NOTICE: This is an unofficial transcript of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's Webinar for Investors on International Issues held on June 10, 2021, that relates to the Board's proposed PCAOB Rule 6100 on Board determinations under the Holding Foreign Companies Accountable Act. The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board does not certify the accuracy of this unofficial transcript, which may contain typographical or other errors.

PUBLIC COMPANY ACCOUNTING OVERSIGHT BOARD

+ + + + +

WEBINAR FOR INVESTORS ON INTERNATIONAL ISSUES

+ + + + +

PROPOSED RULE 6100: BOARD DETERMINATIONS
UNDER THE HOLDING FOREIGN COMPANIES
ACCOUNTABLE ACT (HFCAA)

+ + + + +

JUNE 10, 2021

+ + + + +

This transcript was produced from audio provided by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board.

SPEAKERS:

DUANE DESPARTE, Acting Chairperson
REBEKAH GOSHORN JURATA, Board Member
MEGAN ZIETSMAN, Board Member
LIZA MCANDREW MOBERG, Director, Office of
International Affairs
ERIN DWYER, Deputy Director, Office of External
Affairs

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

3:00 p.m.

MS. DWYER: Thank you for joining us today. I'm Erin Dwyer, the stakeholder liaison at the PCAOB and we are very happy to have all of you with us today, even though we're still virtual as we've been for the last 15 months.

But despite the remote work that all of us have been doing, at the PCAOB we've continued to emphasize and prioritize our engagement with key stakeholders including investors, audit committees, and financial preparers. Our webinar today is a part of that engagement and we're really pleased that you've taken time out of your busy schedules to be with us.

Before we jump into this, I do want to give the disclaimer for myself and fellow speakers who are presenting today, and that is that the views expressed are those of each speaker and do not necessarily reflect the view of the Board, other Board members, or the PCAOB

staff.

With me today I'm really pleased to have as our speakers Acting Chairperson Duane DesParte, and Board members Rebekah Goshorn Jurata and Megan Zietsman, as well as our Director of the Office of International Affairs Liza McAndrew Moberg. If you do not see Liza, it is not your connection. She was having a little technical difficulty so she is joining us by audio today. We apologize for that but she's there on the phone and we are delighted she can join us.

So, with that, I would like to turn it over now to Duane. Duane, I was hoping you could kick us off with some opening remarks.

MR. DESPARTE: Sure. Thank you, Erin.
On behalf of myself and Rebekah and Megan,
welcome. Really thank you for being here. As
Erin mentioned, stakeholder outreach is really a
key focus for us, remains a key focus for us, and
we're looking forward to our engagement today.

One of the things that you might know

is we had some developments last Friday that I thought I would just cover very briefly. Last Friday the SEC announced Bill Dunhnke's departure from the PCAOB and I was designated as Acting Chair effective at that time.

On Tuesday you may have seen that the SEC also commenced a process to solicit and consider nominations for all five of our Board positions. I expect that some of you may have questions about these changes. We would, though, appreciate if we could devote out time together today to address our agenda which, of course, is on international audit-related issues.

That said, I do want to emphasize that during this time of leadership transition

Rebekah, Megan, and I, and all of our dedicated and talented staff, remain fully committed to our responsibilities and to our mission of investor protection through what we do day in and day out in our audit oversight activities.

Our core standard setting, inspections, and enforcement activities will

proceed normally through the transition period, and we will continue to work in coordination with the SEC to assess and respond to evolving priorities as we always do.

With that, Erin, I'll turn it back to you.

MS. DWYER: Great. Thank, Duane.

Appreciate those remarks.

I do now want to jump into our topic at hand. We are going to address international work. I know that some of what's going on on the international stage has been top of mind for many investors, including the PCAOB's role and responsibilities related to the Holding Foreign Companies Accountable Act.

Before we get into the details, Duane,
I was thinking maybe we could take a step back
and I thought it might be helpful if you could
give us a sense of the scope of our international
oversight responsibilities and its relationship
to HFCAA.

MR. DESPARTE: Sure. Thanks, Erin.

You know, robust inspections and investigations of audit firms that audit U.S. public companies are really what we're all about. It's our core mandate under the Sarbanes-Oxley Act.

That mandate applies whether firms or the public companies that the firms audit are located inside or outside the U.S. All firms auditing U.S. public companies are required to register with us and they are subject to our oversight activity.

To illustrate the scope of our oversight program from an international perspective, we have approximately 1,700 audit firms that are registered with us, and of those about 49 percent are located outside of the United States.

Of those approximately 800 firms, 300 of them are located in 62 foreign jurisdictions and those 300 firms perform activities that make them subject to our inspection and our investigation activity including the obligation to be inspected by the PCAOB at least once every

three years.

For the 12 months ended March 31,

2021, this year, PCAOB-registered firms located

outside the U.S. issued approximately 1,200 audit

reports on U.S. issuer financial statements.

Those issuers had a combined market

capitalization at that time of more than \$11

trillion.

So all of that is to highlight for you that while we are a U.S. regulator, our mandate extends to firms, wherever they may be, that audit U.S. issuers and, thus, international focus and engagement is very important to our success and to what we do.

I will offer that in order for us to effectively fulfill our inspection and our investigation activities, firms -- you know, we need firms to cooperate and provide our inspection teams, our investigators, our enforcement teams, with complete and timely access to personnel and to documentation. In most cases, that is exactly what happens but not

always.

In some situations, we are not able to fully inspect or investigate registered firms completely and, partly in response to those types of situations, Congress did pass the Holding Foreign Companies Accountable Act. I think we're going to talk a little bit more about that now.

Erin.

MS. DWYER: Yep. Thanks, Duane. I'm unmuting myself. I think that's a really helpful overview in setting our stage to now turn to the proposed rule. Since we are in an open comment period for that proposed rule, I just want to outline logistically where we are in that process and provide some disclosures or disclaimers, if you will.

As many of you know, on May 13 of this year the Board issued a release regarding a proposed PCAOB rule that would govern Board determinations under the Holding Foreign

Companies Accountable Act. That release contains the views of the Board with respect to the

proposed rule and invites public comment on it.

We welcome input from all stakeholders on all aspects of that proposed rule including the questions posed in the Board's proposing release. We encourage you to submit a written comment if you wish to do so.

The comment period does close on July 12th. Instructions for submitting comments are on our website as well as in the proposing release, so I encourage you to take a look at that. I will just now, before we jump into this discussion, reiterate my earlier disclaimer that the views each speaker expresses on this topic are specifically their own and not necessarily the views of the rest of the Board or PCAOB staff.

With those disclaimers out of the way,

Duane, can I turn back to you to share with the

audience sort of a high-level overview? I think

I've satisfied the lawyers so maybe you can give

us --

MR. DESPARTE: All the fine print that

we put at the top. Yes, sure. Under -- we're referring to it as HFCAA, Holding Foreign

Companies Accountable Act, but that's also a mouthful. The PCAOB is required under that Act to determine whether we are unable to inspect or investigate completely registered public accounting firms that are located in a foreign jurisdiction because of a position that is taken by one or more authorities in that jurisdiction.

In addition, the SEC is required to take various actions with respect to public companies that use registered audit firms that the PCAOB has determined fit that criteria.

Under HFCAA such companies are referred to as "covered issuers."

The SEC's website has a lot more information about the actions that the SEC is required to take under HFCAA including a release that they issued in March that addresses reporting requirements for public companies that are, in fact, being covered issuers under the Act.

With respect to our determination, we issued a proposed rule on May 13th that provides a framework for the Board in making this determination as is required under the Act.

Along with the text of the proposed rule, the Board had an open Board meeting and we discussed the background of our proposed rule, the need for the proposed rule, and the intended operation of the proposed rule.

I encourage you to take a look at the release that we issued for further detail.

Nothing we say today is intended to modify or supersede the discussion of the proposed rule as set forth in that release.

I also encourage you to provide us any comments or feedback that you may have on the proposed rule through our comment period which, as Erin just mentioned, runs through July 12th.

We're making it as simple as possible. You can just email us at comments@PCAOBUS.org.

I will now turn to Liza McAndrew

Moberg who heads up our Office of International

Affairs to share some additional details on the proposed rule.

Liza.

MS. MCANDREW MOBERG: Thank you,

Duane. If it isn't a sign of the times, of

course, my technology issues started 15 minutes

before this was starting so I apologize for not

being on camera but hopefully you can hear me

fine.

As Duane said, and you'll hear us say a couple more times as we go along in this description, the HFCAA calls for the Board to determine whether it's unable to inspect or investigate completely registered public accounting firms in a foreign jurisdiction because of a position taken by authorities in that jurisdiction.

I want to cover three aspects of the rule that the Board recently proposed and, as was already said, is open for public comment.

Specifically what I'll cover is, first, how the Board proposes to allow two types of

determinations. Second, how the Board proposes to make those determinations. And, third, how the Board proposes to communicate its determination.

First, on the type of determinations, the Board is proposing to take a two-pronged approach to determining which firms cannot be inspected or investigated completely. The first proposed approach is for the Board to make its determination as to a jurisdiction.

In that scenario the Board can determine that all firms headquartered in a particular jurisdiction cannot be inspected or investigated completely. The Board expects to employ this approach in most cases and has indicated that in its proposing release.

Second, the proposed rule allows for firm-specific determinations, so we have jurisdiction-wide or firm-specific determinations. For example, because the jurisdiction-wide determination would apply to all firms headquartered in the jurisdiction, the

Board's proposed rule provides the Board the ability to identify specific firms that are not headquartered in the jurisdiction but that have an office there and that the Board cannot inspect or investigate completely because of the foreign authority in that jurisdiction. So those, in summary, are the types of determinations the Board proposes to make.

I'll move on now to the second issue which is how the Board proposes to make the determinations. The proposed rule would tie the Board's ability to inspect or investigate completely to the mandate in the Sarbanes-Oxley Act with respect to inspections and investigations.

The Board would assess whether the position taken by the foreign authority impairs the Board's ability to execute its statutory mandate with respect to inspections or investigations. That assessment is driven under the proposed rule by three factors:

First, the Board's ability to select

engagements in audit areas to be reviewed during an inspection, and to select potential violations to be investigated.

Second, the Board's access to, and its ability to retain and use, any documents or information that the Board considers relevant to the inspection or the investigation.

Third, the Board's ability to conduct inspections and investigations in a manner consistent with the statutory mandate and the rules of the Board. Really, this third factor is capturing any other aspect of the Board's requirements, statutory mandate, that aren't already covered in the first two factors I just went over.

An example of this is the Board's ability to satisfy its inspection frequency requirements -- for some firms it's annually and for some firms it's every three years -- and the Board's ability to share information with the SEC as required under the Act.

These three factors are not separate

prerequisites for a Board determination. Rather, if a position taken by a foreign authority impairs the Board's ability to execute its mandate in any of these three respects, a Board determination could be warranted under the proposed rule.

Also, the Board may not be impaired as to both inspections and investigations. The Board may make a determination under the proposed rule if it's unable to either inspect or investigate completely.

In addition to the three factors that the Board would evaluate, the proposed rule provides that the Board may consider any documents or information it deems relevant. The proposed rule, however, identifies for the avoidance of doubt and clarity certain categories of documents or information that the Board may consider.

The proposed rule indicates that determinations would remain in effect indefinitely until modified or vacated by the

Board. However, as proposed, the Board would reassess at least annually whether its prior determinations merit reassessment.

Now I'll move on to the third aspect that I wanted to cover which is communicating about the determinations. Under the proposed rule when the Board makes a determination, it would issue the determination in the form of a report to the Commission, the SEC. The Board's report would describe the Board's assessment and the basis for the Board's determination and identify the firms subject to the determination.

Promptly after the Board's report is issued, a copy of the report would be made publicly available on the Board's website.

As Duane and Erin both said, the Board has requested comments from the public on its proposed rule and the Board welcomes comments or feedback submitted in writing.

Erin, with that, I'll turn it back to you.

MS. DWYER: Great. Thank you, Liza.

To reiterate I guess now for a third time, please do think about submitting a comment or any feedback to our docket. As Duane mentioned the email is comments@PCAOBUS.org.

specific countries that pose challenges so I know we'll get into that a little later. So since we're going to go into the country-specific topic shortly here, maybe Rebekah, I'll turn to you and, you know, sort of sticking with the same HFCAA theme. That legislation was born out of Congress' concerns about the implication of the PCAOB's inability to access information from auditors in certain circumstances.

While the HFCAA has increased attention to this issue, we have at the PCAOB for many years sought to be transparent with investors and the public about these access challenges, so can you describe our initiatives and what that has looked like over the past several years?

MS. JURATA: Absolutely. First of

all, I just want to say thank you to Duane and to you, Erin, as our Stakeholder Liaison. I think this demonstrates how critically important it is that we can demonstrate to our stakeholders that we're still showing up and doing our day job and fulfilling our mission.

But, more importantly is that the mission of the PCAOB, as Duane indicated in his opening remarks, is not limited to the boundaries of the United States but, in fact, our mission and mandate is abroad and international. Our international inspections program is crucial to ensure that we can monitor and enforce for compliance with the standards of the PCAOB.

It's also critically important that we are able to facilitate our international inspections program to ensure that everybody is playing by the same rules of the road. I think over the course of time the PCAOB has established incredible cooperative relationships with our counterparts and foreign regulators, but we do still have some access issues. With that little

bit in the beginning, I'll go ahead and dive into a little bit more.

The international cooperation is obviously crucially important and how we facilitate that here at the PCAOB is through a number of facets including significant engagement between the PCAOB with an international regulatory information-sharing body called IFIAR, which Duane is currently the chair of IFIAR, where all the regulators -- all the other audit regulators get around the table and, you know, facilitate really critically important information sharing in recognition that our borders and our financial services markets are global in nature, and that we want to advance audit quality internationally. It's because we have to facilitate those international cooperations.

Now, also throughout the history of the PCAOB as we have continued to apply our standards compliance regime inspections program internationally, we need to do that through

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

engagement with our counterparts abroad. In certain jurisdictions, you know, you might come across a conflict of law issue, but we've been able to mitigate a lot of these access issues through cooperative agreements.

I think it's a success that we can demonstrate that just this past April the PCAOB entered into such a cooperative agreement with the country of Belgium, and I just have to applaud Liza and her team for everybody to get to that success. Right now there are no obstacles for the PCAOB to facilitate our international inspections program in Europe, which is significant so that we can ensure that those investors who are availing themselves of the U.S. capital markets can do so in comfort knowing that PCAOB's inspection program is applying itself both domestically and abroad.

We have at the PCAOB, as you noted,
Erin, in your kickoff over to me, tried to
enhance the disclosure and what we are making
publicly available to investors of what we're

doing abroad including those international cooperative agreements and where we are still struggling with access.

(Laughter). Sorry. It was like abracadabra.

MS. DWYER: I was trying to get my slides up. I didn't mean to scare you with it.

MS. JURATA: Like what did I do? What did I say? No, but I appreciate that t-off.

This will show, as Erin is pointing out, what we're trying to make readily available for all of our stakeholders, and investors in particular, to know where we are able to show up and do our job and where we are still having problems.

I have to give credit that making everything transparent happened before I joined the Board starting in 2009 and really kind of geared up in 2018 where we wanted to flag as much information as possible for those investors of issuers who were using auditors that may be located abroad who have not been inspected by the PCAOB.

In particular, starting in 2018, we starting making quarterly data available which included the aggregate market capitalization of issuers whose audits we have been unable to inspect, and data about auditors doing referred work, as well as about the auditors that sign issuer audit opinions.

I think to just sort of, you know, circle back to what I began in talking about was that we want to ensure that auditors who are registered with the PCAOB are subject to the same rules and requirements and that we are able to go in and do inspections to ensure compliance with our standards.

What is really important and relates to our international inspections program is that we're applying the same standards and principles of our program both domestically and abroad consistently. There has been a certain jurisdiction, which comes as no surprise, where we have not had that same experience.

Now, other jurisdictions have raised

their own concerns and issues. As I kind of referenced earlier, we've been able to work through those through cooperative agreements. I think that Congress has highlighted the fact that we want to ensure that investors who are availing themselves of the U.S. capital markets recognize that issuers who use an auditor registered with the PCAOB should be subject to the same requirements and the same inspections program.

That is why, I believe, that Congress required the SEC and the PCAOB to take action under the Holding Foreign Companies Accountable Act. I think, you know, as we work through that as a critical rulemaking, hopefully it will fill that gap but, obviously, it's in the early stages. The lawyer in me, Erin, will circle that also and say we welcome comments as we move forward with the proposal. But I do just want to emphasize that the work that we do, both domestic and, importantly, abroad, we're trying to increase our transparency.

As Erin popped up, and startled me

(laughter), on our website we really are trying to make it clear to the investing public where we are having issues but also where we are successfully facilitating our international inspections program.

MS. DWYER: I apologize, Rebekah, for the pop-up but I did want to share and show investors where you can look on our website under the Oversight tab and there's a whole section on the international that has some really good information, as Rebekah noted, that we've been updating quarterly.

When you click through on the audit reports issued by PCAOB-registered firms in jurisdictions where denied access to conduct inspections, you can search by a number of parameters, including country, firm name, among a number of items. I'm going to turn that up but warn my speakers that they will pop back up again, different slides. Apologies again for that.

I did want to before we move on, you

know, kind of turn to our audience again because I think a lot of people are surprised, at least when I speak with investors and others, when they hear that there's about \$2.3 trillion, Rebekah, as you mentioned, in market cap that's audited by PCAOB registered firms in jurisdictions where we face access challenges.

I'm going to try to ask a poll question here and hopefully no one is frightened by this pop-up poll like I did with my slide.

The poll question is for investors: When thinking about investment risks, do you consider PCAOB access challenges often, occasionally, rarely, or never? I'll give everyone a minute to answer that before I share the results with the group.

All right. I'm going to end the poll so hopefully everyone has voted and share the results with everybody. So hopefully my fellow speakers can see this. What we're getting is that almost half of folks who answered this question occasionally consider PCAOB access

challenges, where another almost 40 percent think of us often, and about 22 percent rarely or never.

I have to say that makes me happy that over about -- oh, gosh, my math is bad, but 68 percent about are thinking about the PCAOB's access either often or occasionally. I don't know if others want to provide comments as they go about their results but I think I've now ended that poll.

You know, I'll move on a bit, I think. We've covered a lot about, Rebekah, where we have challenges.

Megan, as Rebekah mentioned, access challenges are the exception, not the norm for us at the PCAOB when it comes to our international oversight program. Can you speak maybe a little bit to the scope of our oversight internationally as well as our enforcement activities?

MS. ZIETSMAN: Yeah, sure, Erin.

Hello everybody and thank you for joining and for having the opportunity for us to engage with you

today.

I think maybe what I'm doing is recapping some of the points that others have already made. Maybe this puts some of the other conversation in context again. I think as Duane mentioned at the beginning, the PCAOB's responsibilities are mandated by Congress and they apply equally to all registered firms irrespective of where those firms are located.

Our registration processes, our inspection processes, and our enforcement activities are intended to operate in the same way for all firms. Of course, audits of issuers need to be done in accordance with the PCAOB standards and rules. In accordance with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, the Board is expected to periodically inspect firms that issue audit reports for U.S. issuers.

During those inspections our staff are required to go and obtain the documents and the information that they need so that they can perform those reviews of both selected audit

engagements, as well as firms' quality control systems and perform any other procedures that they think are appropriate in the context of those inspections.

Of course, I think it goes without saying that inspections and investigations are really crucial aspects of the Board's oversight and critical to the accomplishment of the mission of the Board.

To give a sense of the scope of our international oversight activities, I think you heard some of the stats and data through the presentation already, but the slide that's up now shows that actually nearly half of the firms that are registered with the PCAOB are actually located outside of the United States. You can see on the slide where since 2004 the PCAOB has actually conducted inspections of one or more registered firms.

The Board, of course, is strongly committed to enforcing compliance with our standards, rules, and the related federal

securities laws. Obviously, that's core to the achievement of our mission.

As the Board and as the members of our organization we are all strongly committed to that goal. When registered firms and their associated persons engage in improper conduct, we also will take prompt action to hold them accountable. That's to not only hold people accountable for things that we think they haven't done properly, but it's also intended to deter others from similarly engaging in that same kind of improper conduct.

So we continue to allocate substantial resources to our enforcement activities and our enforcement priorities with an emphasis on cases that involve significant audit failures. That's really where we tend to try to focus our efforts and our resources.

Maybe just to give a little bit of a sense for our enforcement activities related to non-U.S. firms and their associated persons, over the five years ending December 31, 2020 one-third

of our cases related to non-U.S. firms or their associated persons. That's a term that's defined in our rules. Those cases were located in 17 jurisdictions. Currently when we look at our current case load we kind of continue roughly at that one-third level as well.

I think you've heard a little bit about agreements that we have in place with foreign regulators. Those agreements address both inspections as well as investigations which fall under our enforcement function.

While non-U.S. oversight might involve some additional coordination considerations with non-U.S. regulators, fundamentally an inspection or an investigation should be the same whether or not the firm is located within or outside of the U.S.

I think at that point I'm going to turn over to Liza and she'll give us a little more information about what does an inspection entail and really how that might look in the context of a non-U.S. inspection.

Liza, I'll turn it over to you.

MS. DWYER: Yeah. And I'll jump in really quickly I think before Liza starts because we did have an audience question that I'm now seeing, so apologies guys, about in the COVID environment how the access challenges to documents are handled. Liza, I think you're going to walk us through sort of how the inspections work.

As you're thinking of your comments on that, if you can speak to how we've been handling our international inspections during COVID and what, if any, additional challenges have arisen, I think that would be helpful to the group.

MS. MCANDREW MOBERG: Great, Erin.

Yes, happy to do that and I will cover that.

Erin, since I can't see what's on the screen, we're going to go back to the presentation. If you can let me know when we have up on the screen our slide on home regulator involvement.

I'll get started with reinforcing

something that Megan just said which is all our inspections are the same fundamentally whether it is of a U.S. firm or a non-U.S. firm, and that includes also whether we do the work on our own or if we do it cooperatively with the home country regulator in the jurisdiction.

I'm going to provide you an overview of the inspection process in a minute, but first let's talk a little bit about how other regulators are involved in our inspections in some cases.

Erin, do we have our slide up?

MS. DWYER: We do and I will -- I'm on
the home regulator slide. When you tell me to
move on, I will.

MS. MCANDREW MOBERG: Perfect. Thank you. You guys are having a real-time demonstration of PCAOB agility and flexibility in unforeseen circumstances.

On the home regulator involvement, during our inspections if we start with the two poles of this slide, in many cases a non-U.S.

firm inspection is PCAOB only. Quite a lot of our inspections are done where perhaps there's not a regulator in that country, or perhaps there is a regulator but for a number of reasons the regulator chooses to not work with us on the inspection.

Not in any negative way. It's just for whatever reason the choice that they make. In those cases we notify the firm, we coordinate our inspection, we go and do our inspection just as we would any U.S. firm, no difference. If we go on to the opposite side of the slide, a joint inspection.

In many cases we truly do all aspects of our inspection jointly with the home country regulator. That would be before we even contact the firm we might plan with the regulator. We are out on the field together. We talk with each other about what we find and we'll see some of that when I get to the inspection process in a minute. So those are joint inspections and those can be done also for a number of reasons.

In the earliest days in some jurisdictions the law required that the inspection be done jointly with the foreign regulator. Today there are many places where that is the law and it's just become normal for us and those regulators to have a relationship where we plan and conduct inspections together.

In other jurisdictions there is no requirement under law that we do the inspections jointly, but we choose to. The foreign regulator wants to and we are always open to having a conversation with them about doing that.

We find it, the staff finds it, very beneficial for us to be communicating with the audit regulators in the home country. We learn a lot about what it is that they are seeing in their domestic environment that that firm is operating in, so we find those joint inspections and those communications very useful.

In the middle of the slide here we have coordination or observation. This can take a variety of forms. We have some regulators who

like to be the ones to contact the firm and say,
"hey, the PCAOB is coming" and set up the dates.
We have some regulators who say "go ahead and set
up with the firm, but I'm going to ask the firm
if I can come and observe what you do."

Again, we are open to all of those sorts of arrangements. Of course, we do all of this in compliance with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act which requires us to keep information confidential, but certainly there are provisions in place and ways that we can work with the foreign regulator nonetheless.

So if we move on, Erin, to the next slide on the cycle, I want to give an overview here really quickly of what the planning cycle looks like and then we'll go through a timeline in a little bit more detail.

The key point that I want you to take away from this slide is that the inspection process really doesn't stop once we issue a report. We plan our inspection, we go out and do it, the Board reaches its conclusion.

Importantly, it's the Board that decides what to issue in the final report. It's a Board report on the inspection.

Then after the report is finalized, we take a look at whether or not any quality control issues have been remediated by the firm to the satisfaction of Board within 12 months. At the end of all of that, again we're still not done.

We've learned a lot through that whole process.

Before we start planning the next inspection -- at this moment every non-U.S. firm, the number of audit reports that they issue subjects them to inspections once every three years. We do not have any non-U.S. firms at this moment whose activity level on audit subjects them to an annual inspection.

But if we're coming back to the firm three years later -- we might decide to pull it forward depending on the facts that we know -- we think about what we learned in that report in that past inspection, and we think about what have we learned in other inspections. That cycle

is really meant to reinforce that idea. We're always building off of prior knowledge to see how that informs the risks and the approaches for future inspections.

I want to reinforce at this point,
this is a reminder I'm sure to many of you, that
we inspect quality control overall for the firm,
the firm-wide quality control system. Then we
also select certain engagements and inspect those
engagements. We don't do 100 percent of the
engagements that we select. We select focus
areas with an engagement. Again, it's based on
our risk assessments.

So, Erin, if we can move on now to the next slide on the timeline. Perfect. Thank you.

just went through on the last slide but a couple of more details. This is where I'm going to get to some of the challenges that we've had and some of the different ways we've adapted to the COVID environment.

I want to reinforce before I start

that, in fact, with very few exceptions, in fact one exception, this is the timeline and these are the processes for every one of our inspections. The only exception is for a non-U.S. firm, if those work papers are not documented in English, you'll see the very first item on the timeline is our planning and our risk assessment, we think about whether we need a translator or an interpreter to help us make sure we get through the work papers and, importantly, to help us make sure we have the means to communicate effectively with the inspected firm so that their firm personnel can really communicate to us what they need to about the work that they did.

You'll see in the timeline that we don't just show up and surprise the firm and say, "We're here. We're starting to inspect." We notify the firm in advance of the inspection. The firm then provides us some preliminary information. We've already done our risk assessment. We've done some planning based on information we have, what we know. Some of it

from the prior inspection, some of it from the annual reports that the firms have to file, and other documents that we received. We ask them to provide us a little bit more information so that we can further refine our plan. Then you'll see the second item at the top. We notify the firm of the specific engagements that we've selected and the focus areas for our review so that they have everything ready for us when we get out there to inspect.

We also ask them to give us even a little bit more information so, again, we further refine. It's not unlike an audit, in fact, where the auditor is required to continually reevaluate the information and reassess as they go along in the process.

One thing that is a little bit different this year, this is one of our COVID challenges and how we've responded, is the early access in the test of technology. In many cases for the U.S. firms, in particular, we might have gotten advanced access and we might have utilized

technology in order to see some of the firms' documents.

In the non-U.S. setting, we had never done that prior to COVID. We didn't ask for work papers in advance. We would fly to the jurisdiction, we would show up at the firm's offices, and we would start our work from there, so there was no technology to deal with. We would get there and there would be firm laptops ready for us.

Now what we have done to pivot in the COVID environment, all of our inspections since we closed mid-March of last year, closed our offices and started working from home, all of our inspections had been remote whether they are domestic or foreign. Some of those still are laptops. Some firms choose to send us laptops with all of their data on it for the inspection.

We return it at the end.

But in many cases it's technology enabled and we didn't have all of this set up with every single one of the firms around the

world that we'd need to inspect, so we've spent a lot of time working with their IT and with our IT to ensure that we've established effective and safe ways for us to access the data.

Then we conduct our field work.

Again, we have "remote" signaled here because this year, and in most of last year, those were remote inspections. We do our field work and at the end of it, we request and the firm provides supporting documentation for what we have found.

Again, we don't keep all of the firm's audit work papers, all of their files. We don't have a need for all of them, but we do have a need for the documentation that supports what we have found that we think might be a finding, we call it.

After the field work we issue comment forms to the firm. It describes what it is that we found and it gives the firm an opportunity to respond. It may be that there's something that they feel that we didn't see and they want to provide it to us. It may be that there are other factors they want us to consider, so that comment

form really makes sure that we've had a thorough process and a thorough understanding between our teams and the firm.

Based on those comment forms, we draft a report. We have an internal process to ensure that across all of our many inspections that we conduct, we have consistency in how we've evaluated what we found and decided what belongs in an inspection report.

Again, the firm has a chance to review that report and respond. Not to negotiate with us about what's in it, but rather that they see it, they can see if they've provided us everything that we needed that is relevant and, importantly, the firm has an option to provide a letter that we will attach to the final report that the Board ultimately publishes.

As I said before, all of our reports are, in fact, reports of the Board. Our Board votes on them and once they are voted on, they are published.

Finally, as I mentioned before, if we

have quality control findings, the firm has one year in order to demonstrate to the Board's satisfaction that it has remediated those quality control findings. But we don't just wait 12 months until we talk to them. It is a process of communication with the firm and the staff between the time we issue it and the time that ultimately the Board reaches its determination.

So that, in some detail, is what happens in an inspection. Again, I want to go back to the only things that are different are translators are needed. We have been using technology a lot more on the remote inspections this year. And, as I said before, there would be coordination of varying degrees with the regulators along the way.

I want to make one thing very clear also. When we coordinate with regulators, we still independently, the Board, draws its own conclusions at the end of the inspection. All of the procedures that we needed to have done have been done and the Board has evaluated what it

found to arrive at its own conclusions.

We speak with the foreign regulator about what we found and we find that two-way dialogue very helpful to understand how they are concluding and them understanding how we are concluding but, at the end of the day, it is an independent report of our Board at the end of the joint inspection.

I'm going to turn back to Erin in just one minute, but I wanted to touch on something that Megan said earlier to emphasize what we've gone through with you in detail, what happens in an inspection, in our investigations it's the same concept. When our investigators are looking at a suspected matter of a non-U.S. firm, they are conducting all of the procedures, they are going through the processes, the same as they would in a U.S. firm.

In some cases when we get access to that information, we request it through a home country regulator but that doesn't change in essence what it is that are investigators are

doing in order to form recommendations to put before the Board.

With that, Erin, I will turn it back to you and see if we have any questions.

MS. DWYER: We do, Liza. I actually think one that we just got is a good one for you, which is how do you determine which international firms to inspect. I guess we got ahead of ourselves a little. Maybe you can just take a step back and share with the group how we choose which international firms we are going to inspect.

MS. MCANDREW MOBERG: Sure. No problem. So this is driven by the statute, by our mandate. If a firm is conducting audit work that subjects it to our inspection, which really if they are issuing audit reports for any U.S. issuer, they are subject to being inspected every three years. Sometimes for risk reasons, or for other reasons, we might do it more frequently than every three years. We are able to do that. The Board is able to do that.

We know pretty well -- we have about 300 firms right now, non-U.S. firms, that are subject to inspection and we know when they are coming up due for their three years. If there's a foreign regulator involved, some foreign regulators don't inspect every single firm every single year so we might have conversations with them about we are going to need to come in the next three years. When will you be there? We try to align our schedule so that joint inspection works very effectively for us, for them and, frankly, I think it's probably better for the firm as well.

MS. DWYER: Great. Thanks, Liza.

While you were talking, I popped up another slide
just to show folks where on our website you can
find our inspection reports. I think sometimes
I've heard from stakeholders that they didn't
know they could access our inspection reports but
if you do go, again, to PCAOBUS.org under
oversight, you will see a link to firm
inspections reports.

Again, once you get there, you will have a lot of different ways you can search for a report. Right now this is just what the most recent reports that we've issued are. They are coming up alphabetically so you'll see some of the Deloitte firm reports there, but you can also do a country look-up, as well as whether it includes a public quality control criticism. I really do encourage investors to look at those reports. I think it's really useful information.

We are coming to the end of our time and we will open the floor to question and answer.

Before we do that, I wanted to get one more polling question in from our attendees to ask sort of about your confidence in the audited financials of companies based in jurisdictions where the PCAOB cannot inspect audits is.

Please fill in the blank with much less, less, the same, more, or much more compared to jurisdictions where the PCAOB can inspect.

I'm going to give that a minute. Please as we're

taking our poll questions, if you have questions for us, the Q&A box is where you can ask them.

and share the results. Pretty interesting.

Almost 90 percent of you have less or much less confidence in the audited financials of companies where we cannot inspect. About 13 percent of you have the same amount. Interesting results.

Like I said, I will now turn to our Q&A. We have a question here that asks sort of with the extent of remote auditing happening by firms in the last year -- I imagine this is related to COVID -- the person is asking what is the PCAOB been doing to assess the impact in 2020, as well as in this current year, and are we able to do that sort of assessment internationally.

Maybe, Duane, I'll kick it to you if you'd like to start.

MR. DESPARTE: Sure. Yeah, I can start. Erin, I do have the polling question still up just by the way, on my screen at least.

In any case, with respect to remote auditing, certainly last year not only were auditors doing their audits remotely, but a lot of the financial close activities for issuers were being performed remotely as well.

That certainly can -- that certainly got our attention, as you would expect. Last year right out of the gate we engaged with the firms to get a better understanding of what they were doing to ensure that they had quality controls around their inspections -- around their audits.

We also in our inspections we increased our scope to include some calendar non-calendar year-end audits; for instance, June 30th audit, just to start to get a feel of what some of the risks were going to be. We have a general feel kind of what complexities were out there last year. We had a lot of discussions with the firms in terms of what activities and controls they were putting in place to address those complexities. That's kind of overall from

an international perspective.

It was mentioned earlier that PCAOB is a very active member of the International Forum of Independent Audit Regulators, IFIAR. IFIAR spent a lot of time with the global firms, the largest network firms, to engage with them to understand what they were doing and how they were managing the remote environment.

I think as the PCAOB we have a lot of information about what the firms have told us they were doing. We are just starting our inspections of 2020 audits for the most part so we are now going to be finding out -- you know, we kind of understand what the firm intended to do. We are now going to inspect to see how that worked out.

But the feedback that we've gotten

from most of our stakeholders is that it seems to
have run more smoothly than anybody would have
initially expected. I think that really relates
to some significant investments in technology at
preparers and at firms that help facilitate a

very unique, obviously, and challenging,
situation.

Erin, I don't know if anyone else would want to comment.

MS. JURATA: Erin, I might jump in and just say, you know, I don't have much to add because Duane answered the question but I do just want to flag that we did as an organization try to signal and make public a lot of areas of concern and high risk given the remote audit environment.

As Duane said, you know, we did a significant amount of ongoing outreach, not only with audit firms, but also with audit committees seeing how they were addressing the risk. We were trying to make public and signaling to the firms registered with us and subject to our requirements that we expected the audit procedures, in particular over ICFR, should change in light of the fact that if the auditor is doing a remote audit, then they can't rely on procedures that were previously used in a non-

remote environment.

I think highlighting that and then, as well, as focusing on the quality control systems of firms and how they've adjusted in a remote environment is going to feed into our 2021 inspections. Just to emphasize what Duane pointed out was that I want to applaud the work that the Staff did in responding to 2020. We did change our inspections program in response to the COVID environment.

I think it bears mentioning again what Duane just said, we changed the issuers whose audits were selected for inspection and review to include some with calendar year ends of June 2020, as well as the interim reviews. The PCAOB did get some real-time updates of how firms are handling it, and then again calling out the high-risk areas through a lot of publications.

MS. DWYER: Great. Thank, Rebekah.

I think we just have another question that maybe I'll wrap us up with because we at almost the time mark. This is a really good

question. Maybe, Liza, I'll give this one to you to start, at least, which is in a joint inspection does the PCAOB ever wish to inspect areas or items that foreign inspectors -- foreign regulators they mean -- don't wish to inspect?

If so, what happens?

MS. MCANDREW MOBERG: It happens all the time, Erin. We're very used to this discussion. You know, at its heart a joint inspection and the work that we do collaboratively really is about the foreign regulator respects that firms are doing work, registered with us and did work that subjects them to our oversight. That firm needs to meet its requirements under its registration obligations.

That foreign regulator has its own work that it has to do under its mandate. From one jurisdiction to another, the scope, the frequency, the type of work that the foreign regulator needs to do to satisfy their own mandate, could be quite different from ours.

They and we agree to work together so that each side can get done what they need to do in an effective way. It is quite often that we talk to the regulator. We say -- they want to do some things, we want to do some things. Part of the time we might be out in the field together doing the same things and part of the time we might be in the field together doing totally different things.

They obviously being in the jurisdiction will spend, you know, different amounts of time at that firm and have the luxury to come and go. We go out and try to get everything done effectively while we are there. In some jurisdictions it could be in one year they will look at a firm with us together and then the next year they won't look at the firm at all. It might not be part of their inspection cycle.

We really see a lot of variations of the extent of coordination in an individual joint inspection but, in most cases, our program has

been very successful at managing those to achieve the outcomes -- the objectives of the Act.

MS. DWYER: Great. Thanks, Liza. You have brought us to almost exactly 4:00 so I just on behalf of the attendees would like to thank Acting Chair DesParte, as well as Board Members Zietzman and Goshorn Jurata, as well as Liza for, I think, what hopefully was really useful information today. Thanks to you all for bearing with us on the technology. Still after all these months I'm not sure we quite nailed it but I think we did okay.

Then, Duane, did you have any concluding remarks?

MR. DESPARTE: Yes. I hope this gives you an increased appreciation for the rigor with which we approach our work internationally and gives you an understanding of why we do that.

You know, I was really encouraged by the poll question results because I think it demonstrates that at least folks here today understand the protection that what we do at PCAOB provides to

investors.

It's so important that protection apply equally to any issuer whether it's a U.S. issuer or not. I think that's what Congress is getting at in the act that we discussed. But it really is fulfilling to know that you view what we do really matters. Of course, we do as well.

The international component is just so important given the materiality that we talked about earlier.

Thank you for being here. We appreciate your interest. If you have further questions, please reach out to us informally as well. The best to everybody.

MS. DWYER: Thanks, Duane.

Thank everyone for joining us. Please do reach out if you have any questions for us.

We hope to see your comments in the HFCAA proposed rule docket. Thanks again. Bye-bye everybody.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 4:00 p.m.)