
2020 Inspection Marcelo de los Santos y Cía., S.C.

(Headquartered in San Luis Potosi, United
Mexican States)

May 13, 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. 104-2022-134A

(Includes portions of Part II of the full report
that were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2022-134)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

2020 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2020 Inspection.....	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 Marcelo de los Santos y Cía., S.C., 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.

We selected for review one audit of an issuer with a fiscal year ending in 2019. For the 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

The following information provides an overview of our 2020 inspection, which was our first inspection of this firm. 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
Firm data	
Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures	1
Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	0
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	1
Audits reviewed	
Total audits reviewed²	1
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	1
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	1
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	1

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.

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 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.

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.

Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 2020 inspection. For the issuer audit 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	
Audit area	Audits reviewed
Revenue and related accounts	1
Cash and cash equivalents	1
Inventory	1
Financial reporting and close	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, 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.

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) 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 supporting the firm's opinion on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR.

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 areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement and ICFR audits related to **Revenue, Inventory, Financial Reporting and Close, and Evaluation of Control Deficiencies.**

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Revenue**:

The firm tested certain controls over revenue at an interim date. The firm did not perform any procedures to update the results of that testing from the interim date to year end. (AS 2201.55)

The sample sizes the firm used in certain of its substantive procedures to test revenue were 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)

The firm performed certain substantive procedures to test revenue at an interim date. The firm did not perform any procedures to extend its audit conclusions from the interim date to year end. (AS 2301.45)

With respect to **Inventory**:

The firm did not determine the likely sources of potential misstatements associated with certain inventory to identify and test controls that addressed the risks of misstatement for the relevant assertions for this inventory. (AS 2201.30 and .39)

The issuer engaged an external specialist to estimate the quantity of certain inventory. The firm did not obtain an understanding of the methods and assumptions used by the external specialist to develop the estimate. (AS 1210.12)

The firm did not perform any procedures to test the existence of certain inventory. (AS 2510.09)

With respect to **Financial Reporting and Close**:

The firm identified a risk related to the manual consolidation process. The firm did not identify and test any controls over the issuer's financial statement consolidation process, including controls over journal entries and other adjustments. (AS 2201.39)

In addition, the firm did not perform any procedures to identify and select journal entries and other adjustments for testing. (AS 2401.58)

The firm used the work of the issuer's internal audit for certain testing of controls over the financial reporting and close process at certain components of the issuer. The firm did not assess the competence and objectivity of internal audit to support the extent to which the firm used its work. (AS 2201.19; AS 2605.09 and .10)

With respect to the **Evaluation of Control Deficiencies**:

The firm identified control deficiencies at certain of the issuer's components. The firm did not evaluate the severity of each identified control deficiency to determine whether the deficiency, individually or in combination, represented a material weakness. (AS 2201.62)

Audits with a Single Deficiency

None

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) 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. In some cases, we assess the firm's compliance with specific PCAOB standards or rules on other audits that were not reviewed and include any instances of non-compliance below.

The deficiencies below are presented in numerical order based on the PCAOB standard or rule with which the firm did not comply. We identified the following deficiencies:

- In the audit reviewed, the firm's foreign affiliates had obtained letters of representation from management for certain of the issuer's non-Mexican components, but the firm, as the principal auditor, did not obtain, and review and retain, such letters. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1205, *Part of the Audit Performed by Other Independent Auditors*.
- In the audit reviewed, the firm's engagement letter to the issuer's audit committee incorrectly described the objective of the audit and certain of the responsibilities of the auditor. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In the audit reviewed, the firm did not make certain required communications to the issuer's audit committee related to (1) the significant risks identified through its risk assessment procedures; (2) the extent to which the firm planned to use the work of internal auditors; (3) the issuer's critical accounting policies, practices, and estimates; (4) the firm's evaluation of the quality of the issuer's financial reporting; and (5) corrected and uncorrected misstatements. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In the audit reviewed, the firm did not make a required communication to the issuer's audit committee related to the management representation letter. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*, and AS 2805, *Management Representations*.
- In the audit reviewed and in the three other audits, the firm did not file its report on Form AP by the relevant deadline. In addition, in one other audit, the firm's report on Form AP omitted information related to the participation in the audit by an other accounting firm. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3211, *Auditor Reporting of Certain Audit Participants*.

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.

* * * *

Testing Inventory

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 to test inventory will meet the requirements of AS 1210³ and AS 2510. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,⁴ which is included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to obtaining an understanding of the methods and assumptions used by an external specialist to develop an estimate of the quantity of certain inventory and testing the existence of certain other inventory.

Engagement Quality Review

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the review procedures performed by the firm's engagement quality review (EQR) partners will meet the requirements of AS 1220. (QC 20.03 and .17)

³ AS 1210, *Using the Work of a Specialist*, which was in effect at the time of the audits that were the subject of this inspection, was replaced by AS 1210, *Using the Work of an Auditor-Engaged Specialist*. In addition, AS 1105, *Audit Evidence*, and AS 1201, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*, which were in effect at the time of the audits that were subject to this inspection, were revised to include appendices for auditor's use of the work of a company's specialist and auditor's supervision of the work of an auditor-employed specialist, respectively. This replacement and these revisions are effective for audits of financial statements for fiscal years ending on or after December 15, 2020.

⁴ Issuer A

In one audit,⁵ which is included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies in an area that the EQR partner was required to evaluate. In this audit, the EQR partner did not identify a deficiency in an area of significant risk, including in one case a fraud risk.

* * * *

Auditor Reporting of Certain Audit Participants

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the firm's personnel will comply with PCAOB Rule 3211. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In four audits,⁶ including the current and prior three years' audits, the firm did not file its report on Form AP by the relevant deadline. In addition, in one of the prior year audits, the firm's report on Form AP omitted information related to the participation in the audit by an other accounting firm.

⁵ Issuer A

⁶ Issuer A

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 Board provided the firm an opportunity to review and comment on a draft of this report. The firm did not provide a written response.

