
2021 Inspection Smythe LLP

(Headquartered in Vancouver, Canada)

December 1, 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. 104-2023-027A

(Includes portions of Part II of the full report
that were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2023-027)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

2021 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2021 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	10
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

2021 INSPECTION

In the 2021 inspection of Smythe LLP, 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 Canadian Public Accountability Board.

We selected for review three audits of issuers with fiscal years ending in 2020. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

2021 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 necessarily 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 2021 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2021 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

	2021	2018
Firm data		
Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures	9	4
Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	0	0
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	5	2
Audits reviewed		
Total audits reviewed²	3	2
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	3	2
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	0	0
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	2	0

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 deficiency was identified. Depending on the circumstances, remedial actions may include performing additional

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, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*) 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 audit report or issuer audit clients lost prior to the outset of the inspection.

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.

Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 2021 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.

2021		2018	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Revenue and related accounts	3	Cash and cash equivalents	2
Long-lived assets	2	Long-lived assets	1
Inventory	1	Inventory	1
Cash and cash equivalents	1	Revenue and related accounts	1
		Goodwill and intangible assets	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 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.

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.

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

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to **Revenue** and **Inventory**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Revenue**:

The issuer recognized certain revenue from transactions with related parties. The firm did not identify, and appropriately address, a departure from GAAP related to the issuer's omission of a disclosure required by FASB ASC Topic 850, *Related Party Disclosures*, related to this revenue. (AS 2810.30 and .31)

The firm sent a positive confirmation request to one of the issuer's customers for total revenue for the year and accounts receivable at year end. The customer did not respond to the aspect of the confirmation request related to revenue. The firm did not perform alternative procedures. (AS 2310.31)

With respect to **Inventory**:

The firm did not perform any substantive procedures to test certain inputs used by the issuer to determine the cost of certain inventory. Further, the firm did not perform sufficient substantive procedures to test the allocation of overhead costs to this inventory because it limited its procedures to comparing costs and production to the prior year, without performing procedures to determine whether prior year costs and production would be representative of the current year. (AS 2301.08)

For certain other inventory, the firm did not perform any substantive procedures to test, or in the alternative, identify and test any controls over, the accuracy and completeness of certain reports that it used in its inventory cost testing. (AS 1105.10)

Issuer B

Type of audit and related areas affected

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

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Long-Lived Assets**:

During the year, the issuer identified indicators of possible impairment for certain long-lived assets and engaged a specialist to determine the fair values of these assets. The firm's approach for substantively testing the fair values of these assets was to test the issuer's process. The following deficiencies were identified:

- For one asset group, the firm did not evaluate whether the significant assumptions developed by the company's specialist were consistent with relevant information. (AS 1105.A8b)
- For another asset group, the firm did not perform any procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of the significant assumptions developed by the company's specialist. (AS 1105.A8b)
- For both asset groups, the firm did not test, or in the alternative, identify and test controls over, the accuracy and completeness of certain issuer-produced data that the company's specialist used. (AS 1105.A8a)

With respect to **Cash**:

The issuer reported certain cash at year end that included amounts held in banks located in another country that had restrictions on the convertibility and remittance of amounts outside this country. The firm received positive confirmations from financial institutions indicating that certain of these amounts consisted of term deposits with maturities beyond one year. The firm did not perform any procedures to evaluate whether the issuer properly classified these amounts as unrestricted cash and disclosed any

restrictions in conformity with International Accounting Standard 7, *Statement of Cash Flows*. (AS 2810.03, .30, and .31)

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. As a result, the areas below were 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 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 three audits reviewed, the firm did not make certain required communications to the issuer's audit committee, or equivalent, related to the issuer's significant accounting policies and practices, critical accounting policies and practices, and critical accounting estimates. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not make a required communication to the issuer's audit committee related to the name, location, and planned responsibilities of an other accounting firm that performed audit procedures in the audit. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm communicated in writing to the audit committee that there were no significant deficiencies identified during the audit. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1305, *Communications About Control Deficiencies in an Audit of Financial Statements*.
- In the three audits reviewed, the engagement team performed procedures to determine whether or not matters were critical audit matters but did not include in those procedures certain matters that were communicated, or required to be communicated, to the issuer's audit committee, or equivalent, and that related to accounts or disclosures that were material to the financial statements. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 3101, *The Auditor's Report on an Audit of Financial Statements When the Auditor Expresses an Unqualified Opinion*. These instances of non-compliance do not necessarily mean that other critical audit matters should have been communicated in the auditor's report.

- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm's communication of a critical audit matter in the audit report included language that was inconsistent with information in the firm's audit documentation. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 3101, *The Auditor's Report on an Audit of Financial Statements When the Auditor Expresses an Unqualified Opinion*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm's audit report did not include a statement indicating that the financial statements included the related notes and schedules. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 3101, *The Auditor's Report on an Audit of Financial Statements When the Auditor Expresses an Unqualified Opinion*.
- In two of three audits reviewed, the firm's report on Form AP contained inaccurate information related to the participation in the audit by certain other accounting firms. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3211, *Auditor Reporting of Certain Audit Participants*.
- In the three audits reviewed, the firm's independence communications with the audit committee, or equivalent, did not describe the professional standards related to required communications. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3526, *Communication with Audit Committees Concerning Independence*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not provide the audit committee a required independence affirmation. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3526, *Communication with Audit Committees Concerning Independence*.

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.

Reliance on Data and Reports

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 establish a basis for reliance on data or reports will meet the requirements of AS 1105. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In two audits,³ both of which are included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to unwarranted reliance on data and reports. In these audits, the firm did not test, or in the alternative, test controls over, the accuracy and completeness of certain data and reports that it used in its substantive testing.

* * * *

Communications with Audit Committees

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 the requirements of AS 1301 * * * * . (QC 20.03 and .17)

In three audits,⁴ all of which are included in Part I.B, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to the firm's communications with the issuer's audit committee, or equivalent. * * * *

³ Issuers A and B

⁴ Issuers A, B, and C

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.



August 9, 2022

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

Dear Mr. Botic:

RE: Draft Report on the 2021 Inspection of Smythe LLP

We are pleased to provide our response to the draft report dated July 21, 2022, on the 2021 inspection of Smythe LLP (the "Draft Report") conducted by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB").

Smythe LLP is committed to performing high quality audits and is in full support of the PCAOB's inspection process. We have carefully reviewed and considered the matters brought to our attention in the Draft Report and are taking appropriate actions to enhance our policies and procedures to improve our audit methodologies and quality control processes.

We appreciate the work of the PCAOB inspection team and look forward to working with the PCAOB in the future.

Yours very truly,

Smythe LLP

Smythe LLP
Chartered Professional Accountants

SMYTHE LLP | smythecpa.com

VANCOUVER

1700-475 Howe St
Vancouver, BC V6C 2B3
T: 604 687 1231
F: 604 688 4675

LANGLEY

600-19933 88 Ave
Langley, BC V2Y 4K5
T: 604 282 3600
F: 604 357 1376

NANAIMO

201-1825 Bowen Rd
Nanaimo, BC V9S 1H1
T: 250 755 2111
F: 250 984 0886

