NOTICE: This is an unofficial transcript of the portions of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's Standing Advisory Group meeting on June 18, 2015 that relate to the Board's proposal on improving transparency through disclosure of engagement partner and certain other participants in audits. The other topics discussed during the June 18, 2015 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: http://pcaobus.org/News/Webcasts/Pages/06182015_SAG.aspx.

PUBLIC COMPANY ACCOUNTING OVERSIGHT BOARD

+ + + + +

STANDING ADVISORY GROUP

+ + + + +

MEETING

THURSDAY
JUNE 18, 2015

+ + + + +

The Standing Advisory Group met in the Federal Hall of the Washington Plaza Hotel, 10 Thomas Circle NW, Washington, DC, at 8:30 p.m., Martin Baumann, Standing Advisory Group Chairman, presiding.

PCAOB BOARD

JAMES R. DOTY, Chairman JEANETTE M. FRANZEL, Board Member JAY D. HANSON, Board Member STEVEN B. HARRIS, Board Member

STANDING ADVISORY GROUP

- MARTIN F. BAUMANN, PCAOB, Chief Auditor and Director of Professional Standards, SAG Chairman
- JOAN C. AMBLE, President, JCA Consulting, LLC HON. RICHARD C. BREEDEN, Chairman and CEO, Breeden Capital Management, LLC
- LORETTA V. CANGIALOSI, Senior Vice President and Controller, Pfizer, Inc.
- PETER C. CLAPMAN, Senior Advisor, CamberView Partners, LLC
- WALTON T. CONN, JR., U. S. Partner and Global Head of Audit Methodology and Implementation, KPMG LLP
- WALLACE R. COONEY, Vice President-Finance and

- Chief Accounting Officer, Graham Holdings Company
- MICHAEL J. GALLAGHER, Managing Partner, Assurance Quality, PwC
- SYDNEY K. GARMONG, Partner in Charge, Regulatory Competency Center, Crowe Horwath LLP
- KENNETH A. GOLDMAN, Chief Financial Officer, Yahoo, Inc.
- L. JANE HAMBLEN, Former Chief Legal Counsel, State of Wisconsin Investment Board
- ROBERT H. HERZ, CEO, Robert H. Herz LLC; Executive-in-Residence, Columbia Business School, Columbia University
- PHILIP R. JOHNSON, Former Non-executive Director, Yorkshire Building Society
- JOYCE JOSEPH, Principal, Capital Accounting Advisory and Research, LLC
- JEAN M. JOY, Director of Professional Practice and Director of Financial Institutions Practice, Wolf & Company, P.C.
- GUY R. JUBB, Global Head of Governance and Stewardship, Standard Life Investments, Ltd.
- DAVID A. KANE, Americas Vice Chair, Assurance Professional Practice, Ernst & Young LLP
- JON LUKOMNIK, Executive Director, Investor Responsibility Research Center Institute; Managing Partner, Sinclair Capital, LLC
- DOUGLAS L. MAINE, Limited Partner and Senior Advisor, Brown Brothers Harriman & Co.
- MAUREEN F. MCNICHOLS, Marriner S. Eccles
 Professor of Public and Private Management
 and Professor of Accounting, Stanford
 University
- ELIZABETH F. MOONEY, Analyst, The Capital Group Companies
- LIZ D. MURRALL, Director, Stewardship & Reporting, Investment Management Association
- RICHARD H. MURRAY, CEO, Liability Dynamics Consulting, LLC
- ZACH OLEKSIUK, Americas Head, Corporate
 Governance and Responsible Investment,
 BlackRock
- JEREMY E. PERLER, Partner and Director of Research, Schilit Forensics

NEAL R. GROSS

- SANDRA J. PETERS, Head of Financial Reporting Policy, CFA Institute
- WILLIAM T. PLATT, Managing Partner-Professional Practice, and Chief Quality Officer-Attest, Deloitte & Touche, LLP
- GREGORY A. PRATT, Chairman, Carpenter Technology Corporation
- SRIDHAR RAMAMOORTI, Associate Professor of Accounting, School of Accountancy, and Director, Corporate Governance Center, Kennesaw State University
- BRANDON J. REES, Acting Director, Office of Investment, AFL-CIO
- PHILIP J. SANTARELLI, Partner, Baker Tilly Virchow Krause LLP
- THOMAS I. SELLING, President, Grove Technologies, LLC CHARLES V. SENATORE, Executive Vice President, Head of Regulatory Coordination and Strategy, Fidelity Investments
- JEFFREY L. TATE, Chief Audit Executive, The Dow Chemical Company
- SIR DAVID P. TWEEDIE, Chairman, International Valuation Standards Council
- JOHN W. WHITE, Partner, Corporate Department, Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP

OBSERVERS

BRIAN CROTEAU, Securities and Exchange Commission GINNY BARKER, Department of Labor BOB DACEY, General Accountability Office SUSAN DEMANDO SCOTT, Financial Industry Regulatory Authority

HARRISON GREENE, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation

JAMES GUNN, International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board

LARRY SMITH, Financial Accounting Standards Board BRUCE WEBB, Auditing Standards Board

PRESENTERS

JOUKY CHANG, Duff & Phelps

KEN LINING, Aon Hewitt WENDY STEVENS, WeiserMazars

PCAOB STAFF

GREG FLETCHER, Associate Chief Auditor GREG SCATES, Deputy Chief Auditor JOY THURGOOD, Associate Chief Auditor JESSICA WATTS, Associate Chief Auditor KEITH WILSON, Deputy Chief Auditor

1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
2.2	MR DOTY:	Thank vou. Marty	I've assured Martv

on several occasions that to preserve this slot of an important meeting it requires that some of you find this useful and helpful. So you can get me off of this with the appropriate advice to Marty.

2.2

But it is my chance to thank you again for coming, for giving us your guidance, for providing the kind of critical insight on our standard setting projects that we require.

I would note, of course, at the outset I speak only for myself here, in this overview of where we're going and what we're doing. I express no views about the -- other than my own, none on behalf of the Board or other members. But as I said last night, your participation gives us a critical piece of input and guidance.

We'll be discussing these significant standards that Marty has discussed, and consulting on work on auditing as we go forward. But I want to briefly touch on the progress of a couple of projects that we've discussed a number of times.

And one is enhancing transparency by naming the engagement partner and certain other firms in an audit.

And also, our project on audit quality indicators, which

1	we'll say something about.
2	As discussed in the last meeting, we've been
3	considering using a form, a PCAOB form, as an alternative
4	to requiring that names and information be provided about
5	the engagement in the audit report.
6	And it's my hope that this will allay auditors'
7	concerns on liability issues that they perceived in
8	connection with the disclosure of the audit engagement
9	partners' name, and the other participating firms.
10	We're ready to seek comment on a potential form
11	that could be used. And I hope to do that through a
12	supplemental request for comments later this month. And
13	with something to be said later on the AQI project, we
14	may well be in a position to proceed on both with the help
15	of our colleagues at the Commission.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 MR. BAUMANN: Thanks very much. Ken Goldman. 9 Thank you. This is my first 10 MR. GOLDMAN: meeting, so I'll just be brief in terms of a couple of 11 12 thoughts relative to Chairman Doty's comments. First of all, I think when the auditing standards 13 change, I would just recommend, it's helpful for issuing 14 companies to understand more of how those changed. 15 Sometimes we see the impact of those, but it's actually 16 during the auditing process. And I see this both as a 17 CFO, as well as a chairman of a couple of companies, in 18 19 terms of the audit committees. 20 You talked about Two is just a comment. enforcement actions. One thing I've noticed, just again 21 22 in my brief tenure here is I see a lot of the enforcement

actions, from what I see anyway, on firms that to me are relatively small. And it just brings to my thought as to whether certain firms should be doing audits. Or too is are we spending so much time on relatively smaller firms, versus larger firms.

Three -- and this is going to be contentious, but I'll say it anyway. I was on the treasury committee with some others here, when we looked at a number of factors. This is back in the '07, '08 timeframe. I have about 20 binders still from that period, which now are nicely on the shelf.

But one of the things we did talk about was the partner being -- you know, signing the opinion. We're still talking about it. And to me, I'll just make this comment. I am proud to sign on behalf of my company when I sign. And to me, you know, it should be the same -- I think it should be the same in terms of the auditing profession. They should be proud too.

And to try to put it on some other piece of paper, which is hard to find, it will be found anyway. I don't quite see the benefit of doing that, versus signing somewhere very visible, like under the opinion. Those

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

1	are	my	comments.			
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
LO						
L1						
L2						
L3						
L4						
L5						
L6						
L7						
L8						
L9						
20						
21						
22						

MS. MOONEY: Thanks, Marty. Well first, I would echo Ken Goldman's comments about the transparency project, and really urge PCAOB to move forward, I mean, without delay on this.

For the vast majority of annual reports that I've looked at in other countries, in the major countries, they include the audit partner names. It hasn't been a problem.

So these are -- you know, except Canada, I think all the other major countries do this. It seems like it doesn't look so great on the profession to continue to try to hide this information here.

But anyhow, just in respect to China, Jim, your comments on China, the audit work paper proposal. Is there any difference from what's required of the U.S. companies, or companies listed here, you know, that are from other countries, in terms of, you know, audit work papers in the U.S. securities law?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Thanks, Marty. It's really just 10 MR. TWEEDIE: 11 to back up what Ken and Elizabeth were saying. 12 I don't know the facts of the situation. But like many auditors, the fact that I don't know the facts doesn't 13 stop me expressing an opinion. 14 It was --- not being a lawyer, I just don't 15 understand the difference between putting an auditor's 16 name on a different piece of paper is going to save you. 17 And as a non-American, we've always looked upon the PCAOB 18 19 as a leader in this field. It's spawned similar bodies worldwide. 20 And worldwide the auditor puts his name under his 21 22 opinion. And, you know, I really think it's a shame that

1	the U.S. isn't showing the same sort of leadership that
2	it's shown in other areas. I really would like you to
3	think again and do it properly.
4	MR. BAUMANN: Thanks, David. Any other general
5	comments, questions? Peter Clapman.
6	MR. CLAPMAN: I'll just echo, since the issue has
7	now been raised for the table, the people that have urged
8	strongly to have the audit partner's name disclosed.
9	To me it's an investor protection issue. It's
10	an or disclosure issue to make it easier for investors
11	to understand the audit process in companies they're
12	investing in.
13	And I really don't see, since everybody else in
14	the structure of an audit knows who the senior audit
15	partner is, why this shouldn't be made readily available
16	to the public. And therefore, known to investors who
17	want this information. And it's hard for me to
18	understand why it's not readily understood that that
19	should be given.
20	
21	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

18

19

20

21

22

Well first, on the liability point, 10 MR. DOTY: 11 as I said, I believe that case law is moving significantly 12 in the direction of supporting Ken and Sir David on the proposition that merely naming the engagement partner in 13 an audit report, or even signing on behalf of the firm, 14 15 does not expose that engagement partner to liability 10b-5, under private civil litigation 16 under Rule standards. 17

But what I think as a lawyer is not important. I think what we're trying to do at the PCAOB is move the actual form requirement in a manner that will alleviate, address and lay to rest the concerns that the partner might be needing to make a statement subjecting the

1	partner to individual liability, personal liability.
2	
3	Although suits against individual engagement
4	partners have not been common. And so, I agree with Ken
5	that this information is going to be found if we can get
6	it in an appropriate filing at the PCAOB.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	MR. JUBB: Thank you. In relation to the naming
19	of the engagement partner on audit reports, I wanted to
20	share a very practical testimony relating to how very,
21	very useful this has been in the United Kingdom, in
22	relation to raising questions about audit quality and

1 reporting thereto.

2.2

Last month on behalf of Standard Life Investments, I attended the AGM of Royal Dutch Shell. And I spoke at that AGM in The Hague, to draw attention to the fact that the named partner for Royal Dutch Shell was also the named partner who signed the Rio Tinto audit reports some five or six years ago, at the same time when the chair of the audit committee of Royal Dutch Shell was the CFO.

I was able to do that because we were able to identify the name of the partner. And this was his first year being -- signing off on the Royal Dutch Shell, because he was named in the auditor reports. I was also able to identify that he was the auditor of a company named Bumi. Bumi is a mining company, which its shares are now suspended.

And in today's Financial Times, there is a report of a significant regulatory fine due to non-disclosure of certain related party transactions. And I was able to identify that the partner who signs the Royal Dutch Shell was the same person, because he is named in that way.

And if I didn't have the ability to identify that partner, I would not have been aware of the issues involved. And I would not have been in a position to ask the audit committee in the AGM -- or through the chair, to ask and inquire as to why the audit committee had not provided more disclosures regarding the circumstances associated with the selection of that individual as the audit partner for Royal Dutch Shell.

And I wanted to share this with the -- in the SAG, as a very practical example of how the naming of audit partners can enable a better understanding of the issues associated with a specific audit. Thank you.

MR. BAUMANN: Guy, thanks for those good insights, and we share completely your view of the

MR. BAUMANN: Guy, thanks for those good insights, and we share completely your view of the importance of naming the engagement partner. And it continues to be a very high priority of ours to make sure that that happens. Although a lot of obstacles have been in the way, we believe we'll get there. Joan Amble.

MS. AMBLE: Yes. Thank you. I actually wanted to talk on a different subject. Well actually, I do though want to make the point that I don't see what the issue is with the auditor signing the report either. I

2.2

	1	look to it analogous as the certifications that the CEOs
	2	and Chairman's provide.
3		So if there's some legal issue I'm unaware of, I'm
4		kind of clueless on that. But I'm kind of with the group
5		here that the signature seems to make a lot of sense. And
6		I would think they would be proud to sign it.
7		I was curious if you could offer, Chairman Doty,
8		some further discussion about you had mentioned when
9		the paper on audit committee dialogue was issued, you had
10		had some audit committee input from that. And that you
11		would propose on that in other areas to get more input from
12		the audit committee, which I think, is great. I would
13		welcome those opportunities.
14		I was curious as to whether or not that would be
15		sort of a formal process that you would set up? If there's
16		going to be an advisory group? Or if it would be more ad
17		hoc? And so, if you could just talk about maybe what the
18		outreach program might look like, I'd be interested.
19		
20		
21		