RE: Draft Technical Briefing Deck (revised)

From: "Veinot, Cindy (TBS)" <"/o=govon/ou=exchange administrative group (fydibohf23spdlt)/cn=recipients/cn=veinot, cindy (tbs)d57">
To: "Orencsak, Greg (TBS)" <greg.orencsak@ontario.ca>
Date: Sat, 01 Oct 2016 08:37:10 -0400

Thanks Greg,

I also didn't know much if anything about pension accounting – ignorance is bliss!

From: Orencsak, Greg (TBS)
Sent: October-01-16 8:36 AM
To: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Subject: Re: Draft Technical Briefing Deck (revised)

Thanks Cindy, this is very helpful.

Enjoy your reunion. Remember, you didn't have a BlackBerry 25 years ago, so it'd be almost inappropriate to bring it.

Greg

On Oct 1, 2016, at 8:27 AM, Veinot, Cindy (TBS) <Cindy.Veinot@ontario.ca> wrote:

> Greg – fyi—attached are the edits that I sent to Nadine.
>
> It includes the slide on disclaimer of an opinion, which actually builds from another slide I added before the qualification slide that you suggested we delete.
>
> This table from the auditing standards might be helpful (not in the deck) but in thinking about what to include. Essentially an adverse opinion (statements do not present fairly) and a disclaimer of opinion (report says no opinion is provided) are both escalations of a qualification. Adverse is because the financial statements as a whole are materially misstated (e.g. have the evidence to know they would mislead users) and a Disclaimer is because the auditor doesn't have the evidence to know all the misstatements, but believes that the effects could be pervasive and therefore, can't state an opinion. A disclaimer still results in the issuance of a report, but in the opinion paragraph it says something like, " Because of the significance of the matter described in the Basis for Disclaimer of Opinion paragraph, we have not been able to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to provide a basis for an audit opinion. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the financial statements."
>
> I don't think the situation we are in leads to either an adverse opinion or a disclaimer based on the guidance (which is why I was asking Bonnie about it on Tuesday). In fact given there is no difference in the numbers, its hard to understand how she would issue a qualified opinion.
>
> **Types of Modified Opinions (Ref: Para. 2)**
>
> A1. The table below illustrates how the auditor's judgment about the nature of the matter giving rise to the modification, and the pervasiveness of its effects or possible effects on the financial statements, affects the type of opinion to be expressed.

Nature of Matter Giving Rise to the Modification	*Auditor's Judgment about the Pervasiveness of the Effects or Possible Effects on the Financial Statements*	
	Material but Not Pervasive	*Material and Pervasive*
Financial statements are materially	Qualified opinion	Adverse opinion

~~misstated~~		
Inability to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence	Qualified opinion	Disclaimer of opinion

Nature of Material Misstatements (Ref: Para. 6 (a))

From: Veinot, Cindy (TBS)
Sent: September-30-16 10:19 PM
To: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Subject: RE: Draft Technical Briefing Deck (revised)

Hi Nadine – unfortunately we were editing at the same time – hopefully it won't be too tough to combine the edits.

I've tried to note the text changes in blue and added a few comments to consider.

Thanks,

From: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)
Sent: September-30-16 9:29 PM
To: Mayman, Gadi (OFA); Orencsak, Greg (TBS); Thompson, Scott (MOF); Veinot, Cindy (TBS); Hughes, Karen (TBS)
Cc: MacIntyre, Kyle (TBS); Laughton, Patrick (TBS); Sawosch, Mercedes (TBS); Fong, Pauline (TBS); Patel, Bharat (TBS)
Subject: RE: Draft Technical Briefing Deck (revised)

All,
Thanks for your comments. Please find attached a revised version of the deck reflecting:

- Revised narrative for the bullet referenced by Gadi below (slide 8)
- Placeholder slide for denial of opinion (Cindy to insert)
- Additional comments on enhancements to Public Accounts to support transparency and accountability (slide 15)

Nadine

From: Gadi Mayman [mailto:Gadi.Mayman@ofina.on.ca]
Sent: September 30, 2016 8:55 PM
To: Petsche, Nadine (TBS); Orencsak, Greg (TBS); Thompson, Scott (MOF); Veinot, Cindy (TBS); Hughes, Karen (TBS)
Cc: MacIntyre, Kyle (TBS); Laughton, Patrick (TBS); Sawosch, Mercedes (TBS); Fong, Pauline (TBS); Patel, Bharat (TBS)
Subject: Re: Draft Technical Briefing Deck

The borrowing program slide looks good; I'm just wondering about the third bullet two slides before, which describes completing the review and discussion with the AG "over the coming months". I know those are the timelines, and we need to be careful about not adding anxiety in our relationship with the AG now, but I'm wondering how we pivot to the technical briefing or lock-up for the FES in a month unless we're silent about the timelines here?

Gadi

From: Petsche, Nadine (TBS)

Sent: Friday, September 30, 2016 8:31 PM
To: Greg Orencsak (MOF); Scott Thompson (CAB); Veinot, Cindy (TBS); Karen Hughes (MGS); Gadi Mayman
Cc: Kyle MacIntyre (MOF); Patrick Laughton (MOF); Mercedes Sawosch (CAB); Pauline Fong (MOF); Bharat Patel (MOF)
Subject: Draft Technical Briefing Deck

Greg/Scott/Cindy/Karen/Gadi,
Please find attached a copy of the draft technical briefing deck for your review and comment.
Thanks.
Nadine

p.s. Note that I have included a placeholder for the timeline page.

<Pension Asset Technical Briefingnpp_cv.pptx>