NOTICE: This is an unofficial transcript of the portions of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's Investor Advisory Group meeting on April 29, 2026 that relate to the PCAOB's strategic priorities. The other topics discussed during the April 29, 2026 meeting are not included in this transcript excerpt. The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board does not certify the accuracy of this unofficial transcript, which may contain typographical or other errors or omissions. An archive of the webcast of the entire meeting can be found on the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's website at: PCAOB Investor Advisory Group Meeting | PCAOB

PUBLIC COMPANY ACCOUNTING OVERSIGHT BOARD

+ + + + +

INVESTOR ADVISORY GROUP

+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY
APRIL 29, 2026

+ + + + +

The Advisory Group met via videoconference, at 9:34 a.m. EDT, Demetrios (Jim) Logothetis, Chair, presiding.

PCAOB BOARD OF DIRECTORS

DEMETRIOS (JIM) LOGOTHETIS, Chair
GEORGE R. BOTIC, Board Member
MARK A. CALABRIA, Board Member
STEVEN D. LAUGHTON, Board Member

INVESTOR ADVISORY GROUP

AMY COPELAND McGARRITY, CFA
ALICIA DAMLEY, CFA, CPA (Canada), CA
DIANA GLASSMAN
KEN GOLDMAN
STEVEN R. GREY
SATYAM KHANNA
DAVID L. KNUTSON, CFA, FRM, CMT
JEFFREY P. MAHONEY, J.D., CPA
JASON NAGLER
PAUL F. O'BRIEN, Ph.D.
SANFORD (SANDY) RICH
GINA SANCHEZ
NEMIT SHROFF, Ph.D.
JEN SISSON
GARY WALSH, CFA, CPA

OBSERVERS
WILL BIBLE, Deloitte
MELISSA BURGUM, Accenture
SHAWN PANSON, PwC

PCAOB STAFF

CHRISTINE GUNIA, Director, Registration and Inspections
BRENT SIMER, Chief of Staff
SABA QAMAR, Investor Advocate
ANNIE TORRES, Associate Director
MATT ULAN, Senior Inspector

[redacted]

MS. QAMAR: So if you could all turn to Page 4 of the slide deck, we have the questions up there. Next on the agenda is a session on the strategic plan for 2026 to 2030. As mentioned earlier, on March 31st, this year, the new board initiated a process to develop a strategic plan for the next couple of years and requested public feedback on that. We already discussed questions 1, 2, and 3, so we'll be -- we'll try to make sure that we go through the next couple of questions. I know the IAG is working on a comment letter and some members are doing their individual comment letters, but this discussion will help us.

So question 4: What standard setting projects should the PCAOB pursue? And who would like to go first to answer that question? I don't want to call people out, so it's better if you volunteer because I know you guys like to talk.

Alicia?

MS. DAMLEY: So hopefully, this is not just for my own edification, but as I kind of think about what's been happening around the world over the last ten-plus years, we're seeing more and more convergence, right? Whether that's in accounting standards, whether that's --

MS. QAMAR: I -- go ahead.

MS. DAMLEY: Sure.

We're seeing a lot of convergence whether that's in accounting standards, whether it's in other areas. You know, I'm always struck by the banking -- the financial sector, specifically the banking sector, as we moved sort of to this concept of Basel standards and the BIS to now the FSB where there's this kind of collaboration at the global level. And I would suggest that accounting doesn't care about geography, right? Accounting standards are agnostic with respect to geography. Sector can sometimes play an important role in terms of fine-tuning the accounting standards, but for the most part, you know, across the world, and that's partly why IFRS made so much sense and brought so many countries along.

So within that context, one of the

things that occurred to me when I saw this question was, is there a survey necessary in terms of thinking through what standards the PCAOB currently has and to bench that or compare that against are there gaps? Where are those gaps? Or where's the PCAOB ahead of others? And whether there might be an opportunity to have this kind of preliminary conversation with peers to then think about the next steps? I don't know what the answer to that is, but it seems to me that that would be a good idea within the context of considering other aspects of the strategic planning process.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Yeah. I guess I'll respond. First of all, if you -- if -- when we -- the initial information they put out there in terms of a strategic plan and requesting comments, there were four priorities -- four key priorities, right? The first priority for us is to finalize or let's say, make the revisions through the process for QC 1000 so that we can begin to think about re-engineering or modernizing the inspection process, which is priority -- not number two, important, but two, in terms of the strategy, right?

Number three is we talk about harmonization, to your point, right? Convergence. So we want to make sure -- because for example, last week when I was in Paris and the Big Six firms presented there, I guarantee you, maybe they had talked about this in advance, but every one of them put on the list fragmentation of standards. And what they said is, we are putting together this global platform to standardize the audit and make it more efficient and effective, improve audit quality, but what gets in the way is fragmentation of standards. Can you please get together, all of you, as regulators, as accounting bodies, auditing bodies, whatever, and do something about it?

So I can tell you it's a big priority for us in the strategy. We're working for the SEC because the SEC has made some comments about how they want to invest and pursue global harmonization. So we're doing that. The survey that you're suggesting or the approach you're suggesting would make a lot of sense. We have sort of started there. One of the first questions that I asked is: Can you show me next to each other where are we different, specifically as it related to IASQM1 and QC 1000? Because obviously that's a big deal. And we're moving towards that. We were -- we will definitely, in our strategic plan and the budget, put in additional investments in this area because it's going to -- it should be helpful to the filers, to the registrations, to the entire process. Ultimately, we need to harmonize it.

And by the way, as we -- since we talked about inspections earlier and there were questions, whether it was China or other places, the inspection process outside of the United States and the related risks. We do most of those inspections ourselves from here. And the reason we do them from here is because many, if not all, I would say many for now not to get in trouble, but many of the regulators around the world don't have the resources to do the inspections and the work that we do here. And so it would be easy to say, okay, well now I'm going to go to France. There's no reason for us to go to France. We'll rely on the French regulator to do the inspections, in theory, but we're nowhere close to having all of these regulators around the world ready to do that.

So if you think about it in terms of standards, the goal should be to harmonize the standards as much as we can. You know, we are in a globalized world after all. The inspection process, it should be -- our goal should be to work together with the other regulators and to try to rely on one another as much as possible so they won't duplicate the effort. Just think about the need for -- or somebody asked the question about resources, right? Think about an inspection that takes place in a country where

English is not the spoken language. We need to employ translators. Well, there's -- it's a challenge, finding the right people and doing it the right way.

So yes, I think directionally we want to go there. It's a very big priority for us. And hopefully, at the next meeting or two meetings from now, we will be able to report back to you what progress we have made in that regard.

MR. BIBLE: Yeah. If I can add one thing, it was announced by the chairman at the open meeting that is part of the subsequent solicitation for comment on the strategic plan, we're also going to be issuing a standard setting agenda consultation. So that will be a good opportunity for us to put something forward and then the general public to react on where there might be those divergences between the standards and where we might be able to focus moving forward to bring those together.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Thank you.

MS. QAMAR: Thank you, everyone.
Sandy?
MR. RICH: Just a question about that topic in particular. The International Assurance Audit Standards Board, is that the centralized global area where all this converges?
MS. BURGUM: So I was on the PIOB, which oversees the IAASB and the IASBA, right? So the challenge --
MR. RICH: I'm on the UAG.
MS. BURGUM: I don't know what the UAG -- oh, Users Advisory Group for IFIAR. That's for IFIAR, isn't it?
MR. LOGOTHETIS: Any other letter.
MR. RICH: IASB.
MS. BURGUM: Okay.
So the challenges is the vast -- I -- I'll say as an organization, CFA Institute, we love international accounting standards. We wanted global standards. We would love global auditing standards, but standard setting is a

political process.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Yes.

MS. BURGUM: Right?

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Very much.

MS. BURGUM: And sometimes the politics don't work in our favor, right?

So the issue with international standards is that they are, for the most part, developed by the profession for the profession. So they are similar to the legacy standards of the AICPA, right? So they've been funded mostly by the profession.

The PIOB, so they've been created by the IAASB and IESBA, which is the ethics. They've been moved out of under IFAC, which is the accounting organization, International Federation of Accountants. Moved under an organization called IFIA under PIOB, which was supposed to ensure the public interest. But it's all voluntary, and that system is having money problems, right? So the challenge is that it seems like in America right now, we're going to make America great again except in auditing standards. We want to converge. We want to converge. Just a little cheeky, but true. It's kind of ironic, right?

So you know, I was on the PIOB. I think its mission is great. I believe in the work, but a lot of the standards have been developed by the profession for the profession. And I think that the PCAOB has to be mindful of that. We are mindful of that as an investor organization, that some of those things may not -- they're opposite of the reason why the PCAOB was created.

And so while certainly, we would love for these things to be more consistent, we would like them to be more consistent relative to the interests of investors as opposed to the profession. So that's the challenge that we see from an organization that loves international. I mean, if you go back 15 years, we were all in on IFRS. IFRS has been very good for investors globally. But unfortunately, you know, there's a lot of conversation right now about merging the IASB and the IAASB, in circles.

I'm not sure that's a good idea because they both are having money problems and two things with money problems together we all know is -- been in mergers, it doesn't make a solution necessarily. And as I reminded at the IFRS Advisory Council last week, a lot of the people funding one are funding the other. So when you merge them, you're not going to have just an elimination of costs, you're going to have an elimination of revenue because they're like, oh, well, you have cost savings. I shouldn't have to fund as much, right? So there's big challenges there associated with that.

So ideally, I like it, but there's a lot of politics associated with that and a lot of politics that have to be worked out. The irony is, despite all the kerfuffle on -- from Congress about the funding under SOX of the FASB and the PCAOB, they're the best funded regulators in the world, right? And they're the most independent. And in my view, from -- they've done the most to improve audit quality, because not all audit regulators are the PCAOB, right? We saw that in Wirecard, right?

So I'm like, yes, but we all need to be aware of what those challenges are politically is what my -- globally, it'd be great if the CAMs were the same, right? I prefer QC 1000 over ISQM 1. They won't talk about audit quality metrics. We like audit quality metrics. We like better firm reporting. You might see those in our letter.

So for me, those are the -- those are the bigger questions than the standards, right? Because recently, in an interview about the reconfiguration of the IAASB, I said, the only thing to -- two things that matter to me, governance and funding. When you get those right, then you can get the standards right. Without governance and funding, it's kind of like not worth talking about yet. That's my personal perspective, having been involved in both.

MR. RICH: Yeah. I think it's a great way to articulate it. Thank you so much for doing that, because I learned a lot last week about all of that. And now I have a -- I have an offer. We'll do all the funding, as long as we can eliminate the politics -- I'm just joking. I'm just --

MS. PETERS: I don't think that's possible. Call them social science and have them add auditing --

MR. RICH: I'm kidding. I'm kidding.

MS. QAMAR: Amy, and then Jen and Alicia.

MS. COPELAND MCGARRITY: Thanks. I just have a quick one, and it piggybacks off of something that Sandy said. It's not a new standard. It's, I think, maybe clarification or underscoring the importance of CAMs. And I think Jeff's valiant efforts over the years to increase and highlight really good CAMs, I think is going a long way. But I believe maybe more support and clarification from the PCAOB could really underscore the importance of this incredible disclosure to investors, that we have just seen a little bit more boilerplate than I think was originally intended and it's maybe less political, since it's already in there. So I would encourage the PCAOB to focus a little bit on that, if that's possible. Thank you.

MS. QAMAR: That's a very good idea, Amy.

Jen?

MS. SISSON: Yeah. So a couple of things. One, on the international piece, I think I broadly agree, although I think I'm just more optimistic that it's fixable.

I don't think it's as broken as it -- that made it sound, Sandy, but I -- there's challenges, for sure, and there's a lot of work being done.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: (inaudible).

MS. SISSON: No, fair. It is

political. It is. But I think there's some ways forward on that and I think it's great that the U.S. is involved. I think my -- I think from an international investor perspective, there's a little bit of nervousness about the U.S. suddenly deciding to get involved and, like, I would encourage you -- I would encourage you all -- we welcome to the international -- but, like, come and join it. Don't try and roll over it. I think that would be a good way.

What I would observe from having been -- you know, we -- investment is completely global, like you said, right? The accounting -- like, you know, account, it's not a regional issue. Is that the best application of the international standards is where you have a really robust local endorsement process. And that's true of the accounting standards and auditing standards, right?

So the -- again, your real peers in the UK and Japan, et cetera, will take the international standard, will make appropriate tailoring, and that's probably a good balance, I would think. Because the other real difference is that most of the international standards are very principles-based and this is quite a rules-based environment, so finding a way, I think, to effectively bridge that gap will be important. It's not to say that you couldn't have more of a principles-based approach, but that would be a big shift to navigate, I would suggest.

And another on CAMs, in a degree, that's actually another one where the way that that's interpreted in different countries is different. And the UK FRC have just made some changes to the reporting requirements on -- essentially, introducing, kind of, like, a graduated findings type element to CAMs. And they -- no one has reported on that yet, but, like, if that worked, that would be a huge step forward for investors, compared to what we've gotten, because they -- they're not uniquely unhelpful in the U.S. CAMs. They are also in many other places.

MS. QAMAR: Alicia and then Gina, Nemit.

MS. DAMLEY: If I remember GAAS correctly, unlike GAAP, it is actually more rules-based. You know, you will be independent. There -- there's no gray area around some of these requirements. So it seems to me that, notwithstanding the political will aspect, if you can get the IAASB and the, kind of, progress that's been made around IFRS and the incredible adoption in the rest of the world, GAAS should be even easier. It's less complicated. It's narrower. It's less complicated.

And the big difference here is that the firms have a vested interest, right? Because Wirecard should not have happened, essentially. The primary reason, or at least it appears to be the primary reason, was that the GAAS standards were different across the different countries and, therefore, what the auditors were allowed to do essentially meant that basic confirmations went unchecked. You know? I think we look at it from a North America -- or at least I look at it from a North American perspective and go, excuse me? But those are the GAAS standards there.

So I think I come back to this, you know -- to, kind of, the reasoning that I offered with respect to what standard-setting projects should be undertaken, is to first literally do a survey. Because I really do think, you know, if you can create the BIS and then, within that, create the FSB and adoption of those Basel standards, right? It's a common good aspect and surely financial reporting is a common good across the world and even more broader than protecting the financial system, in terms of users, et cetera.

MR. RICH: Yeah. I mentioned earlier that we intend to invest more in this area of harmonization, convergence, whatever you want to call it, obviously for us on the auditing side as opposed to accounting. And what we've been thinking about, this hasn't developed anywhere but it needs to, is what areas can we work together on that makes the most sense? And currently, even based on this conversation, technology seems to be the most important one where both the -- obviously the accounting firms and the regulators, us and all the regulators, have an interest in working together to figure out, you know, some of the complexities that we talked about and the related standards that we may need around that. So it's very high on our list, for sure.

MS. QAMAR: Thanks.

Gina.

MS. SANCHEZ: So currently, the PCAOB is publishing statistics around -- the term just escaped my head. Kind of, risks that are forming either sectorally or globally with regard to the findings in the -- in our inspections. And one of the things that I think about when I think about, sort of, a way to, sort of, find hotspots is, whenever your auditor comes in, as anybody who has been chair of the audit, you have a meeting with them and they'll ask you, do you think there's anything -- is there anything we should be focusing on? So that's always that first question that you get. And in a well-governed organization, you will have some kind of whistleblower tip line that gives you, kind of, opportunities to make inspections internally. In a well-governed organization, those get inspected and you, kind of, take care of those. In a poorly-governed organization, those don't get expected.

However, there's no real political disclosure either, to investors or outside the organization, when that occurs and I wonder to what degree, sort of, the -- finding a way to harness that information as a way of detecting risk in an organization, in some way that -- I don't know the -- you know, around confidentiality, what can be done. But it seems that a lot of time fraud is an open secret and there are people who understand and know what is happening and that information may or may not make it through. And by the time it occurs, it's 12 months in by the time you get to -- you know, an inspection of a -- of an audit firm that may or may not be failing a specific organization -- a company.

And so I just wonder if part of our standard setting should take into account that information and how that becomes a part of an audit more formally than just, let's have a meeting and tell me if you think anything is happening. And this is just something for consideration because I don't really -- I can't really tell you how this could happen. But it just seems to me that that is a way of finding hotspots both, you know, geographically and sectorally that we could use as an -- as a standard-setting institution.

MR. RICH: Yeah. And the only thing I would say is, you know, based on my understanding and my experience, anything that is considered -- you know, firms have processes and policies to deal with whistleblowers, right?

And those have improved year to year. And it's a requirement that the audit firm, when they go in to do their assessment, the risk assessment at the beginning, their planning or whatever, to ask that specific question. And in fact, for every quarterly review, for example, part of the letter of representation includes that specific question: Were there any whistleblowers? Are there any issues that we need to be aware of? And that follows, obviously, and is communicated to the audit committee, right?

We, as regulators, when we go in to do the inspection, the first thing we ask is -- we basically ask the same question. And the reason we ask that question is to make sure that the audit firm asked the right questions, right? Because it should be one and the same. And of course, both the audit firm and us have full access to all of that information.

So it's part of, let's say, the standard auditing process currently, but I totally get your point because, ultimately, it's those sorts of concerns, along with restatements, that are indicators of problems, right? So we need to reconsider -- I will -- and obviously, we'll make a note and we'll see how we can bake it into this modernization of the inspection process. Perhaps there needs to be some sort of an emphasis there as well.

MS. QAMAR: Thanks.

Nemit.

MR. SHROFF: Thanks, Saba.

So I think -- I don't know which of the seven questions this falls under, but if there is a way to revisit the idea of firm and engagement level quality metrics, the disclosure of that. Adding to, I think, what Satyam said as well, like, you know, information about just a firm's use of AI. You add this, even if it's just data collected within the organization at the PCAOB and then you can decide at a later stage as to what needs to be disclosed or not disclosed, I think that would be very helpful.

MS. QAMAR: Thank you, Nemit. Helpful

feedback.

Ken, do you still have your --

MR. GOLDMAN: Yes. Mess here -- I, sort of, thinking that we're asking -- we're answering that general question. I gave some of my comments, I think, to an email, so I just -- I'm going to give a couple, three, comments; food for thought.

If I think about where we're going in the next, I guess, four years, I do think you're going to have to -- you're going to have to face up to AI and cyber, how it affects all the audits. I think we have to figure that out. It's going to -- it's going to be -- it -- it's going to get -- we talked about it earlier today, but I think thinking about how you work, how you do your job, how the auditors do their job, how companies do their preparation is, I would have to say, first and foremost.

Another hot button of mine, and I'll just bring it up, is -- I mean, there's an issue of quarterly versus semi-annual reporting. I think it misses the point. I think that -- I have been doing this, actually, for 50 years, so I got you by -- beat by ten. And it used to be a 10-Q with 30 pages. 10-K, maybe 50. I review now, because I'm on so many boards, they're all over 100 pages. Not to mention the proxy. The proxy used to be, also 20, 30 pages. It's now well over 100 -- well over 100 pages.

I think someone has to look at -- and it's easy to keep on adding. We all -- we just add, add, add. Nothing gets subtracted. I don't know who -- whose problems this becomes, but I think between the PCAOB and SEC has to think about, are we really making life in public so complicated, not because of quarterly and semi-annually, but because the filings are so, you know, they're so extensive. 10-K risk factors, they have 40 to 50 pages. We try to simplify, mute. Anyone who looks in this room, go look at it. Go look at risk factors. I dare you to look at risk factors and I dare you to find what the really important ones are. So anyway, I just wanted to bring that up.

The last point I want to make is, I was thinking about your private equity investing in accounting firms. And I -- it goes -- I was thinking about that and how professional leagues did it. Professional leagues say, you can invest in us but you're passive; you have no influence on the team. And yet, I'm -- I can -- I, you know, I usually like -- I, sort of, always liked free market, but I must admit, I am a little concerned about where this may entail. And so far, none of them have gone after a Big Six before -- big Four, whatever. But I do -- I am concerned that we might get ourselves -- and now there's a lot of issues on medical and healthcare states are saying, you can't invest. So far, we're very quiet here. No one has even talked about, to my knowledge, what's -- is there any restrictions on private equity firms, maybe venture firms, investing in accounting firms, so -- or our auditing firms or whatever term.

So I -- those are the sort of things that I'm not sure where it comes under, but I think they're -- they -- these are things that I think about that will affect the profession going forward.

MR. RICH: Ken, if I can just hit on the last point. Actually, my former firm, Ernst & Young, almost went through a split a couple of years ago --

MR. GOLDMAN: Oh, right. Yeah, I remember that well. It was not -- it was not fun.

MR. RICH: It was not fun at all, especially for a retired partner like myself, right? So I was very involved in the process, obviously, you know, and openly against the split. But it would -- it would've involved private equity firms coming in with hundreds of millions of dollars, right?

So as much as all the accounting firms, when they came in to present to us last week, they all talked up and down, especially the Big

Four, about the -- of the multidisciplinary firm, therefore totally against the split. But we have to be realistic. The dynamics of the profession, the dynamics of the economy, there's so many factors that -- you know, for me, I would not be surprised if something like that came up again with one of the big firms, and it has huge implications, right?

From an enforcement point of view, at the end of the session last week in Paris, I asked all these regulators, there were 45 -- 45 -- 50 of them. I said, how many of you have the authority to stop an investment of private equity into one of your accounting firms? And the answer was, I think, one. I think maybe the Netherlands or somebody has some rules that would allow them, otherwise, we don't have that authority.

And the only thing we can do is, obviously we need to be sensitive to it and it goes back to our QC 1000. We need to be thinking -- it's almost like the private equity firm needs to come in, if they are interested, and look through the QC 1000 requirements and all the other auditing standards and say, can we operate in this environment and make money, right? Because they need to have -- at a minimum, they need to have all of those things because that's where we come in. If we come in and they're not meeting those requirements, for example, they're putting pressure on the audit partner to limit the amount of work that they do, it's a red flag. It's a problem, right? And theoretically, we have an opportunity to shut him down at some point right? Or shut him down through the business by issuing a bad report or whatever.

It gets extremely complicated. It's -- we'll see how things develop in the next few years but, again, it's part of the overall challenge. And it does tie back to your first point, which is AI, right? AI and cybersecurity, how do we do the audits and so on and so forth. Thank you.

MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you.

MS. QAMAR: David, do you still have your question?

MR. KNUTSON: (No audible response.)

MS. QAMAR: So I'll go back to Steve and then Gary Walsh.

MR. GREY: To Ken's point and our self-selecting group, I guess. I feel like I'm in a safe space. I can admit this. I do read the risk factors and, you know, one of the things that you find out is that, mostly, it's a copy and paste from the prior year. But with all of that information, one thing that you can do, I mean -- I'm not worried about being inundated with too much information at all, especially with AI. For example, you can learn some interesting things if you upload the risk factors from the last five years' annuals and say, tell me how they've changed. That says something.

I remember when -- earning season is always demanding, but you would have to somehow, you know, juggle your time because you'd have to listen to these calls. And then finally, you could get transcripts and then you could get them almost immediately after the call. And now, which I'm doing this earning season, you can have AI give you a quick but detailed summary of the transcript. We're not going to be overwhelmed with information. We're going to be able to process it and evaluate it very, very quickly. I think -- that I don't think is going to be an issue.

And it -- as far as quarterly filings, I mean, so much of that is going to be automated anyway. You know, companies are used to making these quarterly filings; it's not a burden at this point. It's a routine and it's only going to be accelerated and made easier by AI, right?

MS. QAMAR: Thank you so --

MR. GOLDMAN: Let me just do a quick -- it -- I was relating more to the burden of the people preparing the remarks. You're -- I think you're talking about people reading them. And, yes, we all do red lines, so yes, I understand that quite well. But I'm just telling you, the companies -- if the SEC wants more companies to go public, there's only 4,000 companies public today, used to be 8,000, you got to think about what it entails and why companies are not going public. There's a whole bunch of reason, I won't go through it right now, but there are a bunch of reasons, one of which is the complexity of all the reports -- all the reporting you have to do. That's all I'm making the point from preparers, not from reading it like you, because you're just going through, like all of us do, the -- basically the red line.

MR. GREY: Yeah. I think it's a fair point but, again, a lot of it, you see they're just repeating the material because the business fundamentally hasn't changed. So from a perspiration point of view, it's -- I don't know that the workload is increasing.

MS. QAMAR: Jeff, Gary.

MR. MAHONEY: Thank you, Saba.

Just reemphasize a couple of points that I think have already been made. So first, the IAASB and whether the PCAOB should do a wraparound of their standards rather than produce their own standards. I saw that the, I think this was an accurate quote, the chief accountant of the SEC indicated that there were, at least in his view, some governance issues and some funding issues with respect to that. So I think, you know, we're a governance organization. We have best practices in governance, including with respect to standard settings. So my view, and I think Sandy said some so I may just be repeating, but I think if there are governance issues and funding issues, those need to be resolved before the PCAOB does some type of wraparound of international standards. At least that would be my recommendation. And based on our existing CI policies, I would have to oppose greater use of the IAASB standards without the governance and the funding being resolved.

Harmonization, I spent a lot of time in my career involved in harmonization of accounting standards. It was an incredibly difficult process. I think the success may be that, you know, when I was much younger, we had auditing standards setters in all of Europe and different parts of the world and now, for the most part, it's U.S. and IAASB, and then countries do variations of the IAASB. But we have narrowed down the set of accounting standards. That wasn't easy to do. Took a long time. But it was a very difficult process and I wouldn't underestimate, I know auditing standards are different, I wouldn't underestimate how hard this might be.

To Sandy's point, you know, some of the issues we ran into were legal, political, and cultural. And those three things, hard to imagine, but those three things made it very, very difficult to harmonize accounting standards. I -- you know, I think we got as best as you could where we have U.S. GAAP, we have international standards, and then countries around the world tweak the international standards. That's probably as good as you're going to get.

That said, can, you know, U.S., can PCAOB, learn from what's going on at the IAASB and elsewhere? Absolutely. And they should talk to each other, communicate, try to find best ideas, and pursue them. That's all good but, you know, if you're talking about harmonization, you know, a single set of high quality auditing standards, my response is, good luck. Good luck.

MS. PETERS: Can I add one thing?

MR. MAHONEY: Sure.

MS. PETERS: Just because it's relevant here, is what many people don't realize, and in going through the funding issues with the IAASB and the PIOB, is we talk about international standards, like what the IAASB publishes, is what countries adopt, and I agree with Jen's comment about endorsement in a particular country. But international audit opinions do not say, ISAs. They say, UK ISAs. They say, Canadian ISAs. They don't have a brand, which is -- investors understand what IFRS is and they'll see PCAOB standards in the opinion, they may not pay as much attention to them, but there is no uniform brand to investors of international standards.

MS. QAMAR: Thank you, Sandy.

MR. MAHONEY: My final point, it goes to standards and it's just to repeat what I said earlier, that public information provided from your standards, from your inspection reports can be useful to institutional investors in making voting decisions. So you can produce material information for institutional investors with respect to their voting decisions, as I mentioned, on audit committee chair and members and on ratification of the external auditor. So from my perspective, any PCAOB auditing standard that provides more public information that can be used by institutional investors for voting in any of those three areas are the types of standards that I would strongly support. So thank you.

MR. RICH: Thank you.

MS. QAMAR: Thank you, Jeff.

Gary and then David.

MR. WALSH: We've talked a lot -- a little bit, in this meeting, about the attractiveness of the profession to college graduates. And I know George and I have talked about the outreach efforts that are taking place with students. I want to emphasize that we need to do more.

Our firm has roughly 15 to 20 interns every year and it seems like the best of them are dual-major accounting and finance, and they're debating whether or not they pursue accounting or finance, and they're looking at what will give them the best general business experience. And they are rewarded for an extra year of school by having pay that doesn't come close to what the investment banking salaries are. And I know there's a difference in terms of the lifestyle, but I think we need to do more about promoting the attractiveness of the industry.

I've seen what has happened with Landman. That show has really transformed that profession. I don't know if that's for a good thing or a bad thing and I don't know if we can have an auditor -- a version of that, but --

MS. SANCHEZ: The Netflix show, Auditor?

MR. WALSH: And I think we --

MS. GLASSMAN: We could. No one would watch it. Yeah.

MR. WALSH: I think we -- it's a great profession, a great way to start one's career, and I think we ought to do more to promote that.

MS. QAMAR: Thank you, Gary.

MR. SHROFF: Can I just add --

MS. QAMAR: Yeah.

MR. SHROFF: -- one point? I mean, I just want to say that the 150-hour rule, if that's what you're referring to, that is very costly and to the extent barriers can be reduced to get people in accounting, that's -- it's very helpful. There's a lot of evidence to support the idea that the 150-hour rule is not helpful.

MR. RICH: Yeah. And the only thing I will say, what I heard from the accounting firms last week in Paris is that, while they support that, that we need to get away from 150 hours to get more people interested and everything else, they're also struggling and, kind of -- we, kind of, talked about this here as well, is how do we prepare the young people to come into the profession with more technology knowledge and especially AI? Is there an opportunity to do some more of that?

And I sat on the board of the largest Catholic university in America, until I took this job, for, like, ten years, and we were struggling to figure out, how do we get resources to teach AI? Because if the kids were to take four years of, let's say, accounting or five years overall and incorporate AI, they would make a lot more money. But it seems that there's not an -- we talk about a lack of resources, there's not even enough professors that are available out there to teach AI. I don't know if that's true or not. Your -- this is your domain.

MR. SHROFF: No, we should keep it that way, I mean --

MR. GREY: Yeah, but a lot of that is already going on online.

MR. SHROFF: Yeah, it's true. It's going on.

MR. GREY: You know, kids are getting on and they're attending classes online and they're learning. They want to know --

MR. SHROFF: Yeah.

MR. GREY: -- and they want to learn.

MR. SHROFF: And the number of courses, now, that incorporate AI into existing curriculum is -- many of my colleagues, I see this happening throughout. So it's -- so it --

I think the academic profession is certainly catching up to the demand.

MR. GREY: Stanford has a great online AI curriculum. Anybody can get it on YouTube.

MS. QAMAR: David.

MR. SHROFF: Not on the East Coast?

MR. GREY: And I hear MIT, a small, somewhat obscure school on the East Coast has quite an impressive curriculum.

MR. KNUTSON: Yeah, no, I was just going to comment -- and I think it was commented on in the -- in some of the email exchanges before this meeting. But if you think about the firms that the PCAOB inspects, some of their largest, most important clients are not public companies. They are the big private equity complexes. I mean, who -- Blackstone or KKR, et cetera, are enormously influential and important clients for -- and it -- because they frequently, you know, sort of, dictate not just who audits the firm itself, but who audits the portfolio companies.

And so I just -- I don't know where it's going to fit into the strategic plan, and I know the name of this organization, but we have to, I think, think about the obligation we have to investors in, you know, private credit, private equity. Do we have an obligation to them? If so, how do we, sort of, execute on it? Presumably the work that we do, inspecting the firms and their methodologies and procedures, enures to the benefit of private investors and public investors. But I think we're probably behooves us to be more, sort of, explicit about that.

MS. QAMAR: Jen.

MR. RICH: We currently have no mandate, as you know, for private --

MR. KNUTSON: I know.

MR. RICH: -- but I think through the influence, your influence --

MR. KNUTSON: Yeah.

MR. RICH: -- you know, for Congress and such, there is no other place right now, right? Than for the PCAOB to take on a responsibility, just like we did, you know, eight years ago with credit -- with brokers and dealers.

MR. KNUTSON: Yeah.

MS. QAMAR: Yeah. Jen.

MS. SISSON: Just a quick follow-up on Nemit's comment about the 150 hours. There's an interesting experiment, I'm going to say, that's been underway now in Canada for, if I'm not mistaken, more than a decade where, previously, for the chartered accounting designation, you had to do your -- to get your time at a public accounting firm. Now, they've broadened it out in terms of where you can get those hours. So that was, sort of -- it was driven by a couple of other issues, but that was an interesting, kind of, approach to still get experience or the relevant experience, but widen out the options that the student -- or that the student has.

MR. SHROFF: Where did they -- where did they widen it to?

MS. SISSON: Very broad. Everything from a governmental organization to a private company, to a public company, to a public accounting firm. And of course, simultaneously, what has happened is that the public accounting firm structures have changed in terms of what's permissible, in terms of how you can be set up, i.e., license to audit versus just focusing on tax versus focusing on insolvency or other advisory. So it's really brought -- like, it's really changed the landscape in terms of what's happening.

MS. QAMAR: Diana and then we'll move to the next two questions, because I do think they're interconnected and a lot of it has been discussed earlier during the day.

MS. GLASSMAN: Thank you.

I thought I'd just attempt to connect some dots here. So we were talking about how we want to raise the profession's profile, attractiveness, attract the best and the brightest, give them the work that they're just going to dive into and love, and add value to themselves, but to investors and the public markets. And I'm just wondering if -- a lot of times the value is added at intersections or sometimes it's said another way. Sometimes, failures are where there are gaps, right? And as we think broadly, and I really do applaud this strategic planning process, I'm just wondering if there might be some opportunities that are either exciting opportunities that we can own or take a lead in or maybe some gaps that are out there that are needed that maybe we could fill maybe by thinking about what really is our mandate and figuring out a way to squeeze it in.

And so this notion of risk, like, on the investor -- the first thing I do is I go to the CAMs. I do. I go to -- I am boring, yes, so I read this stuff, too. I get excited by it. But I go to the CAMs first, and then I read the management, MDNA. The MDNA is -- and I do look at the risk factors. The risk factors, I do exactly what you do, what's different. And - but what -- I think what investors are looking for is the interpretation, internal consistency. So yeah. We do this part of the financial statements. But actually, I'm looking at the CAMs, and are the CAMs related to the MDNA, and are they related to the risk factors, and which of the risk factors are really risks, and which is just legal gobbledygook that they must put out there?

And some interpretation is what would be very, very helpful, and I think it would elevate the profile of the profession, and I think what would attract really great people into the profession and keep great people. And so some example -- so the mechanism is the elaborating on how you think about risk and how you prioritize the inspections. There's something there. But there's also the time frame issue. So we focus on a one-year, but ETF investors, long-term investors, bigger part of the capital markets, they do have a longer term time frame, even though, of course, there's -- there is the near-term purpose, but it's near, medium, and long-term. And when we think about directors, we're holding them accountable for all of the above, including me, I guess. And so the -- but there is very much a short-term focus in the financial statements. And the question is -- and let's just take the private credit.

Like, big public companies are buying private companies. Sometimes, I look at the financials of these private companies. They're terrible. It's like, where did this come from? Who was the auditor on that? Was it a Big Four auditor? Sometimes it is a Big Four auditor. I know that some of the auditors are -- they're all approaching in -- public and private differently. Some are splitting the practices. Some are, I've heard, reducing the standard. I don't know what it -- what exactly it is, but that impacts public markets.

We're going to have these huge private IPOs. It's -- that's incredible. Again, what are their -- I don't have visibility into their marketing as a public company investor, but I should because it's going to impact all of our lives. And then on the AI front, for example, just another sort of an emerging risk, I'd love some -- so you mentioned how all of this is dependent on AI data centers and getting the power and the -- all this stuff. Like, that's a real risk. We know that's a real risk, but that's not really addressed in the financial statements. I don't think it is. Maybe it should be somehow.

I'd say, again, part of this thinking about risk. Also, I just put it up there because I do see that there's a huge need for interpretation, and AI will make space for interpretation if we have the right people, but actually getting that right, giving investors that information that is interpretive and how you think about it, I think that would be so very valuable. And it is -- it's both the opportunity and the challenge.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Yeah. No. I totally get it. I understand your expectations. Obviously, there's no question there is an expectations gap, always has been between, you know, what the investors want and need versus what the accounting world, the accounting firms, are offering. It's -- it gets complicated. It's been, you know, talked about for years. I don't know that that expectations gap has closed much.

Our dilemma as the regulators is that we can only follow the firms and we can only challenge the extent of their audit procedures, including, of course, if there is adequate disclosures. But those -- they're following a checklist, essentially, of what they should disclose. And I think what you're asking for is there a better articulation of those disclosures that should be made that would be more informative? But that's more for the FASB to, and the SEC to interpret. And for us, based on those rules, to come along and say, did you do a good enough job?

MS. GLASSMAN: What I heard, just to -- I'm -- this is my first time, so --

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Sure.

MS. GLASSMAN: -- excuse me. I don't, you know, I'm just learning. But what I did hear is that when we set our investigation -- when I -- when we set our audit priorities and we set our investigation priorities, we are reading all of that contextual information. We are bringing our firm, our accounting firms -- I spent ten years at PWC, Coopers PWC.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Sure.

MS. GLASSMAN: We are bringing our industry knowledge. We are bringing our global experts everywhere. But I -- so I think that the way to -- postulating is an idea, that a way to squeeze it in is explaining that process and making it come alive and that process, by focusing on all of these really important risks, showing how you think about it could be a little bit of a -- of a fulcrum point that is within the mandate.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: It is. I think through -- the way I think about it is, a lot of that should come through the responsibilities and the mandate the audit committees have. The audit committees need to take time. Somebody mentioned earlier the concept of education. At least when I was back in the profession, we would take time with the audit committee to do a -- an educational session, right? Some -- most of the time together with a management of the company, right? So we would sit down and say, okay, these are the developing issues, AI, whatever the case might be. These are the questions that you should be asking as an audit committee, including in this case, of course, disclosures and things like that.

So hopefully, the SEC is following up accordingly and the audit committees are, you know, taking up their responsibility to work with management and the external auditors to ask those sort -- those questions because those are critical questions.

There's no -- it -- I totally agree. And then for us, I guess, in terms of our inspection, we ought to be looking, and I think we are looking, at the documentation that comes out of those discussions because there's minutes of the audit committee meetings. And in order to test the effectiveness of the law, you know, we should be in the mandate. We should be looking at those minutes to make sure that there's adequate discussions with the audit committee.

MS. GLASSMAN: But there's just one -- and I come here again with so much respect for this group. And thank you again for having me. But I -- I'm not sure that the audit committees are all equally knowledgeable about their investors. Coming into an audit committee --

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Yeah.

MS. GLASSMAN: -- was surprised at how little they knew about the investors. They make a lot of assumptions about investors, and a lot of audit committees don't want to talk to investors. And so it's -- some of the stuff that they were saying about what investors are thinking -- they don't understand investor organizational structure, so nobody can understand an organizational structure, but they don't understand investor organization structures and how investor decisions are made. And they might hear from an investor, a -- an analyst. They will hear from a small group of investors, but they might be missing the broader group of investors.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Yeah, it's possible.

MR. CALABRIA: Ken, if I could make a reflection on this before we move on.

I'll certainly say for me, it's extremely helpful to hear the context of, you know, SEC quarterly reporting audit committees. I kind of look at it as our responsibility at PCAOB as we look to the strategic plan to filter out what is statutorily our responsibility. So maybe I'll -- this is my pre-way of saying, please submit anything you want and everything you want to the strategic plan, comment period, understanding there's a lot, there's some of it we can't legally do, but I do want to welcome the conversation because it helps me place our role within the context of everybody else's. But that's just to understand that I certainly don't expect any of you to have, you know, checked with your lawyer ahead of time to make sure your comments are within our statutory mandate. That's our job.

MS. QAMAR: Super helpful.

David, did -- so I can --

MR. KNUTSON: No.

MS. QAMAR: -- do you -- okay.

So that leads me to -- that leads me to the last question in the interest of time. How can the PCAOB enhance transparency with its stakeholders?

Ken?

MR. GOLDMAN: Yeah, I said this before. I think to get more out and about, it's very simple. I think to -- I -- most of my audit committee friends have never had a meeting with PCAOB. I think to -- so I think to travel across the good old U.S. of A and meet with audit committees, find a way to do this. There's great places in most of the big cities. But I think to do that would be very helpful. I think the more you can communicate, you know, I -- you know, honestly, I see from both FASB and FASIC, I -- actually a lot of the -- a lot of the meeting, like this meeting is on -- is public, so I actually attend a lot of those. So I think the great benefit of webinars and so forth and on the web is you can get online for everybody. But I would just recommend more in-person meetings with audit committees so you can hear from them, or audit, you know, audit committees, I said it that way. You can hear from them directly what they -- just like we're having a meeting here, what their concerns are, and you can also tell what -- how you think.

I'll make one more point, which is an

interesting -- you know, it's funny. When I first got involved here, you know, I -- the --

And, Jim, you'll be interested.

-- the -- I would hear from my -- the auditors, all the complaining about PCAOB. It was just unbelievable. And they would just use excuses upon excuses. And having me being involved here, I have a much more firsthand impression of what this organization is set out to do, whether it's you or your prior folks. And I've been involved a couple of different times now with PCAOB. I was on the SAG earlier. And so I just, you know, so I've had the benefit of hearing firsthand, as many in this room -- all of us in the room have. And I -- but most people don't. So I think to help educate the auditors, I mean, the audit committee members so they have the benefit of what we have in this room would be a big, big positive.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: I think I was telling somebody earlier today, my goal -- and again, I'm going to spend some time with my board members on this topic, but my goal is to be out of this office at least 50 percent of the time once I get through the transition period and we put a strategic plan together and we have a budget together and all of that hopefully by the end of June or sometime. I think it's required by July, but after maybe some vacation in the summer. After that, I want to be out 50 percent of the time. I want to be talking primarily to the audit committees. My group has heard me so many times talk about this. I want a list of all the audit committee chairs for all the public companies in America. I want to be -- invite them to -- I wanted to invite them to conferences, to do conferences around the country, and invite them to come and join and demystify, if that's the right term, what do we do.

We need to have this direct interaction with them, because otherwise, let's face it, eventually, as somebody said from the accounting firms, they're going to tune us out, and that would be the worst possible scenario, right? So that's what I intend to do. That's what I think we're going to have to do. And I think it's appropriate. And I was telling somebody, even at the break here today, that in my mind, when I was working in the profession, I would, you know, think about 24/7, certainly wake up in the morning and think about my client, and more specifically the audit committee chair. The audit committee chair of my client was the most important person other than my family. And I worked towards making sure that they knew what we were doing, how we were doing it, that we would communicate with them all the time before and after the audit committee meetings.

They drove so many things, right? And in the PCAOB I struggled to figure out, okay, who's my client? And ultimately, my client is you guys. It's -- you're the investors and the audit committees. Some of you, of course, overlap. So that's my mindset. We work for the audit committees and investor groups that represent the investors and that's what we protect through helping the firms, monitoring the firms, regulating the firms to make sure that they do the best job possible in terms of audit quality. I don't know if that's helpful, Ken, but that's what I'm intending to do.

MR. GOLDMAN: Yeah. Very helpful.

MS. QAMAR: Thank you. Thank you, Tim.

Jen, Jason, and Jeff, and Sandy.

MS. SISSON: So I think it is a really great idea to plan to be out of the office most of the time doing outreach. I think that's a fantastic thing. I really, though -- I would just make one amendment to what you just said, right, which is that your primary audience is not audit committees, so it's investors, right? And, like, the goal of this organization is investor protection. And so I would suggest that your primary audience should be investors, not the audit committees. And your -- if -- your client is the investor. The audit committee is a part of the governance process that oversees the auditors who you inspect, but both the audit committee and yourselves are doing that on behalf of the investor. So please don't -- I -- I'm not saying they're not an important part of the ecosystem. Clearly, they are, they are elected by investors, but we have to keep absolute front and center goal that the purpose is investor confidence. And I think if we -- if there's a sense that the investor is not the core of it all, that's when you would -- like, there's no point in having an audit if it's not for the investors. The audit is not for the audit committee.

MR. NAGLER: And that's -- just to jump in, that's not in -- a harder argument to make, right? You can draw a direct line from the activities of the PCAOB and the cost of capital and the reliance of the U.S. markets and why they're the most attractive in the world and have the lowest cost of capital and all of that. You also, I mean, promote the organization, and the most fundamental kind of marketing 101 ways is, is this video going to be posted? Is it going to be boosted on social media? Is it going to be broken down into individual videos that are promoted? What other videos are going to come out or scheduled for the next month? Talking about different things that you do, value that you add. Just basic marketing, making it very clear and easy to understand terms, how the organization holds value.

MS. SISSON: And seek to do investor conferences, right? So it's interesting you say that the international standard -- the international standard setters do investor conferences all the time, all around the world. You guys don't. And, like, you come and do our conferences. I'm sure you can do some. We -- I would really -- you got to get out in front of the investors.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Yeah. Point well taken. And it's interesting, Saba and I had this discussion last night, and I said to her, okay, I know through -- there must be a database of audit committee chairs, and we must be able to find some way to get that information. And my question to her was, okay, can you give me the list of investor groups where we can do the same, because we need to find that group as well, right? So I -- it's -- I'm not prioritizing one over the other. I mean, they're both important, but we need to get to those investor conferences. And you guys, I mean, you need to help us, right? I can -- you call out on me and I'll work out the appropriate meetings.

MS. SISSON: I actually think it's easier and it should be -- I do think you should prioritize investors over the audit committees, at least in the near term while you guys are brand new and you're setting your new plan, given the goal. But I think, you know, actually within this advisory group, you've got three of the biggest investor networks going.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Okay.

MS. SISSON: And we ought to be able to help you with that.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Great. Thank you. Thank you.

MS. QAMAR: Thank you.

Jason?

MR. NAGLER: So let me tack onto that a little bit as well. I mean, what we talk about is the inspection report, if it's usable, all the data in it, the signal, and the noise. I don't want to cut back on data, although I find a lot of it not super helpful. And that -- and I mean, you know, in my day job, I'm representing 45 trillion in assets for our members. They don't -- they're not reading these reports. They think the audit quality is fine. So I mean, that -- that's a pretty good -- that's a pretty good signal there that I think we've done a lot of great stuff over the last 20 years. I think, you know, something like part 1C where you have foot fault independence matters getting reported in a report that were caught by their own internal controls. Like, who needs to know that? Maybe the audit committee. The audit committee does know that.

They get reported on that kind of stuff. That makes a lot of sense. So I think -- I encourage you all and the staff, as you're going through this process, think about, like, really what's material. To me, that's a restatement, right? That's a trend in quality. To me, it's the large accelerated files. It's the Mag 7, right? These are kind of, like, the risks to me. This is -- if 50 percent of the U.S. is invested in index funds and the weight is, you know, to the Mag 7 the way it is, those are the risks, right? A small cap with a small auditor, that's significantly less risk to the capital markets, and that's how I think about it. So I just encourage you to do that.

And then number two is an impossible task, and I'm sorry to ask you to do this, but whatever you do over the next two and a half years, stress test it across the aisle, across, you know -- because I think the flip-flopping, that what we've seen over the last, you know, seven, eight years, it -- it's not helpful for anyone.

And I think, you know, if you can reach across the aisle, if you can reach out to all stakeholders, if you can build some kind of consensus around what's reasonable for all parties, so it will be sticky in, you know, two and a half years, six and a half years, whenever that time comes, I think that's just super important. And I think you're thinking about it in the right ways. You come from the profession, and I love to hear that because I just -- I'm thinking about investors. I'm thinking about these audit firms that need to implement. I'm thinking about having lasting, you know, rules, policies, procedures, so people can operationalize. So whatever you can do on the impossible task, we would appreciate that as well.

MS. GLASSMAN: Thank you, Jason.

MS. QAMAR: Thank you, Jason. Thank you.

We are almost over time. So Jeff, Alicia, and Sandy, and that will be the last word. Thank you.

MR. MAHONEY: Thank you, Saba. So CII is having their fall conference in Boston, so I'm putting you down for attending, okay?

MS. QAMAR: I'll see. Yeah.

MR. MAHONEY: Just want to make sure.

With respect to question 7, I would encourage you to, you may have already done this, I would read Dennis Beresford's letter. He was the chairman of the FASB when I started there. I have a great deal of respect for him. And what he says in his letter, I think he said many times in the past, I have as well to various PCAOB chairmen over the years, but I need to just read you a key part. He says, "Open deliberations where staff recommendations are actively discussed and challenged lead to better outcomes and a more informed constituency," adding that, "the board should consider increasing the transparency and interactivity of its meetings and to move away from what may appear to observers as an overly legalistic process with board members mainly reading from prepared scripts. As such, greater openness combined with enhanced external engagement should improve both the quality and the credibility of the PCAOB standards." I agree with that statement 100 percent.

I think he said it several times throughout the history of the PCAOB, I have as well, and we've seen very little movement in response to that.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Jeff, first of all, Dennis Beresford was one of my idols. He was my mentor, the first person I'd called when I got this offer, this opportunity. I've been talking to him regularly. He sent me a very long, nice letter that I just read again last night. I could not agree more. I hope that today's session, which was my first, gave you an indication that I'm listening to him. And also, what we put out in terms of my first open meeting back in March 31st, and what do we want to do, this is absolutely critical between the investor groups, the audit committees, all the stakeholders. And if we're not listening to you, we don't -- we should not exist. And so thank you for that. I appreciate it.

MR. MAHONEY: Thank you.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Yeah.

MS. QAMAR: Alicia.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: I'm going to go visit with him, by the way. I haven't set a date, but probably next month.

MR. MAHONEY: Great.

MR. LOGOTHETIS: Yeah.

MS. QAMAR: Alicia and Sandy, and then we have to end the meeting. Thank you.

MS. DAMLEY: Very quickly, the PCAOB has the interest of all investors. And second, the communication strategy, I think the priority is refreshing the entire communication strategy before the PCAOB gets out there, because I think it would be relevant and important to be able to have a more solid foundation as you move out to talk to the various constituencies.

MS. QAMAR: Thank you.

Sandy.

MS. PETERS: Yeah, I was going to agree with everything that Jen said, and I was going to add one thing. I know, it's rare, right?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER 2: (inaudible) --

MS. PETERS: Oh, is that one of the greatest challenges you have with investors in seeking feedback is they see so little of the audit.

MR. KNUTSON: Yeah.

MS. PETERS: And so an -- a different approach needs to be taken with them. They're not stupid, right? They're not confused.

MR. KNUTSON: Of course.

MS. PETERS: They just don't have much information because audit is a credence good, right? And they need to be -- they -- we need more transparency to hold our agents, which are the audit committee, more accountable, right? And I would think it was -- is it Diana? Is it Diana? Her comments with respect to audit committees are really important. There's a vast difference in quality of audit committee members. They are chosen for a variety of different reasons. Investors do not put them on the slate necessarily. And so you have to remember that they don't have the same perspective and they don't necessarily talk to investors. So I would keep that in mind. I would also say that it's very important this -- the IAG has been a very important element of the process for investors, and some use -- they'll say that we're not investors at times, we're investor advocates.

I find that troubling because it's meant to be a bit diminutive in my mind. But in reality, we're no different than the national office because they're not out doing audits, right? They're advocating for the firms.

Certain audit organizations are auditor advocates. They're not auditors, right? It is a different language. It is a different challenge. It is a different degree of connection and attention. And our organizations take a great deal of time because it's integral to our credibility to make sure that we get the feedback we need to develop a position. And so I think it is important to say that, and I think that the conversation here where you can get those different perspectives is really like no other, because when you go and get a group of people together, you'll have to start with some of them, who the PCAOB is, right?

But if you ask them a question in a specific way about what they're getting and what it means and the like, then you'll get a much richer response, which we do in our surveys. So to enhance transparency is give them what they need to give you a meaningful response, ask them a question in a way in which they can respond, and embrace that they may not know as much about audit as you do, but they know a lot about investing.

MS. QAMAR: You want to say a few --

MR. LOGOTHETIS: No. I -- I'm telling you, I -- this is -- I've been here for two and a half months, and this has been probably my most valuable day. I mean, nothing against my colleagues or anybody else. No, seriously. I mean, I --

MR. KNUTSON: I thought that's because we are --

MR. LOGOTHETIS: -- was -- I was anxious to come together, and I'm looking forward to more such meetings because that's what brings challenge and validation to what we do, and for me at a personal level given the circumstances, I guess I was thinking, you know are -- is this important? Am I important? And what you've said through your questions and your comments, it gives me a lot more confidence to think, yes, this is important. It's not theoretical. It's not just in my mind, right?

It's needed for the 70-some trillion dollars that we all strive to support and protect.

And so yeah. This has been a lot of fun, by the way. Thank you.

[redacted]