
2019 Inspection KPMG SA

(Headquartered in Paris La Défense, French Republic)

July 6, 2021



THIS IS A PUBLIC VERSION OF A PCAOB INSPECTION REPORT

PORTIONS OF THE COMPLETE REPORT ARE OMITTED FROM THIS DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH SECTIONS 104(g)(2) AND 105(b)(5)(A) OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002

PCAOB RELEASE NO. 104-2021-138A

(Includes portions of Part II of the full report that were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2021-138)

Table of Contents

- 2019 Inspection 2
- Overview of the 2019 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year 3
- Part I: Inspection Observations 5
- Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions 6
- Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules 8
- Part II: Observations Related To Quality Control 9
- Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection ReportA-1

2019 Inspection

During the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (“PCAOB”)’s 2019 inspection of KPMG SA, we assessed the firm’s compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of public companies. Our inspection was conducted in cooperation with the French High Council for Statutory Auditors.

We selected for review three audits of issuers with fiscal years ending in 2018. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm’s system of quality control.

2019 Inspection Approach

In selecting issuer audits for review, we use a risk-based method of selection. We make selections based on (1) our internal evaluation of audits we believe have a heightened risk of material misstatement, including those with challenging audit areas, and (2) other risk-based characteristics, including issuer and firm considerations. In certain situations we may select all of the firm’s issuer audits for review.

When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. Rather, we generally focus our attention on audit areas we believe to be of greater complexity, areas of greater significance or with a heightened risk of material misstatement to the issuer’s financial statements, and areas of recurring deficiencies. We may also select some audit areas for review in a manner designed to incorporate unpredictability.

Our selection of audits for review does not constitute a representative sample of the firm’s total population of issuer audits. Additionally, our inspection findings are specific to the particular portions of the issuer audits reviewed. They are not an assessment of all of the firm’s audit work nor of all of the audit procedures performed for the audits reviewed.

View the details on the [scope of our inspections and our inspections procedures](#).

Overview of the 2019 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year

The following information provides an overview of our inspection in 2019 of the firm’s issuer audits as well as data from the previous inspection. We use a risk-based method to select audits for review and to identify areas on which we focus our review. Because our inspection process evolves over time, it can, and often does, focus on a different mix of audits and audit areas from inspection to inspection and firm to firm. Further, a firm’s business, the applicable auditing standards, or other factors can change from the time of one inspection to the next. As a result of these variations, we caution that our inspection results are not necessarily comparable over time or among firms.

Firm Data and Audits Reviewed

	2019	2017
Firm Data		
Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures	5	4
Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	41	45
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	31	35
Audits Reviewed		
Total audits reviewed²	3	3
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	2	2
Audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	1	1
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (“ICFR”)	3	3
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	3	1

¹ The number of engagement partners on issuer audit work represents the total number of firm personnel (not necessarily limited to personnel with an ownership interest) who had primary responsibility for an issuer audit (as defined in AS 1201) or for the firm’s role in an issuer audit during the twelve-month period preceding the outset of the inspection.

² The population from which audits are selected for review includes both audits for which the firm was the principal auditor and those where the firm was not the principal auditor but played a role in the audit. The population of issuer audits from which audits are selected for review may differ from the issuer audits at the outset of the inspection procedures due to variations such as new issuer audit clients for which the firm has not yet issued an opinion or issuer audit clients lost prior to the outset of the inspection.

If a deficiency is included in Part I.A of our report, it does not necessarily mean that the firm has not addressed the deficiency. In many cases, the firm has performed remedial actions after the issue was identified. Depending on the circumstances, remedial actions may include performing additional audit procedures, informing management of the issuer of the need for changes to the financial statements or reporting on ICFR, or taking steps to prevent reliance on prior audit reports. Our inspection may include a review, on a sample basis, of the adequacy of a firm's remedial actions, either with respect to previously identified deficiencies or deficiencies identified during the current inspection. If a firm does not take appropriate actions to address deficiencies, we may criticize its system of quality control or pursue a disciplinary action.

The fact that we have included a deficiency in our report — other than those deficiencies for audits with incorrect opinions on the financial statements and/or ICFR — does not necessarily mean that the issuer's financial statements are materially misstated or that undisclosed material weaknesses in ICFR exist. It is often not possible for us to reach a conclusion on those points based on our inspection procedures and related findings because, for example, we have only the information that the auditor retained and the issuer's public disclosures. We do not have direct access to the issuer's management, underlying books and records, and other information.

Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 2019 inspection and the previous inspection. For the issuer audits selected for review, we selected these areas because they were generally significant to the issuer's financial statements, may have included complex issues for auditors, and/or involved complex judgments in (1) estimating and auditing the reported value of related accounts and disclosures and (2) implementing and auditing the related controls.

2019		2017	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Revenue and related accounts	3	Revenue and related accounts	3
Business combinations	1	Business combinations	2
Long-lived assets	1	Inventory	1
Cash and cash equivalents	1	Cash and cash equivalents	1
		Use of other auditors	1

Part I: Inspection Observations

Part I.A of our report discusses deficiencies, if any, that were of such significance that we believe the firm, (1) at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR or (2) in audit(s) in which it was not the principal auditor, had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit. Part I.B discusses deficiencies, if any, that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion(s) or fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(s) but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules. Consistent with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act ("the Act"), it is the Board's assessment that nothing in Part I of this report deals with a criticism of or potential defect in the firm's quality control system. Any such criticisms or potential defects are discussed in Part II. Further, you should not infer from any Part I deficiency or combination of deficiencies that a quality control finding is identified in Part II. Section 104(g)(2) of the Act restricts us from publicly disclosing Part II deficiencies unless the firm does not address the criticisms or potential defects to the Board's satisfaction no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

Classification of Audits with Part I.A Deficiencies

Within Part I.A of this report, we classify each issuer audit in one of the categories discussed below based on the Part I.A deficiency or deficiencies identified in our review.

The sole purpose of this classification system is to group and present issuer audits by the number of Part I.A deficiencies we identified within the audit as well as to highlight audits with an incorrect opinion on the financial statements and/or ICFR.

Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

This classification includes instances where a deficiency was identified in connection with our inspection and, as a result, an issuer's financial statements were determined to be materially misstated, and the issuer restated its financial statements. It also includes instances where a deficiency was identified in connection with our inspection and, as a result, an issuer's ICFR was determined to be ineffective, or there were additional material weaknesses that the firm did not identify, and the firm withdrew its opinion, or modified its report, on ICFR. This classification does not include instances where, unrelated to our review, an issuer restated its financial statements and/or an issuer's ICFR was determined to be ineffective. Any deficiencies identified in connection with our reviews of these audits would be included in the audits with multiple deficiencies or audits with a single deficiency classification below.

Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

This classification includes instances where multiple deficiencies were identified that related to a combination of one or more financial statement accounts, disclosures, and/or important controls in an ICFR audit.

Audits with a Single Deficiency

This classification includes instances where a single deficiency was identified that related to a financial statement account or disclosure or to an important control in an ICFR audit.

Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions

This section of our report discusses the deficiencies identified, by specific issuer audit reviewed, in the audit work (1) supporting the firm's opinion on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR and (2) in audit(s) in which it was not the principal auditor, to fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit.

We identify each issuer by a letter (e.g., Issuer A). Each deficiency could relate to several auditing standards, but we reference the PCAOB standard(s) that most directly relates to the requirement with which the firm did not comply.

Issuer audits are presented below within their respective deficiency classifications (as discussed previously). Within the classifications, we generally present the audits based on our assessment as to the relative significance of the identified deficiencies taking into account the significance of the financial statement accounts and/or disclosures affected, and/or the nature or extent of the deficiencies.

Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

None

Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

Issuer A

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the ICFR audit related to **Revenue** and **Business Combinations**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Revenue**:

The issuer entered into certain revenue arrangements with multiple performance obligations and allocated the total consideration from these arrangements between goods and services. The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of management's review of new contracts for appropriate revenue recognition. The firm did not evaluate the review procedures that the control owners performed, including the procedures to identify items for follow up and the procedures to determine whether those items were appropriately resolved. (AS 2201.42 and .44)

With respect to **Business Combinations**:

The issuer determined the fair value of an acquired intangible asset using various assumptions, including revenue growth rates. The firm identified control deficiencies related to two controls selected for testing over management's review of these assumptions. Except for the two deficient controls, the firm did not identify and test any controls that address the risk of potential misstatement related to errors in the assumptions, including revenue growth rates. (AS 2201.39)

Issuer B – Industrials

Type of audit and related area affected

In our review of an audit in which the firm played a role but was not the principal auditor, we identified deficiencies in connection with the firm's role in the financial statement and ICFR audits related to **Revenue**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

For one business unit, the firm selected for testing a control that consisted of management's review of a monthly revenue variance analysis. The firm did not evaluate the review procedures that the control owner performed, including for certain customers, the procedures to identify items for follow up and the procedures to determine whether those items were appropriately resolved. (AS 2201.42 and .44)

For this business unit, the firm's substantive procedures to test revenue consisted of testing samples of transactions and performing substantive analytical procedures. The following deficiencies were identified:

- In performing its testing of the selected transactions, the firm did not evaluate whether the selling prices that the issuer used to record revenue agreed with the terms in the customer purchase orders or contracts. (AS 2301.08)
- The sample size the firm used was too small to provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence because these procedures were designed based on a level of control reliance that was not supported due to the deficiency in the firm's control testing discussed above. (AS 2301.16, .18, and .37; AS 2315.19, .23, and .23A)
- In performing the substantive analytical procedures, the firm did not evaluate whether the relationship between cash receipts and revenue was sufficiently predictable. (AS 2305.13 and .14)

For another business unit, the firm selected for testing a control that consisted of management's review of a monthly revenue variance analysis. The firm did not evaluate the review procedures that the control owner performed, including the procedures to identify items for follow up and the procedures to determine whether those items were appropriately resolved. (AS 2201.42 and .44)

For this business unit, the firm's substantive procedures to test revenue consisted of substantive analytical procedures. The firm did not (1) evaluate whether prior period revenue was sufficiently predictive of revenue for the year and (2) develop certain other expectations it used in these analytical procedures, based on industry revenue growth data, at a level of precision to provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence. (AS 2305.13, .14, and .17)

Audits with a Single Deficiency

Issuer C

Type of audit and related area affected

In our review, we identified a deficiency in the ICFR audit related to **Long-Lived Assets**.

Description of the deficiency identified

The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of management's review of certain assumptions used to determine depreciation expense on long-lived assets. The firm did not evaluate the review procedures that the control owners performed, including the procedures to identify items for follow up and the procedures to determine whether those items were appropriately resolved. (AS 2201.42 and .44)

Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules

This section of our report discusses any deficiencies we identified that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion(s) or fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(s) but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules. When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. As a result, the area below was not necessarily reviewed on every audit. In some cases, we assess the firm's compliance with specific PCAOB standards or rules on other audits that were not otherwise selected for review and may include instances of non-compliance below.

We identified the following deficiency:

In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not assemble a complete and final set of audit documentation for retention within 45 days following the report release date. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1215, *Audit Documentation*.

Part II: Observations Related To Quality Control

Part II of our report discusses criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control.

Deficiencies are included in Part II if an analysis of the inspection results, including the results of the reviews of individual audits, indicates that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that firm personnel will comply with applicable professional standards and requirements. Generally, the report's description of quality control criticisms is based on observations from our inspection procedures.

Any changes or improvements to its system of quality control that the firm may have brought to the Board's attention may not be reflected in this report, but are taken into account during the Board's assessment of whether the firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

Criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control, to the extent any are identified, are nonpublic when the reports are issued. If a firm does not address to the Board's satisfaction any criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm's system of quality control within 12 months after the issuance of our report, any such deficiency will be made public.

* * * *

Testing Revenue

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the work performed by the firm's personnel with respect to testing revenue will meet the requirements of AS 2301 and AS 2305. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,³ which is included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to the firm's substantive testing of revenue.

³ Issuer B

Appendix A: Firm's Response to the Draft Inspection Report

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the firm's response, excluding any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.

The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.

In addition, pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm's response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.



KPMG S.A.
Siège social
Tour EQHO
2 Avenue Gambetta
CS 60055
92066 Paris la Défense Cedex
France

Téléphone : +33 (0)1 55 68 86 66
Télécopie : +33 (0)1 55 68 86 60
Site internet : www.kpmg.fr

February 11, 2021

Mr. George Botic
Director – Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-2802
Unites States of America

**Response to Part I of Public Company Accounting Oversight Board Draft Report
on 2019 Inspection of KPMG S.A.**

Dear Mr. Botic,

We are pleased to provide our response to Part I of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB") Draft Report on the 2019 Inspection of KPMG SA, dated January 15, 2021 ("Draft Report").

Consistently executing high-quality audits is our top priority. We take the findings from the PCAOB inspection process seriously and believe the inspection process serves to assist us in identifying areas where we can continue to improve our performance and strengthen our system of audit quality control. We remain committed to full cooperation with the PCAOB, appreciate the professionalism and commitment of the PCAOB staff, and value the important role the PCAOB plays in improving audit quality.

We conducted a thorough evaluation of the matters identified in Part I of the Draft Report and have taken appropriate actions to address the engagement-specific findings in a manner consistent with PCAOB auditing standards and KPMG policies and procedures.

We remain dedicated to evaluating and improving our system of quality control, including monitoring audit quality and implementing changes to our policies and practices in order to enhance audit quality. We understand our responsibility to investors and other participants in the capital markets and are committed to work constructively with the PCAOB to improve audit quality and build confidence in the auditing profession.

Yours sincerely,

KPMG S.A.

Jay Nirsimloo
Senior Partner

KPMG S.A.,
société française membre du réseau KPMG
constitué de cabinets indépendants adhérents de
KPMG International Limited, une entité de droit anglais.
Document Classification: KPMG Highly Confidential

Société anonyme d'expertise
comptable et de commissariat
aux comptes à directeur et
conseil de surveillance.
Inscrite au Tableau de l'Ordre
à Paris sous le n° 14-30080101
et à la Compagnie Régionale
des Commissaires aux Comptes
de Versailles.

Siège social :
KPMG S.A.
Tour Egho
2 avenue Gambetta
92066 Paris la Défense Cedex
Capital : 5 497 100 €
Code APE 6920Z
775 726 417 R.C.S. Nanterre
TVA Union Européenne
FR 77 775 726 417

