



Illustrative Examples of LOR evidence

Please refer to the illustrative examples for LOR evidence for the technical context, professional values, attitudes (PVAs) and Acumens.

The examples below are based on a video where a first-year trainee went on their first inventory count.

Please use this as guidance when drafting/review the evidence in the LORs.

NEW!

Guidance on knowledge sources & skills when documenting your evidence for Acumen learning outcomes.

[Guidance: Acumen Knowledge Sources & Skills](#)

Technical Context

When documenting the technical context, trainees should provide detail regarding the technical tasks performed by addressing the six journalist questions:

Note

- The technical context **should not be a copy and paste from the Library Procedures in Aura**.
- **EGA references are optional** and it is sufficient for the trainee to **refer to the FSLI** if they completed multiple EGAs for a specific FSLI.
- It is also **not necessary for the trainees to individually justify each technical exposure selected**.

WHAT

WHERE

WHEN

WHO

HOW

WHY

I performed an inventory count on the 31st of January 2024 for XYZ Limited, as part of the year-end audit procedures. The inventory count was spread over five warehouses in Bellville. In preparation for the inventory count, I attended a planning meeting with the engagement manager on the 26th of January 2024 where she provided me with the audit plan and instructions to perform the count. In preparation for the count, I completed the "Making it Count" eLearn on Vantage to upskill myself as this was my first inventory count. I was the only person from PwC who attended the inventory count. I identified specialised inventory requiring the assistance of experts while at the count and contacted the engagement manager for guidance on liaising with the auditor experts. I documented my work and findings on Aura in the 'Execute and evaluate physical inventory observation' EGA.

Professional Values and Attitudes (PVAs)

Trainees should document two aspects:

1. CONTEXT

Describe the behaviour

WHAT

WHERE

WHEN

WHO

HOW

WHY

2. COMPLEXITY

How complex was the situation in which the PVA was demonstrated

While completing the inventory count in the Bellville A2 warehouse, I noted employees suggesting incorrect inventory counts for product A (a high value product) to inflate inventory levels. I faced an ethical dilemma on whether to report this misconduct to my engagement manager/partner, risking potential strain on professional relationships with the client, or to compromise on accuracy, which went against the professional standards. The ethical dilemma resulted in a self-interest threat to my integrity and objectivity. I decided to contact my engagement manager and discussed the matter with her. We concluded that this resulted in an increased risk, specifically for the Bellville A2 warehouse and that additional audit procedures would need to be performed to mitigate the risks identified. The situation was however not complex as the ethical dilemma was easily identifiable (it is wrong to inflate inventory levels) and it was easy for me to determine the correct response (i.e. report it to my manager).

Note

- The reference to complexity is very important as a proficiency rating for PVAs is only assigned in the PDS.
 - The evidence therefore needs to address complexity as this will determine the proficiency rating awarded in the PDS using the decision tree.
-

Acumens

Trainees should document four dimensions:

1. TASK UNDERSTANDING

Application of acumen (learning outcome) in the technical context



2. TASK COMPLETION

How complex was the technical context, integration of knowledge sources and skills or only predetermined steps that were followed.

3. GUIDANCE

*Guidance received to **demonstrate the acumen learning outcome** (not technical context)*

4. DEPENDENCIES

Autonomy / work under supervision, low risk tasks / responsibility taken for quality of own & work of others, managing own work etc.

Note

- When reference is made to the technical context, it refers to the technical context of the work performed by the trainee. In this case, the trainee would've followed predetermined steps to liaise with the experts (indicating a non-complex technical context for the trainee). Had the trainee completed additional training and was involved with the experts in valuing the inventory, this would result in the technical context becoming more complex for the trainee.
- The documentation above covers all the dimensions to be considered when assigning a proficiency rating in the LOR using the decision tree.
- If the trainee did not document the four dimensions in their evidence, **revision should be requested**.

While completing the inventory count in the Bellville B5 warehouse, I observed that the inventory contained in this warehouse was of a highly specialised nature. I realised that we may require the assistance of our audit experts in Advisory to confirm the value of the inventory. I contacted my manager to confirm the contact details of our contact in Advisory in order to liaise with the auditor experts to engage them to assist with the inventory count. I then, with the assistance of my manager, reached out to the auditor experts and arranged for them to perform a count the following day. The experts performed the count and provided me with a report which I documented as part of our audit procedures on Aura in the 'Execute and evaluate physical inventory observation' EGA. The technical context was quite complex as the inventory is highly specialised, however liaising with the experts and documenting their report was not as complex. I received limited guidance from my manager to liaise with the audit experts in advisory and carried out some of the tasks (such as documenting their report) independently.