely,

Zuleka Jasper
National Professional Practice Director
Deloitte & Touche
APPENDIX A

AUDITING STANDARDS REFERENCED IN PART I.A

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>Standard</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements (AS 2201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USING A TOP-DOWN APPROACH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Controls to Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 5.39</td>
<td>The auditor should test those controls that are important to the auditor's conclusion about whether the company's controls sufficiently address the assessed risk of misstatement to each relevant assertion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TESTING CONTROLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Design Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 5.42</td>
<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></td>
<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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements (AS 2201)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing Operating Effectiveness</td>
<td>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>

**AS No. 5.44**

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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### AS No. 13, The Auditor’s Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement (AS 2301)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIMING OF SUBSTANTIVE PROCEDURES</td>
<td>When substantive procedures are performed at an interim date, the auditor should cover the remaining period by performing substantive procedures, or substantive procedures combined with tests of controls, that provide a reasonable basis for extending the audit conclusions from the interim date to the period end. Such procedures should include (a) comparing relevant information about the account balance at the interim date with comparable information at the end of the period to identify amounts that appear unusual and investigating such amounts and (b) performing audit procedures to test the remaining period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issuer</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### AU 331, Inventories (AS 2510)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventories</th>
<th>Issuer B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU 331.12</td>
<td>When the independent auditor has not satisfied himself as to inventories in the possession of the client through the procedures described in paragraphs .09 through .11, tests of the accounting records alone will not be sufficient for him to become satisfied as to quantities; it will always be necessary for the auditor to make, or observe, some physical counts of the inventory and apply appropriate tests of intervening transactions. This should be coupled with inspection of the records of any client's counts and procedures relating to the physical inventory on which the balance-sheet inventory is based.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

REORGANIZED STANDARDS REFERENCED IN PART I

On March 31, 2015, the PCAOB adopted the reorganization of its auditing standards using a topical structure and a single, integrated numbering system. See Reorganization of PCAOB Auditing Standards and Related Amendments to PCAOB Standards and Rules, PCAOB Release No. 2015-002 (Mar. 31, 2015). The reorganized standards will be effective as of December 31, 2016, but the reorganized numbering system may be used before that date. The citations to PCAOB auditing standards included in this report use the numbering system and titles of standards that were in effect at the time of the primary inspection procedures. This table provides the section numbers of those standards included in Part I of this report as reorganized, as well as the titles of the standards both before and after the reorganization. The complete standards are available on the PCAOB’s website at http://pcaobus.org/STANDARDS/Pages/default.aspx.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditing Standards – before the reorganization</th>
<th>Auditing Standards – as reorganized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 3 Audit Documentation</td>
<td>AS 1215 Audit Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 13 The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</td>
<td>AS 2301 The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS No. 15 Audit Evidence</td>
<td>AS 1105 Audit Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU 230 Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work</td>
<td>AS 1015 Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU 331 Inventories</td>
<td>AS 2510 Auditing Inventories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>