

Para 8.0 Accountancy/Auditors – perceptions of “forensic accountants”

I understand from other people within Big 4 audit firms that Forensic accounting people consider themselves to be amongst the “elite” members in their accounting/audit profession. I also believe from my research that most lay people would attribute such roles in such people and firms as having the following characteristics:

- 8.A. Numeracy/finance skills – basic logic and maths -see paragraphs 9.1 and 9.2
- 8.B. Reliance on them – “comprehensive/thorough” = truth underpinned by independence /objectivity - see paragraphs 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5
- 8.C. Access to information – global knowledge management /other audit clients and public information underpinned by technology in access to documents and records – see paragraphs 9.6, 9.7 & 9.8
- 8.D. Professional scepticism, checking and validity:audit testing and deep technical skills - paras 9.9 & 9.10

Some of the PwC steps in their act of A340 “Forensic deceit”

- 9.1 A340 500/600 Pricing - *numeracy and logic*
- 9.2 A340 500/600 Volumes/ Quantities - *numeracy and logic*
- 9.3 A340 Customer delivery projections from Airbus – *totally excluded in PwC analysis / assessment*
- 9.4 A340 External Market forecasts from third parties – *PwC not comprehensive / thorough*
- 9.5 Independence/Objectivity – *professionally compromised*
- 9.6 A340 500/600 External market forecasts - *failure to access global information*
- 9.7 A340 500/600 Data from other Publications – including the file provided by MAC CEO, Mr Neill
- 9.8 Airbus Aircraft A340-500/600 “Website” Order Book - *wrong analysis / assessment*
- 9.9 Airbus A340-500/600 Unit Delivery projections - *failure to check and audit testing validity*
- 9.10 A340-500/600 pricing projections – *failure to check and audit testing validity*

Conclusion

In conclusion, in Paragraphs 9 and 10 above I have posed a series of semi-rhetorical questions as the 'subject matter is beyond belief'. If anyone who reads this document can answer these questions with any degree of authority and credibility I would seriously and genuinely like to hear from them.

Finally I need to record that this document has concentrated predominantly on how PWC reported on A340-500/600 matters, to demonstrate the 'magnitude of the monument to mediocrity' that they have created by their approach to the investigation, their selective choice of data and the basic errors in mathematics/logic used in arriving at their conclusions. It was initially intended that PWC would investigate the full range of my 21 Protected Disclosures (PD'S) but the Audit Committee and its Chairman, Mr. Dimma, limited the scope of PWC's investigation considerably to exclude the PD'S I had made, largely, in relation to Doubtful Solvency and the statutory Supplier Payment Policy and contract terms at MALUK. This is important as the conclusions of the PWC Report were relied on by Magellan and their legal team in the ET tribunal process, to challenge and change their view on the reasonable belief I held initially in making my disclosures. Astonishingly this change of view on my reasonable belief was not restricted to the matters investigated by PWC but was generalised to include my Protected Disclosures on other matters. For the other matters investigated by PwC it is evident that there are other examples of “forensic deceit” but I have not sought to set that evidence out here. The consequences therefore, as a result of the flawed conclusions of the PWC report, are far reaching and have generated a 'litaney of lies' in how other substantive issues have been dealt with by the UK court.