

Joe Hall Discusses PCAOB's Audit Report Proposals on Spreecast

October 2, 2013 | Client Update | 2-minute read

TheCorporateCounsel.net hosted a Spreecast with Davis Polk's Joe Hall and re: The Auditors' Francine McKenna focused on the PCAOB's new audit report proposal, which we address in this [memo](#).

On the Spreecast, Joe summarized the proposals' main requirements, and focused on a few key points that companies may want to think about. One proposal would require the auditor to discuss "critical audit matters" in the audit report. Joe questioned whether this would result in much new information for investors beyond what a company already discloses in its "critical accounting policies" discussion, and was skeptical that it would produce anything like a robust and individualized discussion about the company's financials. New boilerplate seems more likely.

A second proposal would require the auditor to state whether or not it had identified a "material inconsistency" or "material misstatement of fact" in disclosures outside of the financial statements in the company's annual report. Joe pointed out that this would involve the auditors in making legal judgments that they usually disclaim professional expertise for, and questioned whether, in any case, the auditor would be able to make such a statement without substantially expanding the scope of the audit.

Joe noted that the PCAOB did not seem to have done a detailed cost/benefit analysis for either proposal, and expressed hope that the SEC would ask for more information on this topic before approving the proposals.

You can watch the Spreecast [here](#).

If you have any questions regarding the matters covered in this publication, please reach out to any of the lawyers listed below or your usual Davis Polk contact.

Ning Chiu

+1 212 450 4908

ning.chiu@davispolk.com

This communication, which we believe may be of interest to our clients and friends of the firm, is for general information only. It is not a full analysis of the matters presented and should not be relied upon as legal advice. This may be considered attorney advertising in some jurisdictions. Please refer to the firm's privacy notice for further details.