



1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 207-9100
Facsimile: (202) 862-8433
www.pcaobus.org

**Inspection of
Deloitte LLP**
(Headquartered in London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland)

Issued by the
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

September 30, 2010

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**

PCAOB RELEASE NO. 104-2010-136



Notes Concerning this Report

1. Portions of this report may describe deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct of the firm that is the subject of this report. The express inclusion of certain deficiencies and potential deficiencies, however, should not be construed to support any negative inference that any other aspect of the firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct is approved or condoned by the Board or judged by the Board to comply with laws, rules, and professional standards.
2. Any references in this report to violations or potential violations of law, rules, or professional standards should be understood in the supervisory context in which this report was prepared. Any such references are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings of fact or of violations for purposes of imposing legal liability. Similarly, any description herein of a firm's cooperation in addressing issues constructively should not be construed, and is not construed by the Board, as an admission, for purposes of potential legal liability, of any violation.
3. Board inspections encompass, among other things, whether the firm has failed to identify departures from U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") or Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") disclosure requirements in its audits of financial statements. This report's descriptions of any such auditing failures necessarily involve descriptions of the related GAAP or disclosure departures. The Board, however, has no authority to prescribe the form or content of an issuer's financial statements. That authority, and the authority to make binding determinations concerning an issuer's compliance with GAAP or Commission disclosure requirements, rests with the Commission. Any description, in this report, of perceived departures from GAAP or Commission disclosure requirements should not be understood as an indication that the Commission has considered or made any determination regarding these issues unless otherwise expressly stated.



INSPECTION OF DELOITTE LLP

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") has conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Deloitte LLP^{1/} ("the Firm"). The Board is issuing this report of that inspection in accordance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

The Board is making portions of the report publicly available. Specifically, the Board is releasing to the public Part I of the report and portions of Part IV of the report. Part IV of the report consists of the Firm's comments, if any, on a draft of the report.^{2/}

The Board has elsewhere described in detail its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions.^{3/} A substantial portion of the Board's criticisms of a firm (specifically criticisms of the firm's quality control system), and the Board's dialogue with the firm about those criticisms, occurs out of public view, unless the firm fails to make progress to the Board's satisfaction in addressing those criticisms. In addition, the Board generally does not disclose otherwise nonpublic information, learned through inspections, about the firm or its clients. Accordingly, information in those categories generally does not appear in the publicly available portion of an inspection report.

^{1/} The firm has issued reports under the name of Deloitte & Touche LLP.

^{2/} The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In addition, pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report at all. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm's response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.

^{3/} See Statement Concerning the Issuance of Inspection Reports, PCAOB Release No. 104-2004-001 (August 26, 2004).

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection at various times from November 5 2007 to November 15, 2007, from December 3, 2007 to December 13, 2007, from March 17, 2008 to March 21, 2008 and from March 18, 2009 to March 20 2009.^{4/} These procedures were tailored to the nature of the Firm, certain aspects of which the inspection team understood at the outset of the inspection to be as follows:

Number of offices	23 ^{5/}
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Number of partners	Approximately 650
Number of professional staff ^{6/}	Approximately 8,750
Number of issuer audit clients ^{7/}	31

^{4/} The primary procedures were performed by the inspection team for the 2007 inspection of the Firm. These procedures were conducted in cooperation with the Audit Inspection Unit of the Professional Oversight Board, a part of the Financial Reporting Council of the United Kingdom.

^{5/} The Firm's offices are located in Aberdeen, Bath, Belfast, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, Edinburgh, Gatwick, Glasgow, Guernsey, Isle of Man, Jersey, Leeds, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Milton Keynes, Newcastle, Nottingham, Reading, Southampton, and St. Albans, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

^{6/} "Professional staff" includes all personnel of the Firm, except partners or shareholders and administrative support personnel. 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 or are "associated persons" (as defined in the Act) of the Firm.

^{7/} The number of issuer audit clients shown here is based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information for inspection planning

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audits.^{8/} To achieve that goal, Board inspections include reviews of certain aspects of selected audits performed by the firm and reviews of other matters related to the firm's quality control system.

In the course of reviewing aspects of selected audits, an inspection may identify ways in which a particular audit is deficient, including failures by the firm to identify, or to address appropriately, respects in which an issuer's financial statements do not present fairly the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP.^{9/} It is not the purpose of an inspection, however, to review all of a firm's audits or to identify every respect in which a reviewed audit is deficient. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that the firm's audits, or its issuer clients' financial statements, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included a review of aspects of the Firm's auditing of financial statements of three issuers. The scope of this review was determined according to the Board's criteria, and the Firm was not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the scope.

purposes. It does not reflect any Board determination concerning which, or how many, of the Firm's audit clients are "issuers" as defined in the Act. In some circumstances, a Board inspection may include a review of a firm's audit of financial statements of an issuer that ceased to be an audit client before the inspection, and any such former clients are not included in the number shown here.

^{8/} This focus 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.

^{9/} When it comes to the Board's attention that an issuer's financial statements appear not to present fairly, in a material respect, the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP, the Board's practice is to report that information to the SEC, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

The inspection team identified what it considered to be audit deficiencies.^{10/} The deficiencies identified in one of the audits reviewed included deficiencies of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm did not obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements.^{11/} Those deficiencies were –

- (1) the failure to perform procedures to test the existence and fair values of defined benefit plan assets; and
- (2) the failure to perform procedures to test defined benefit plan data provided to specialists whose work the Firm used.

B. Review of Quality Control System

In addition to evaluating the quality of the audit work performed on specific audits, the inspection included review of certain of the Firm's practices, policies, and

^{10/} PCAOB standards require a firm to take appropriate actions to assess the importance of audit deficiencies identified after the date of the audit report to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed opinions. *See* AU 390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and AU 561, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report* (both included among the PCAOB's interim auditing standards, pursuant to PCAOB Rule 3200T). Failure to comply with these PCAOB standards could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions.

^{11/} In some cases, an inspection team's observation that a firm failed to perform a procedure may be based on the absence of documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence, even if a firm claims to have performed the procedure. PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 3, *Audit Documentation* ("AS No. 3"), 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. *See* AS No. 3, paragraph 9; Appendix A to AS No. 3, paragraph A28. For purposes of the inspection, an observation that the Firm did not perform a procedure, obtain evidence, or reach an appropriate conclusion may be based on the absence of such documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence.

procedures related to audit quality. This review addressed practices, policies, and procedures concerning audit performance and the following eight functional areas (1) tone at the top; (2) practices for partner evaluation, compensation, admission, assignment of responsibilities, and disciplinary actions; (3) independence implications of non-audit services; business ventures, alliances, and arrangements; personal financial interests; and commissions and contingent fees; (4) practices for client acceptance and retention; (5) practices for consultations on accounting, auditing, and SEC matters; (6) the Firm's internal inspection program; (7) practices for establishment and communication of audit policies, procedures, and methodologies, including training; and (8) the supervision by the Firm's audit engagement teams of the work performed by foreign affiliates on foreign operations of the Firm's issuer audit clients. Any defects in, or criticisms of, the Firm's quality control system are discussed in the nonpublic portion of this report and will remain nonpublic unless the Firm fails to address them to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the date of this report.

END OF PART I

PARTS II AND III OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC
AND ARE OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the Firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the Firm's response, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.^{12/}

^{12/} In any version of an inspection report that the Board makes publicly available, any portions of a firm's response that address nonpublic portions of the report are omitted. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.



Deloitte LLP
2 New Street Square
London EC4A 3BZ
Tel: +44 (0) 20 7936 3000
Fax: +44 (0) 20 7583 1198
LDE: DX 599
www.deloitte.co.uk

Mr. George H. Diacont
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006

11 March 2010

Dear Mr. Diacont

Deloitte LLP – Response to Part I of the Draft Report

Deloitte LLP (“Deloitte” or the “Firm”) is pleased to submit its response to Part I of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board’s (the “PCAOB” or the “Board”) draft of its Report on the Inspection of Deloitte LLP dated 16 February 2010 (the “Draft Report”).

Deloitte is committed to the highest standards of audit quality. We continually monitor the systems and processes for our audit practice, including quality control, and, among other things, make changes to methodologies, policies, and procedures when we identify improvements that could enhance audit quality. We are supportive of the inspection process and believe the Board’s observations enhance the ability of achieving our shared objective of improving audit quality. Deloitte’s Audit Transparency Report for 2009 provides comprehensive information regarding our approach to delivering quality and is available on our website:
<http://annualreport.deloitte.co.uk/audit-transparency-2009/AT-report-2009.pdf>

We view the PCAOB’s observations as constructive. However, for clarity, we note that the observations included in the Draft Report are already a matter of public record and not a new matter. Both observations relate to our audit work on post-employment benefits on one engagement reviewed jointly by the PCAOB and the Audit Inspection Unit (the “AIU”) of the Financial Reporting Council, the United Kingdom’s independent regulator responsible for promoting confidence in governance and reporting.

Deloitte LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675 and its registered office at 2 New Street Square, London EC4A 3BZ, United Kingdom.

Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu (“DTT”), a Swiss Verein, whose member firms are legally separate and independent entities. Please see www.deloitte.co.uk/about for a detailed description of the legal structure of DTT and its member firms.



Deloitte.

The AIU issued their public report on the 2007/8 inspection of Deloitte on 8 December 2008 and included the following observation in respect of findings from that joint engagement review:


“Post-employment benefits

In a small minority of audits we reviewed, there was, in our view, insufficient evidence to support the judgements concerning post-employment benefits and, in particular, concerning the extent of work undertaken to verify the existence and valuation of certain pension scheme assets”.

We address matters raised by our regulators on a timely basis. The AIU issued their public report on the 2008/9 inspection of Deloitte on 7 December 2009 and in that report the AIU confirmed that the Firm had addressed their overall findings arising from the prior year inspection in a satisfactory manner. No issues in respect of our audit work on post-employment benefits were reported on by the AIU in the 2008/9 inspection report.

We appreciate the efforts of the Board’s inspection team; they maintained a high degree of professionalism during the inspection and we would like to thank them for their efforts. In addition, we acknowledge the work of our partners and staff that prepared for and participated in the Board’s inspection. Lastly, we would also like to recognise the efforts and cooperation of the AIU in the Board’s inspection.

Yours sincerely


Deloitte LLP