

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP
500 Campus Drive
P.O. Box 805
Florham Park NJ 07932
Telephone (973) 236 7000
Facsimile (973) 236 7200

To the Partners of KPMG LLP
and the SEC Practice Section Peer Review Committee:

We have reviewed the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of KPMG LLP (the firm) in effect for the year ended March 31, 2002. A system of quality control encompasses the firm's organizational structure and the policies adopted and procedures established to provide it with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards. The elements of quality control are described in the Statements on Quality Control Standards issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (the AICPA). The design of the system, and compliance with it, are the responsibilities of the firm. In addition, the firm has agreed to comply with the membership requirements of the SEC Practice Section of the AICPA Division for CPA Firms (the Section). Our responsibility is to express an opinion on the design of the system, and the firm's compliance with that system and the Section's membership requirements based on our review.

Our review was conducted in accordance with standards established by the Peer Review Committee of the Section and included procedures to plan and perform the review that are summarized in the attached description of the peer review process. Our review would not necessarily disclose all weaknesses in the system of quality control or all instances of lack of compliance with it or with the membership requirements of the Section since it was based on selective tests. Because there are inherent limitations in the effectiveness of any system of quality control, departures from the system may occur and not be detected. Also, projection of any evaluation of a system of quality control to future periods is subject to the risk that the system of quality control may become inadequate because of changes in conditions, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate.

In our opinion, the system of quality control for the accounting and auditing practice of KPMG LLP in effect for the year ended March 31, 2002, has been designed to meet the requirements of the quality control standards for an accounting and auditing practice established by the AICPA, and was complied with during the year then ended to provide the firm with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards. Also, in our opinion, the firm complied during that year with the membership requirements of the Section in all material respects.

As is customary in a peer review, we have issued a letter under this date that sets forth comments relating to certain policies and procedures or compliance with them. The matters described in the letter were not considered to be of sufficient significance to affect the opinion expressed in this report.

PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

October 28, 2002

Description of the Peer Review Process

Overview

Member firms of the AICPA SEC Practice Section (the Section) must have their system of quality control periodically reviewed by independent peers. These reviews are system and compliance oriented with the objective of evaluating whether:

- The reviewed firm's system of quality control for its accounting and auditing practice has been designed to meet the requirements of the Quality Control Standards established by the AICPA.
- The reviewed firm's quality control policies and procedures were being complied with to provide the firm with reasonable assurance of complying with professional standards.
- The reviewed firm was complying with the membership requirements of the Section in all material respects.

The Section's Peer Review Committee (PRC) establishes and maintains review standards. At regular meetings and through report evaluation task forces, the PRC considers each peer review, evaluates the reviewer's competence and performance, and examines every report, letter of comments, and accompanying response from the reviewed firm that states its corrective action plan before the peer review is finalized. The Transition Oversight Staff (formerly the staff of the Public Oversight Board), an independent oversight body, plays a key role in overseeing the performance of peer reviews working closely with the peer review teams and the PRC.

Once the PRC accepts the peer review reports, letters of comments, and reviewed firms' responses, they are maintained in a file available to the public. In some situations, the public file also includes a signed undertaking by the firm agreeing to specific follow-up action requested by the PRC. That file also includes the firm's annual report which contains information regarding the number of firm offices, firm professionals, and SEC clients for which the firm is principal auditor-of-record.

Planning the Review

To plan the review of KPMG LLP, we obtained an understanding of (1) the nature and extent of the firm's accounting and auditing practice, and (2) the design of the firm's system of quality control sufficient to assess the inherent and control risks implicit in its practice. Inherent risks were assessed by obtaining an understanding of the firm's practice, such as the industries of its clients and other factors of complexity in serving those clients, and the organization of the firm's personnel into practice units. Control risks were assessed by obtaining an understanding of the design of the firm's system of quality control, including its audit methodology, and monitoring procedures. Assessing control risk is the process of evaluating the effectiveness of the reviewed firm's quality control system in preventing the performance of engagements that do not comply with professional standards.

Performing the Review

Based on our assessment of the combined level of inherent and control risks, we identified practice units and selected engagements within those units to test for compliance with the firm's quality control system. The engagements selected for review included audits of clients that are SEC registrants, audits performed under the Government Auditing Standards, audits performed under FDICIA, multi-office audits, and audits of employee benefit plans. The engagements selected for review represented a cross-section of the firm's accounting and auditing practice with emphasis on higher-risk engagements. The engagement reviews included examining work paper files and reports and interviewing engagement personnel. We also reviewed the supervision and control of portions of engagements performed outside the United States.

The scope of the peer review also included examining selected administrative and personnel files to determine compliance with the firm's policies and procedures for the elements of quality control pertaining to independence, integrity, and objectivity; personnel management; and acceptance and continuance of clients and engagements. In addition, we tested compliance with the membership requirements of the Section, including those pertaining to independence quality controls, concurring partner review, and foreign associated firms.

Prior to concluding the review, we reassessed the adequacy of scope and conducted an exit conference with firm management to discuss our findings and recommendations.