
2020 Inspection

KPMG Inc

(Headquartered in Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa)

January 27, 2022

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. 104-2022-053A

(Includes portions of Part II of the full report that were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2022-053)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

2020 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2020 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 Report.....	A-1

2020 INSPECTION

In the 2020 inspection of KPMG Inc, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) 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 South African Independent Regulatory Board for Auditors.

We selected for review three audits of issuers with fiscal years generally 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.

2020 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 2020 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2020 inspection 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 Selected for Review

	2020	2017
Firm data		
Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures	1	4
Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	16	14
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	14	16
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	3

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 we include a deficiency 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.

If we include a deficiency in our report — other than those deficiencies for audits with incorrect opinions on the financial statements and/or ICFR — it 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.

Our 2020 inspection procedures involved one audit for which the issuer, unrelated to our review, restated its financial statements to correct a misstatement and revised its report on ICFR, and the firm revised and reissued its report on the financial statements and revised and reissued its report on ICFR to include an additional material weakness.

Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 2020 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.

2020		2017	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Revenue and related accounts	3	Revenue and related accounts	3
Long-lived assets	3	Cash and cash equivalents	3
Cash and cash equivalents	2	Inventory	2
Use of other auditors	1	Long-lived assets	2
		Business combinations	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 ("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. We discuss any such criticisms or potential defects in Part II. Further, you should not infer from any Part I deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, that we identified a quality control finding 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 revised 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. We include any deficiencies identified in connection with our reviews of these audits 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) and industry sector. 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.

We present issuer audits 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 – Materials

Type of audit and related area affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement and ICFR audits related to **Long-Lived Assets**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of the issuer's review of depreciation expense. The firm did not evaluate the specific review procedures the control owner performed to assess the appropriateness of the methods the issuer used to calculate depreciation. (AS 2201.42 and .44) In addition, the firm did not identify and test any controls over the accuracy and completeness of certain data used in the operation of this control. (AS 2201.39)

The firm selected for testing another control that consisted of the issuer's review of fixed assets not being depreciated, per the issuer's fixed asset register, to identify any assets that should be depreciated.

The firm did not identify and test any controls over the accuracy and completeness of the data, included within the fixed asset register, used in the operation of this control. (AS 2201.39)

The firm used the issuer's fixed asset register in its substantive testing of depreciation expense and accumulated depreciation. The firm did not test, or (as discussed above) test controls over, the accuracy and completeness of the information included in the fixed asset register. (AS 1105.10)

Issuer B – Materials

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 ICFR audit related to **Long-Lived Assets**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of the issuer's review and approval of an authorization for expenditure form for the acquisition of long-lived assets. The firm did not identify and test any controls that addressed whether long-lived assets were appropriately capitalized. (AS 2201.39)

The firm selected for testing another control that consisted of the issuer's review of manual recalculations of depreciation expense and a comparison of those amounts to the depreciation expense calculated by the issuer's fixed asset register. The firm did not identify and test any controls over the accuracy and completeness of certain data used in the operation of this control. (AS 2201.39)

Audits with a Single Deficiency

Issuer C – Materials

Type of audit and related area affected

In our review, we identified a deficiency in the financial statement audit related to **Cash and Cash Equivalents**.

Description of the deficiency identified

The issuer closed its books and records prior to its calendar year end and did not record certain transactions that occurred between the closing date and year end. The firm did not identify, and appropriately address, that the issuer's accounting treatment for these transactions was not in conformity with the International Accounting Standards Board's Conceptual Framework for Financial Reporting. (AS 2810.30)

Unrelated to our review, the issuer reevaluated its accounting for transactions recorded between its closing date and calendar year end and concluded that a misstatement existed that had not been previously identified. The issuer subsequently corrected this misstatement in a restatement of its financial statements, and the firm revised and reissued its report on the financial statements. The issuer

also reevaluated its controls over financial reporting and concluded that a material weakness existed that had not been previously identified. The issuer subsequently reflected this material weakness in a revision to its report on ICFR.

PART I.B: OTHER INSTANCES OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH PCAOB STANDARDS OR RULES

In the 2020 inspection, we did not identify any deficiencies related to other instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules.

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.

We include deficiencies 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.

This report does not reflect changes or improvements to the firm's system of quality control that the firm may have made subsequent to the period covered by our inspection. The Board does consider such changes or improvements in assessing whether the firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

When we issue our reports, we do not make public criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control, to the extent any are identified. 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, we will make public any such deficiency.

* * * *

Policies for Financial Holdings Disclosures

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the firm and its personnel will comply with the firm's policies and procedures with respect to independence-related regulatory requirements. (QC 20.04., 09, and .10)

The firm conducts periodic audits of a sample of its personnel to monitor compliance with certain of its independence policies. In the audit conducted, the firm identified that 56% of senior managers who were audited in 2019 had not reported financial relationships that were required to be reported in accordance with the firm's policies. This high rate of non-compliance with the firm's policies, which are designed to provide compliance with applicable independence regulatory requirements, provides cause for concern, especially considering that these individuals are required to certify on an annual basis that they have complied with the firm's independence policies and procedures.

* * * *

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 Inc.
KPMG Crescent
85 Empire Road, Parktown, 2193,
Private Bag 9, Parkview, 2122, South Africa

Telephone 427 (0)11 647 7111
Fax 427 (0)11 647 8000
Docus 472 Johannesburg
Internet kpmg.co.za

September 30, 2021

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

Response to Part I of Public Company Accounting Oversight Board Draft Report on 2020 Inspection of KPMG Inc.

Dear Mr. Botie,

We are pleased to provide our response to Part I of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB") Draft Report on 2020 Inspection of KPMG Inc. dated August 31, 2021 ("Draft Report").

Consistently executing high-quality audits is our top priority. We take 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 our policies and practices in order to enhance audit quality. We understand that many of our stakeholders are interested in our overall efforts to improve audit quality, including the specific actions we have taken and continue to take. These actions are included in our 2020 Integrated Report. We understand our responsibility to investors and other participants in the capital markets and are committed to continuing to work constructively with the PCAOB to improve audit quality and build confidence in the auditing profession.

Yours sincerely,

KPMG Inc.

Ignatius Schoole
Chief Executive Officer

Jan Vliegthart
Head of Quality and Risk

KPMG Inc., a company incorporated under the South African Companies Act, and a member firm of the KPMG global organization of independent member firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee.

KPMG Inc. is a Registered Auditor in public practice, in terms of the Auditing Profession Act, 26 of 2005.

Registration number 1999/0154/201

Chairman: Wileman Nkomo

Chief Executive Officer: Ignatius Schoole

Directors: Full list on website

The company's principal place of business is at KPMG Crescent, 85 Empire Road, Parktown

