

**Report on**

**2015 Inspection of Ernst & Young LLP  
(Headquartered in Toronto, Canada)**

**Issued by the**

**Public Company Accounting Oversight Board**

**December 15, 2016**

**THIS IS A PUBLIC VERSION OF A PCAOB INSPECTION REPORT**

**PORTIONS OF THE COMPLETE REPORT ARE OMITTED  
FROM THIS DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH  
SECTIONS 104(g)(2) AND 105(b)(5)(A)  
OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002**



## 2015 INSPECTION OF ERNST & YOUNG LLP

### Preface

In 2015, 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").<sup>1</sup>

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 five 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 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Board's inspection was conducted in cooperation with the Canadian Public Accountability Board.

## PROFILE OF THE FIRM<sup>2</sup>

Offices	16 (Calgary, Dieppe, Edmonton, Fredericton, Halifax, Kitchener, London, Montreal, Ottawa, Quebec City, Saint John, Saskatoon, St. John's, Toronto, Vancouver, and Winnipeg, Canada)
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Partners / professional staff <sup>3</sup>	347 / 3,674
Issuer audit clients	49
Other issuer audits in which the Firm plays a role <sup>4</sup>	49

---

<sup>2</sup> 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](http://pcaobus.org/Registration/rasr/Pages/RASR_Search.aspx).

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</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 audits, if any, in which the Firm plays a substantial role as defined in PCAOB Rule 1001(p)(ii).

Lead partners on issuer audit work <sup>5</sup>	48
Other names used in audit reports	Ernst & Young s.r.l./S.E.N.C.R.L.

---

<sup>5</sup> The number of lead partners on issuer audit work represents the total number of Firm personnel 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 April 27, 2015 to October 16, 2015.<sup>6</sup>

#### **A. Review of Audit Engagements**

The inspection procedures included reviews of portions of five 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

---

<sup>6</sup> 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 materially 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.<sup>7</sup>

The audit deficiencies that reached this level of significance are described below.

#### Issuer A

- (1) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the

---

<sup>7</sup> 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 an inspection may include a review of the adequacy of a firm's compliance with these requirements, either with respect to previously identified deficiencies or deficiencies identified during that inspection. Failure by a firm to take appropriate actions, or a firm's misrepresentations in responding to an inspection report, about whether it has taken such actions, could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions.

occurrence and allocation of revenue (AS No. 5, paragraphs 42, 44 and 68);

(2) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the valuation of property, plant, and equipment (AS No. 5, paragraphs 42, 44, and B9);

(3) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the existence of property, plant, and equipment (AU 350, paragraph .24);

(4) the failure in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the valuation of derivatives (AS No. 5, paragraphs 39, 42, and 44); and

(5) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation of derivatives, including, among other things, the use of a sample size that, due to an unsupported level of reliance on controls resulting from the insufficient testing of ICFR described above, was too small (AS No. 13, paragraphs 16, 18, and 37; AU 328, paragraphs .26 and .28; AU 350, paragraphs .19, .23, and .23A).

#### Issuer B

(1) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the valuation of long-lived assets (AS No. 5, paragraphs 42 and 44);

(2) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating of controls over the valuation of intangible assets (AS No. 5, paragraphs 39, 42 and 44); and

(3) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation of intangible assets (AS No. 14, paragraphs 3 and 24).

#### Issuer C

(1) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the valuation of inventory (AS No. 5, paragraph 39);

(2) The failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation of inventory, including, among other things, the use of a sample size that, due to an unsupported level of reliance on controls resulting from the insufficient testing of ICFR described above, was too small (AS No. 13, paragraphs 8, 16, 18, and 37; AU 350, paragraphs .19, .23, and .23A)

The inspection team also identified deficiencies in an audit in which the Firm played a role but was not the principal auditor. Certain of those deficiencies were of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit. The deficiency that reached this level of significance is described below –

Issuer D

the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation of asset retirement obligations (AU 328, paragraph .39; AU 350, paragraph .24).

**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 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.

PCAOB Auditing Standards	Issuers
AS No. 5, <i>An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>	A, B, and C
AS No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	A and C
AS No. 14, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i>	B
AU 328, <i>Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</i>	A and D
AU 350, <i>Audit Sampling</i>	A, C, and D

**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,<sup>8</sup> as well as a

---

<sup>8</sup> 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

firm's failure to perform, or to perform sufficiently, certain necessary audit procedures. 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.<sup>9</sup>

---

has considered or made any determination regarding these issues unless otherwise expressly stated.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

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.

## 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.<sup>10</sup> 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,

---

<sup>10</sup> 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.

the inspection team considers the nature, significance, and frequency of deficiencies;<sup>11</sup> 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 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

---

<sup>11</sup> 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.



PCAOB Release No. 104-2017-040  
Inspection of Ernst & Young LLP  
December 15, 2016  
Page 13

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.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> 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.





Ernst & Young LLP  
Ernst & Young Tower  
222 Bay Street, PO Box 251  
Toronto, ON M5K 1J7

Tel: +1 416 864 1234  
Fax: +1 416 864 1174  
ey.com

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

14 November 2016

**Response to Part I of the Draft Report on the 2015 Inspection of Ernst & Young LLP**

Dear Ms. Munter:

We are pleased to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (the "Board" or the "PCAOB") regarding Part I of the Draft Report on the 2015 Inspection of Ernst & Young LLP (the "Report").

We have thoroughly evaluated all matters described in Part I - *Inspection Procedures and Certain Observations* of the Report and have taken actions to address findings in accordance with PCAOB standards and our policies.

The PCAOB's inspection process assists us in identifying areas where we can continue to improve audit quality. We respect and benefit from this process as it aids us in fulfilling our responsibilities to investors, other stakeholders, and the capital markets generally.

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 public company auditing practice.

Respectfully submitted,

Trent Henry  
Chairman & Chief Executive Officer

Tom Kornya  
Managing Partner, Canada - Assurance Services



**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>.

<b>AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</b>		
<b>USING A TOP-DOWN APPROACH</b>		
<b>Selecting Controls to Test</b>		
AS No. 5.39	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.	Issuers A, B and C
<b>TESTING CONTROLS</b>		
<b>Testing Design Effectiveness</b>		
AS No. 5.42	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>	Issuers A and B

<b>AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</b>		
	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.	
<b>Testing Effectiveness</b>	<b>Operating</b>	
AS No. 5.44	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	Issuers A and B
<b>EVALUATING IDENTIFIED DEFICIENCIES</b>		
AS No. 5.68	The auditor should evaluate the effect of compensating controls when determining whether a control deficiency or combination of deficiencies is a material weakness. To have a mitigating effect, the compensating control should operate at a level of precision that would prevent or detect a misstatement that could be material.	Issuer A
<b>APPENDIX B - Special Topics</b>		
<b>INTEGRATION OF AUDITS</b>		
AS No. 5.B9	To obtain evidence about whether a selected control is effective, the control must be tested directly; the effectiveness of a control cannot be inferred from the absence of misstatements detected by substantive procedures. The absence of misstatements detected by substantive procedures, however, should inform the	Issuer A

**AS No. 5, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements**

	auditor's risk assessments in determining the testing necessary to conclude on the effectiveness of a control.	
--	--	--

**AS No. 13, The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement**

<b>Responses Involving the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Audit Procedures</b>		
AS No. 13.8	The auditor should design and perform audit procedures in a manner that addresses the assessed risks of material misstatement for each relevant assertion of each significant account and disclosure.	Issuer C
<b>Testing Controls</b>		
<b>TESTING CONTROLS IN AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</b>		
AS No. 13.16	<i>Controls to be Tested.</i> If the auditor plans to assess control risk at less than the maximum by relying on controls, <sup>12/</sup> and the nature, timing, and extent of planned substantive procedures are based on that lower assessment, the auditor must obtain evidence that the controls selected for testing are designed effectively and operated effectively during the entire <b>period of reliance</b> . <sup>13/</sup> However, the auditor is not required to assess control risk at less than the maximum for <i>all</i> relevant assertions and, for a variety of reasons, the auditor may choose not to do so.	Issuers A and C

**Footnotes to AS No. 13.16**

<sup>12/</sup> 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.

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

<b>AS No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i></b>		
AS No. 13.18	<i>Evidence about the Effectiveness of Controls in the Audit of Financial Statements.</i> 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 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.	Issuers A and C
<b>Substantive Procedures</b>		
AS No. 13.37	As the assessed risk of material misstatement increases, the evidence from substantive procedures that the auditor should obtain also increases. The evidence provided by the auditor's substantive procedures depends upon the mix of the nature, timing, and extent of those procedures. Further, for an individual assertion, different combinations of the nature, timing, and extent of testing might provide sufficient appropriate evidence to respond to the assessed risk of material misstatement.	Issuers A and C

<b>AS No. 14, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i></b>		
<b>Evaluating the Results of the Audit of Financial Statements</b>		
AS No. 14.3	In forming an opinion on whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework, the auditor should take into account all relevant audit evidence, regardless of whether it appears to corroborate or to contradict the assertions in the financial statements.	Issuer B

<b>AS No. 14, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i></b>		
<b>EVALUATING THE QUALITATIVE ASPECTS OF THE COMPANY'S ACCOUNTING PRACTICES</b>		
AS No. 14.24	When evaluating whether the financial statements as a whole are free of material misstatement, the auditor should evaluate the qualitative aspects of the company's accounting practices, including potential bias in management's judgments about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements.	Issuer B

<b>AU 328, <i>Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</i></b>		
<b>Testing Management's Significant Assumptions, the Valuation Model, and the Underlying Data</b>		
AU 328.26	<p>The auditor's understanding of the reliability of the process used by management to determine fair value is an important element in support of the resulting amounts and therefore affects the nature, timing, and extent of audit procedures. When testing the entity's fair value measurements and disclosures, the auditor evaluates whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Management's assumptions are reasonable and reflect, or are not inconsistent with, market information (see paragraph .06).</li> <li>b. The fair value measurement was determined using an appropriate model, if applicable.</li> <li>c. Management used relevant information that was reasonably available at the time.</li> </ul>	Issuer A
AU 328.28	Where applicable, the auditor should evaluate whether the significant assumptions used by management in measuring fair value, taken individually and as a whole, provide a reasonable basis for the fair value measurements and disclosures in the entity's financial statements.	Issuer A

<b>AU 328, Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</b>		
AU 328.39	<p>The auditor should test the data used to develop the fair value measurements and disclosures and evaluate whether the fair value measurements have been properly determined from such data and management's assumptions. Specifically, the auditor evaluates whether the data on which the fair value measurements are based, including the data used in the work of a specialist, is accurate, complete, and relevant; and whether fair value measurements have been properly determined using such data and management's assumptions. The auditor's tests also may include, for example, procedures such as verifying the source of the data, mathematical recomputation of inputs, and reviewing of information for internal consistency, including whether such information is consistent with management's intent and ability to carry out specific courses of action discussed in paragraph .17.</p>	Issuer D

<b>AU 350, Audit Sampling</b>		
<b>Sampling In Substantive Tests Of Details</b>		
<b>Planning Samples</b>		
AU 350.19	<p>The second standard of field work states, "A sufficient understanding of the internal control structure is to be obtained to plan the audit and to determine the nature, timing, and extent of tests to be performed." After assessing and considering the levels of inherent and control risks, the auditor performs substantive tests to restrict detection risk to an acceptable level. As the assessed levels of inherent risk, control risk, and detection risk for other substantive procedures directed toward the same specific audit objective decreases, the auditor's allowable risk of incorrect acceptance for the substantive tests of details increases and, thus, the smaller the required sample size for the substantive tests of details. For example, if inherent and control risks are assessed at the maximum, and no other substantive tests directed toward the same specific audit objectives are performed, the auditor should allow for a low risk of incorrect acceptance for the substantive tests of details.<sup>fn 3</sup> Thus, the auditor would select a larger sample size for the tests of details than if he allowed a higher risk of incorrect acceptance.</p>	Issuers A and C

<b>AU 350, Audit Sampling</b>		
<u>Footnote to AU 350.19</u>		
<p><sup>fn 3</sup> Some auditors prefer to think of risk levels in quantitative terms. For example, in the circumstances described, an auditor might think in terms of a 5 percent risk of incorrect acceptance for the substantive test of details. Risk levels used in sampling applications in other fields are not necessarily relevant in determining appropriate levels for applications in auditing because an audit includes many interrelated tests and sources of evidence.</p>		
AU 350.23	To determine the number of items to be selected in a sample for a particular substantive test of details, the auditor should take into account tolerable misstatement for the population; the allowable risk of incorrect acceptance (based on the assessments of inherent risk, control risk, and the detection risk related to the substantive analytical procedures or other relevant substantive tests); and the characteristics of the population, including the expected size and frequency of misstatements.	Issuers A and C
AU 350.23A	Table 1 of the Appendix describes the effects of the factors discussed in the preceding paragraph on sample sizes in a statistical or nonstatistical sampling approach. When circumstances are similar, the effect on sample size of those factors should be similar regardless of whether a statistical or nonstatistical approach is used. Thus, when a nonstatistical sampling approach is applied properly, the resulting sample size ordinarily will be comparable to, or larger than, the sample size resulting from an efficient and effectively designed statistical sample.	Issuers A and C
<b>Sample Selection</b>		
AU 350.24	Sample items should be selected in such a way that the sample can be expected to be representative of the population. Therefore, all items in the population should have an opportunity to be selected. For example, haphazard and random-based selection of items represents two means of obtaining such samples. <sup>fn 4</sup>	Issuers A and D
<u>Footnote to AU 350.24</u>		
<p><sup>fn 4</sup> Random-based selection includes, for example, random sampling, stratified random sampling, sampling with probability proportional to size, and systematic sampling (for example, every hundredth item) with one or more random starts.</p>		