



**Crown Melbourne Limited –
Report on the Risk Management
Framework**

June 2019

Inherent Limitations

The Services provided are advisory in nature and have not been conducted in accordance with the standards issued by the Australian Auditing and Assurance Standards Board and consequently no opinions or conclusions under these standards are expressed.

Because of the inherent limitations of any internal control structure, it is possible that errors or irregularities may occur and not be detected. The matters raised in this report are only those which came to our attention during the course of performing our procedures and are not necessarily a comprehensive statement of all the weaknesses that exist or improvements that might be made.

Our work is performed on a sample basis; we cannot, in practice, examine every activity and procedure, nor can we be a substitute for management's responsibility to maintain adequate controls over all levels of operations and their responsibility to prevent and detect irregularities, including fraud.

Any projection of the evaluation of the control procedures to future periods is subject to the risk that the systems may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with them may deteriorate.

Recommendations and suggestions for improvement should be assessed by management for their full commercial impact before they are implemented.

We believe that the statements made in this report are accurate, but no warranty of completeness, accuracy, or reliability is given in relation to the statements and representations made by, and the information and documentation provided Crown Melbourne Limited personnel. We have not attempted to verify these sources independently unless otherwise noted within the report.

Limitation of Use

This report is intended solely for the information and internal use of Crown Melbourne Limited in accordance with our letter of engagement dated 14 February 2019, and is not intended to be and should not be used by any other person or entity. No other person or entity is entitled to rely, in any manner, or for any purpose, on this report. We do not accept or assume responsibility to anyone other than Crown Melbourne Limited for our work, for this report, or for any reliance which may be placed on this report by any party other than Crown Melbourne Limited.

Confidential - this document and the information contained in it are confidential and should not be used or disclosed in any way without our prior consent.

About Deloitte

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited ("DTTL"), its global network of member firms, and their related entities. DTTL (also referred to as "Deloitte Global") and each of its member firms their affiliated entities are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL does not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more.

Deloitte is a leading global provider of audit and assurance, consulting, financial advisory, risk advisory, tax and related services. Our network of member firms more than 150 countries and territories serves four out of five Fortune Global 500® companies. Learn how Deloitte's approximately 286,000 people make an impact that matters at www.deloitte.com.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.
Member of Deloitte Asia Pacific Limited and the Deloitte Network.



Deloitte Risk Advisory Pty Ltd
ACN 611 748 184

550 Bourke Street
Melbourne, VIC, 3000
Australia

Phone: +61 3 9671 7000

www.deloitte.com.au

20 June 2019

Anne Siegers
Group General Manager – Risk and Audit | Crown Resorts
8 Whiteman Street,
Southbank
VIC 3006,
Australia

By email **Confidential**

Commercial In Confidence

Dear Anne,

Assessment of Risk Management Program

In accordance with the engagement letter dated 14 February 2019 between Deloitte Risk Advisory Pty Ltd ("Deloitte") and Crown Melbourne Limited ("Crown"), we have completed an assessment of the risk management program at Crown. This report summarises the procedures performed, our observations and recommendations for improvement resulting from that assessment.

We look forward to further discussing this report with you, at your convenience. We would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Executive and staff of Crown for the strong level of co-operation we have received in performing this engagement.

Yours sincerely

Confidential

Cara Hartnett

Partner

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation

Member of Deloitte Asia Pacific and the Deloitte Network.

1 Executive Summary

1.0 Background

In June 2018, the Victorian Commission for Gambling and Liquor Regulation (“VCGLR”) issued its Sixth Review of the Melbourne Casino Operator and Licence, which presents the VCGLR’s view as to the ongoing suitability of Crown Melbourne Limited (CML), to hold its casino licence. The VCGLR report made a number of recommendations, including Recommendation 3, which states:

‘The VCGLR recommends that, by 1 July 2019, Crown assesses the robustness and effectiveness of its risk frameworks and systems, including reporting lines in the chain of command, and upgrade them where required. This assessment should be assisted by external advice.’

As a result, Crown engaged Deloitte to assess the design of the organisation’s risk management program, and provide relevant observations that will form part of Crown’s above mentioned assessment for the VCGLR prior to 1 July 2019.

1.1 Objective

The objective of this engagement was to assess Crown’s risk management program and provide observations, and where appropriate, recommendations for improvement.

1.2 Scope and Approach

The scope of our engagement included an assessment of risk and governance documentation relating to risk management with particular focus on:

1. Risk strategy – including the risk management policy, strategy, framework and risk appetite statements;
2. Risk operational model – including three lines of defence, roles and responsibilities and delivery model;

3. Risk reporting – including both management and Board reporting; and
4. Risk information systems and risk monitoring, including key risk indicators

Scope Limitations

Our engagement was limited to assessing the design of the risk management program. We did not assess the degree to which the risk management framework has been embedded in the organisation and how well it is operating. It is understood that an independent review was undertaken in May 2018 (by another service provider) that reported on how risk management was embedded across Crown. Enhancements to the risk management framework have been made since this independent review, which will need to be in place for a period of time before their operation and the degree to which they are embedded is assessed.

Our assessment was also restricted to the risk management in place as at March 31, 2019 and did not include a comparisons or benchmarking with risk management practices and processes in the past.

1.3 Observations from Our Assessment

Crown’s risk management framework and its design is consistent with the risk management standard ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management.

Based on documentation reviewed, Crown has a risk management program with the key elements for effective risk management either in place or under development. Elements in place include:

- A risk management framework which sets out the key elements of Crown’s risk management program, including overall governance (including adequate reporting lines and chain of command), roles and responsibilities, risk identification and assessment methodology, risk appetite and the risk reporting process;
- Documentation of identified risks and the assessment of their materiality in risk registers and corporate risk profiles;

- Risk reporting, including risk appetite dashboards, leading risk indicators (KRI's) and aggregate corporate risk profiles; and
- A risk information system to support the risk management program (CURA), which facilitates risk analysis.
- How quantitative metrics and triggers for risk appetite are expressed and how they are used for reporting and proactive risk management; and
- How escalation of risk appetite breaches is actioned and reported.

Efforts to mature the design of the risk management program are ongoing. Over the last 18 months, Crown has undertaken, and continues to undertake programs to enhance the level of maturity and understanding of its risk management framework. Discussions with the Group General Manager – Risk and Audit, indicated that Crown is committed to making continued improvement and enhancements to the risk management program. Key areas that are currently being focused on include:

- Developing key risk indicators and associated reporting;
- Linking principles included in the risk management program with the delegations of authority policy; and
- Developing targeted risk management training programs which compliment compliance and risk-related training programs already in place at Crown.

Recommendations and suggestions for improvement should be assessed by management for their full commercial impact before they are implemented.

In reviewing the recommendations, consideration should be given to the time period for implementation. Some recommendations may be implemented immediately with minimal effort. Others may be addressed over a longer period, as iterations and updates are made to mature the risk management process.

1.4 Recommendations for improvement

This report makes recommendations and observations that would build upon and further enhance Crown's risk management program. The recommendations are intended to provide insights regarding areas for enhancement and improve future maturity. Many of these can be implemented immediately and are being considered as inputs into Crown's Risk Management Strategy prior to its finalisation (currently in draft). Others may be expected to be implemented over the longer term as Crown's risk management program is enhanced.

These recommendations and observations include considerations for the following areas:

- How roles and accountabilities for risk and risk culture are expressed;
- How material risks are aligned to risk appetite to support an aggregate view of risk;
- How qualitative statements for risk appetite are expressed;

2 Detailed Findings

2.1 Risk Management Strategy

The Group Risk Management Framework is outlined in the Crown Resort Limited draft Risk Management Strategy (“draft RMS”) document. The draft RMS describes in detail the risk management framework, including governance (roles and responsibilities), risk appetite and process and methodology that the Crown Resorts Limited Board expects to be implemented across all Group entities.

It does not outline the strategic priorities for the risk function or risk management.

Recommendation: Consider renaming the document as Crown Resorts Limited Risk Management Framework to more accurately represent its contents.

Consideration should be given to developing a Risk Management Strategy document over the medium to longer term. This document would typically set out the strategic priorities for the risk function and program, including those key areas of focus to embed a more efficient and effective risk management function. This could include reference to People and Capability, Risk Culture, Risk Appetite (including corporate profiles) and Risk Reporting.

The following observations are made with regard to the key elements of the Risk Management Framework as outlined in the draft RMS.

2.1.1 Risk Culture

A favourable feature of the draft RMS is recognition of the importance of risk culture.

One of the roles of the Second Line of Defence is to support the communication of the Board’s desired risk culture (S5.5). However, accountabilities for risk culture are not clearly referenced in other areas of the draft RMS, including the role of the Board.

Recommendation:

- a) Accountabilities for risk culture should be reviewed in the following sections of the draft RMS:
 - The Executive Summary
 - The role of the Board in setting the desired risk culture

- The role of RMC in overseeing risk culture;
 - The role of “All other Crown staff” performing their role in a manner consistent with the expected risk culture”
 - Monitoring and reporting.
- b) If there is no clear expression of a target risk culture or an approach to its assessment, reference to risk culture may be better expressed as a strategic priority.

2.1.2 Risk Management Principles (DRAFT RMS S3)

The risk management principles contained within the draft RMS provide sound context around which the risk management framework is designed.

Other common principles that we have observed, which are not currently included in Crown’s framework are:

- A principle related to the promotion of the safety and soundness of the organisation.
- A principle related to supporting Crown’s existing Excellence of Standards of Service (ESOS) statement and CX/EX values.

Recommendation:

Consider including safety and soundness and customer service as additional principles to support an effective and meaningful risk management framework in the ongoing review of the draft RMS document.

2.1.3 Risk Identification and Assessment

The Corporate Risk profiles and associated Risk Matrix and Risk map provide the Executive and Board greater clarity over the identification, measurement and management of Crown’s material risks.

The risk assessment methodology adopted by Crown is typical, using likelihood and consequence criteria to assess identified material risks in terms of inherent and residual risk. Reporting is also typical, using heat maps to show Critical, High, Moderate and Low level risk. This is used to inform further risk reporting and risk monitoring. Importantly, the approach also recognises financial and non-financial impacts and provides clarity on responsibilities for oversight and management of the risks.

Material risks are contained within the Corporate Risk profile which is reported to the Crown Resorts Board. The Corporate Risk profile identifies:

- Name of material risk, its definition and description of how it may arise, and the outcome if the risk is not managed;
- The inherent risk using the Consequence and Likelihood methodology and its mapping to the Corporate Risk Map;
- The controls in place to manage the risk.
- The residual risk using the Consequence and Likelihood methodology and its mapping to the Corporate Risk Map;
- How these align to the 7 Risk Appetite impact categories.

It was observed that Crown Melbourne is completing Corporate Risk profiles and reporting these to the Board. It has also commenced documenting departmental risk registers.

Recommendation:

None noted.

2.1.4 Risk Appetite

Risk appetite was recently designed and approved by the Crown Resorts Board and the Crown Melbourne Board in December 2018.

Risk appetite has been set for seven (7) impact categories, including:

- Financial;
- Brand / Reputation;
- Regulation / Legal;
- People;
- Customers / Patrons;
- Infrastructure; and
- Strategy /Business Sustainability.

Each is assigned a qualitative statement, qualitative Statements and Quantitative Metrics – RMC Reporting Triggers.

a) Qualitative Statements

The qualitative risk appetite statements (“RAS”) for the seven impact categories are not expressed in a manner typical of a risk appetite statements.

Typically a risk appetite statement provides a clear statement of acceptable risk tolerance. In the majority

of cases the qualitative statements are expressed in a manner that does not reference risk tolerances.

For example:

- *Financial*: “Protect and deliver shareholder value”.
A RAS that more clearly expresses risk tolerances may be: “We have limited risk appetite for activities that weaken shareholder value”
- *Brand / Reputation*: Maintain shareholder confidence”
A RAS that more clearly expresses risk tolerances may be: “We have a low risk appetite to undertake any activity that leads to a loss of shareholder confidence or damages our brand or reputation.”

Recommendation: As Crown continues to develop and embed the concept of risk appetite, any updated to the qualitative statements should consider including a clearer statement of acceptable risk tolerances.

b) Quantitative Metrics and Triggers

Quantitative metrics for risk appetite triggers are based on tolerance for individual risk events. This is acceptable provided the trigger is set conservatively – and this appears to be the case. However it is noted that in terms of reporting:

“The trigger can be either a single event, or a series of events cumulating to the [below] thresholds.”
(*Memorandum to RMC, 19 November, 2018*)

The risk appetite framework would benefit from greater transparency on the relationship of the individual material risks recorded in Corporate Risk profiles and the seven higher level risk categories. For example, what are the material risks that if cumulatively considered are assessed against a specific trigger for an impact category? This would support greater insights at the enterprise level of the level of risks attributable with each impact category.

This also impacts on the reporting of risk appetite and is covered in the Risk Reporting section (see below).

Recommendation:

None noted.

c) Operationalisation of the Risk Appetite

The draft RMS recognises that a review of the risk appetite is undertaken annually with changes recommended to the Board.

Recommendation:

None noted.

1.5 Risk Management Policy

The Risk Management policy sets out clear expectations in relation to its risk management objectives, particularly:

- Risk identification and risk management (including controls) within risk appetite
- Cascading and implementation of the risk management framework
- Documentation and reporting of risks

Recommendation:

None noted.

2.2 Risk Operational Model

2.2.1 Risk Governance Framework

Within the introductory comments of the Governance section of the draft RMS, references are made to responsibilities for material risks. For example:

“An effective risk governance framework requires risk ownership and risk management accountability to be clearly defined and assigned to those responsible for material business decision making. This supports the integration of risk identification and assessment into organisational decision making processes.”

This is inconsistent with the commonly held view that risk is everyone’s responsibility, not just those responsible for material business decision making.

It is also inconsistent with the statement in the 1LOD that *“All Crown’s staff are responsible for managing and being accountable for risks particular to their area of responsibility”*

Another example includes:

“Independent oversight, challenge, reporting and monitoring of the risk profile, risk management framework and material business decisions that have the potential to impact the organisation’s risk profile”

It could be argued that an accumulation of many seemingly poor decisions can cumulatively have a material impact – not just those that are material decisions.

Recommendation: A more meaningful way to express the above could be as follows:

- Risk ownership and risk management accountability to be clearly defined to support the consideration of risk in all decision making. This supports the integration of risk identification and assessment into organisational decision making processes;

- Independent oversight, challenge, reporting and monitoring of the risk culture (INSERT) risk profile, risk management framework and material (DELETE) business decisions that have the potential to impact the organisation’s risk profile

2.2.2 Three Lines of Defence

The general articulation and use of the Three Lines of Defence (“3LOD”) within the draft RMS is consistent with the common standard used to give greater clarity on roles and responsibilities for risk.

a) Role of the Board (DRAFT RMS S5.1)

As noted above the draft RMS does not reference the role of the Board in setting the desired risk culture although it is referenced as part of the 2LOD

Recommendations: The role of the Board should include setting the desired risk culture.

b) Role of the RMC (DRAFT RMS S5.2)

It would be expected the role of RMC should also include oversight of the embedding of the Board’s desired risk culture, however, this is not referenced. A clearer expression of the role of the RMC in monitoring the risk profile of Crown would be helpful to ensure that risks are being managed within risk appetite.

Recommendation: Consider amending the role of the RMC to also include oversight of the embedding of the Board’s desired risk culture and management of risks within risk appetite.

c) Crown Melbourne Executive Risk and Compliance Committee (“ERCC”)

A key purpose of ERCC should include oversight of the risk profile of Crown Melbourne to ensure that risks are being managed within approved risk appetite as well as oversight of the embedding of the Board’s desired risk culture. The ERCC charter does not reference either risk appetite or risk culture.

Recommendation: Consider amending the ERCC Charter to include oversight of management of risks within risk appetite and the embedding of the Board’s desired risk culture.

d) First Line of Defence (DRAFT RMS S5.4)

The First Line of Defence (1LOD) commentary recognises that they own and manage the risk and implement risk frameworks. However, this is not reflected in the 3LOD graphic in the draft RMS document.

Recommendation: For clarity the First Line of Defence commentary in the graphic should be updated.

The draft RMS contains the following statements

- *“An effective risk governance framework requires risk ownership and risk management accountability to be clearly defined and assigned to those responsible for material business decision making. This supports the integration of risk identification and assessment into organisational decision making processes”*
- *“The CEO, Executives and Senior Management for the first line of defence and assume ownership of, and accountability for the management of, the material risks faced and effective implementation of the risk management framework”*

The above statements could be considered inconsistent with the application of an effective 3LOD model because:

- Ownership and management of risk is everyone's responsibility - not just those responsible for material business decision making. For example a Table Games Dealer is responsible for the ownership and management of the risks in his activities
- It also appears inconsistent with the statement in the draft RMS (5.4 (b)) where it is stated that “All Crown staff are responsible for managing and being accountable for risks in their particular area”

Recommendations: Review the accountabilities of the 1LOD to reinforce that everyone has ownership of risk and should consider risk in the decision making and activities. It is also recommended that the accountabilities of all staff in the 1LOD in embedding the Boards desired risk culture should be recognised.

e) Second Line of Defence (2LOD) (DRAFT RMS S5.5)

The description of the role of the 2LOD is generally sound and fit for purpose and recognises the key principle that of the 2LOD to develop and design the risk management framework

- The Second Line of Defence is referred to as “Drafting of policies, framework...” The commonly held view is that the 2LOD own and design the risk framework which are then implemented by the 1LOD.

Recommendation. Amend the above to recognise that that 2LOD own the design of the Risk Management framework

- *“effectively supporting the communication of the risk management framework, risk appetite, risk management strategy...”*

Recommendation: This statement could be altered to state that the risk function “own and lead” not support the communication of the risk management framework

2.3 Reporting

The Risk Management Strategy, the Risk Policy and Committee Charters set out expectations with regard to the reporting and oversight of risk. All material risks are summarised within the Corporate Risk profile which is required to be reported to the Crown Resorts Board.

a) Use of Quantitative Triggers for Reporting

Reporting of risk and escalation of risk issues particularly in relation to risk appetite and risk triggers would benefit from greater clarity.

The draft RMS states:

- *“reporting against this risk appetite [table] will be prepared by the GGM – R&A. It will highlight events against reporting triggers by exception”*
- *“In most circumstances reporting trigger events at the regular RMC meeting will be sufficient at other times special meetings of the RMC or other Board members may be required based on the magnitude of the event, as well as the requirement for a timely Board decision”*

The Memorandum to RMC (19 November 2018) states that

“In simple terms, once a quantitative metric is triggered, the Risk Appetite then requires that the matter be reported to RMC. The trigger can be either a single event, or a series of events cumulating to the [below] thresholds”

The following would benefit from greater clarity:

- Is a trigger excess the same as a breach of risk appetite?
- What is the clear and timely escalation process for breaches of risk appetite?
- Who is responsible for escalating breaches of risk appetite and what is required to be reported?
- How is reporting of individual events aggregated to assess cumulative risks against approved triggers?
- What is meant by “magnitude” of the event within the context of a breach of risk appetite and reporting to RMC as opposed to the Board?

In some instances quantitative reporting triggers are stated in a way that could lead to ambiguity with regard to their application and subsequent reporting.

Unless clearly defined, use of terms such as “Significant”, “Material” and “Sustained” can lead to different interpretations with a consequential impact on

escalation and reporting. Often this can be overcome with a combination of more clearly expressed RAS and quantitative metrics.

For example:

Brand / Reputation. Currently states; “An internal event creating a sustained share price loss”. This is defined as >5%.

Over what period does “sustained” mean. Is this over a 24 hour, 1 week or a 1 month period? A way of expressing this with greater clarity to inform reporting may read as follows:

“This is measured by 5% fall in our share price over a rolling 30 day period”

There is apparent ambiguity around the term “trigger” and “risk appetite”. In other organisations the term trigger is used to flag a situation where:

- Unless mitigating action is taken it is likely that a risk will rise above the accepted tolerance level (risk appetite); or
- In less common situations the level of risk is so far below accepted tolerance levels (risk appetite) that there is a concern that the organisation is being too risk averse.

Triggers should be used to provide management with opportunities to more proactively manage risk against agreed risk appetite. The reporting approach to risk appetite in the draft RMS implies that once a trigger point is reached the level or risk is already in excess of risk appetite.

Common practice for reporting of triggers and excesses of risk appetite would be to report these to the Governing body that approved the risk appetite. For example any concerns about potential excesses of risk appetite may be escalated to RMC and actual excesses of risk appetite that have been approved by the Board should be reported to the Board at the earliest opportunity.

Recommendation: Greater clarity could be provided on the:

- Reporting of risks against risk appetite;
- Nature of risk aggregation and reporting;
- Definition and value of triggers and their definitions to support proactive risk management, and the timely escalation where risk appetite is exceeded.

It is acknowledged that the risk appetite framework including reporting has only been recently designed and

that many of the concepts above may be developed over time as the program matures.

b) Escalation of Risk Events

The draft RMS would benefit from greater clarity on the escalation of risk events outside of risk appetite.

Recommendation: Greater clarity could be provided on the following:

- How quickly after a risk event should the approving authority be informed? This could range from immediate escalation to the line manager to a longer period for RMC and the Board.
- A description of the nature of the risk event, how it happened, and what mitigating actions have been done
- What lessons have been learned, additional training given or policies or processes changed to prevent a recurrence?

2.4 Risk Information Systems

Crown is in the process of;

- Developing a reporting dashboard of Key Risk Indicators that will support risk reporting and the consideration of risks relative to risk trigger
- Implementing CURA to support the recording and management of risk issues
- Completing Corporate Risk Profiles and supporting departmental risk registers
- Indicators that will support risk reporting and the consideration of risks relative to risk triggers

Recommendation

Efforts related to implementing risk information systems and reporting should be continued.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Documents Reviewed in the performance of the assessment

The following documents were reviewed as part of this engagement:

- Crown Resorts Ltd Risk Management Strategy (DRAFT)
- Crown Resorts Ltd Risk Management Policy (August 2018)
- Crown Resorts Risk Management Reference Guidelines (DRAFT V1.1 Dec 2018)
- Crown Resorts Ltd – Risk Management Committee Charter (February 2019)
- Crown Melbourne ERCC Charter (July 2018)
- Fraud Management Committee Terms of Reference (January 2019)
- Crown Melbourne Ltd- Audit Committee Charter (July 2018)
- Example of Communication and escalation for a critical incident - Terrorist Threat (March 2018)
- Crown Resorts Ltd - Risk Matrix – various iterations and supporting emails
- Crown Melbourne Ltd – Emergency Management Plan Summary (March 2018)
- Crown Melbourne Ltd - Risk Management Update July – Oct 2018
- Crown Melbourne Ltd – Risk Management Update June 2018
- Crown Melbourne Ltd – Fraud risk profile (December 2018)
- Crown Resorts Ltd – Strategic Risk Update 11 Feb 2019
- Crown Melbourne Audit Committee – 15 November 2018
- Crown Melbourne Audit Committee – 11 February 2019
- Crown Melbourne Ltd – Extract of Regulatory and Governance Update paper, Feb 2019
- Crown Melbourne Ltd – Draft KRI table
- Crown Melbourne Board – Risk Appetite November 2018
- Crown Melbourne Ltd – ERCC 13 November 2018
- Crown Melbourne Ltd – ERCC 30 Jan 2019
- Crown Melbourne Ltd – Fraud Management Committee 23 January 2019
- Crown Australian Resorts – Business Continuity Management Framework –January 2019
- Crown Resorts Ltd – Date Governance Framework – Draft February 2019
- Draft tool for Date Governance Framework – Operationalisation
- Example tool : IT initiative form
- Example tool: Gaming form
- CURA Assessor: User Guide
- Extract Training Register Material Risks
- Extract Risk Tool – key meeting points with Business
- Extract AML program and alignment with risk matrix
- List of key meetings attended by Risk Staff
- Meeting Minutes – Risk Weekly Team Meeting 11 January 2019
- Crown Melbourne Risk Management Framework – Graphic
- Crown – Risk Universe Graphic
- Draft Risk controls



Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited ("DTTL"), its global network of member firms, and their related entities. DTTL (also referred to as "Deloitte Global") and each of its member firms and their affiliated entities are legally separate and independent entities. DTTL does not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more.

Deloitte is a leading global provider of audit and assurance, consulting, financial advisory, risk advisory, tax and related services. Our network of member firms in more than 150 countries and territories serves four out of five Fortune Global 500@companies. Learn how Deloitte's approximately 286,000 people make an impact that matters at www.deloitte.com.

Deloitte Asia Pacific

Deloitte Asia Pacific Limited is a company limited by guarantee and a member firm of DTTL. Members of Deloitte Asia Pacific Limited and their related entities provide services in Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, East Timor, Federated States of Micronesia, Guam, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Thailand, The Marshall Islands, The Northern Mariana Islands, The People's Republic of China (incl. Hong Kong SAR and Macau SAR), The Philippines and Vietnam, in each of which operations are conducted by separate and independent legal entities.

Deloitte Australia

In Australia, the Deloitte Network member is the Australian partnership of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu. As one of Australia's leading professional services firms, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu and its affiliates provide audit, tax, consulting, and financial advisory services through approximately 8000 people across the country. Focused on the creation of value and growth, and known as an employer of choice for innovative human resources programs, we are dedicated to helping our clients and our people excel. For more information, please visit our web site at <https://www2.deloitte.com/au/en.html>.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.
Member of Deloitte Asia Pacific Limited and the Deloitte Network.