
2022 Inspection KPMG Auditores Independentes Ltda.

(Headquartered in São Paulo, Federative Republic
of Brazil)

October 16, 2023

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. 104-2023-185

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2022 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2022 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 I.C: Independence.....	9
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control	11
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

2022 INSPECTION

In the 2022 inspection of KPMG Auditores Independientes Ltda. (formerly KPMG Auditores Independientes), 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 three audits of issuers with fiscal years ending in 2021. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

2022 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 or 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 2022 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2022 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

	2022	2019
Firm data		
Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the principal auditor	13	10
Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	38	46
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	40	48
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	1	2
Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies	33%	67%

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 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.

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 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 2022 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.

2022		2019	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Revenue and related accounts	3	Cash and cash equivalents	3
Cash and cash equivalents	2	Revenue and related accounts	2
Accruals and other liabilities	1	Inventory	1
Inventory	1	Long-lived assets	1
Long-lived assets	1	Significant estimate	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(s) 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 certain deficiencies, if any, that relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules other than those where the firm had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion(s) or fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(s). This section does not discuss instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence.

Part I.C discusses instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules, if any, related to maintaining independence.

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 audits 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 audits 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 audits 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 audits 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 audits 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 (s) on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR.

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 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 and ICFR audits related to **Long-Lived Assets** and **Revenue**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

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

The firm selected for testing controls that consisted of the issuer's reviews of (1) additions to property, plant, and equipment (PP&E), and whether those costs were allocated to the appropriate project within the issuer's accounting system, and (2) PP&E write-offs, and whether those write-offs were appropriately supported and approved. The firm did not identify and test any controls over the completeness of the system-generated reports used in the operation of these controls. (AS 2201.39)

The sample sizes the firm used in certain of its substantive procedures to test additions to, and write-offs of, PP&E 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 deficiencies in the firm's control testing discussed above. (AS 2301.16, .18, and .37; AS 2315.19, .23, and .23A)

The firm did not identify and evaluate a departure from IFRS related to the issuer's use of (1) post-tax future cash flows and a post-tax discount rate, (2) future cash flows that included cash flows of certain forecasted divestments, and (3) for the cash-generating units ("CGUs") of one segment, estimated future cash flows occurring subsequent to the expiration of lease contracts that were not reasonably certain of being renewed, to estimate the value-in-use ("VIU") of its CGUs to evaluate long-lived assets for impairment, which was not in conformity with International Accounting Standard 36, *Impairment of Assets*. (AS 2810.30)

The firm's approach for substantively testing the valuation of long-lived assets was to test the issuer's process. With respect to the inputs, methods, and assumptions used in the issuer's VIU and depreciation and amortization rate calculations for one of its segments, the following additional deficiencies were identified:

- The firm selected for testing controls that consisted of the issuer's reviews of certain issuer-produced data and assumptions used by a (1) company-employed specialist to develop certain inputs and (2) company-engaged specialist to evaluate certain of those inputs. The firm did not identify and test any controls over the completeness of certain reports, and the accuracy and completeness of certain other reports, used in the operation of these controls. (AS 2201.39)
- The firm did not identify and test any controls over the (1) accuracy and completeness of certain issuer-produced data, (2) reasonableness of certain assumptions, and (3) appropriateness of the methods, used by the (1) company-employed specialist to develop certain inputs and (2) company-engaged specialist to evaluate certain of those inputs. (AS 2201.39)
- The firm did not perform procedures, beyond inquiry of management, to evaluate the appropriateness of an input, including taking into consideration the issuer's ability to carry out its stated intentions. (AS 2301.08)
- The firm did not test the accuracy and completeness of certain issuer-produced data used by the (1) company-employed specialist to develop certain inputs and (2) company-engaged specialist to evaluate certain of those inputs. (AS 1105.A8a)
- The firm did not perform any procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of significant assumptions used by the (1) company-employed specialist to develop certain inputs and (2) company-engaged specialist to evaluate certain of those inputs. (AS 2501.16; AS 1105.A8b) In addition, the firm did not evaluate whether the methods used by the (1) company-employed

specialist to develop certain inputs and (2) company-engaged specialist to evaluate certain of those inputs, were appropriate under the circumstances taking into consideration the requirements of IFRS. (AS 1105.A8c)

With respect to **Revenue**:

The issuer recognized certain revenue upon delivery of the sold product to the customer. Pursuant to the customer contracts, the quantity of products sold and delivered was measured using measuring equipment at the issuer's locations. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of the issuer's evaluation of the equipment used to measure inventory quantity on hand and inventory quantity delivered to each customer to determine whether it was appropriately maintained and operating correctly. The firm did not evaluate the specific review procedures that the control owners performed to determine whether the equipment was accurately measuring the quantity of products delivered to each customer. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm selected for testing another control that consisted of management's review of the reconciliation of the quantity of products sold in the revenue system to the quantity of products delivered in the issuer's inventory management system. The firm did not identify and test any controls over the accuracy and completeness of the system-generated reports used in the operation of this control. (AS 2201.39)

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 deficiencies in the firm's control testing discussed above. (AS 2301.16, .18, and .37; AS 2315.19, .23, and .23A)

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 certain deficiencies that relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules other than those where the firm had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion(s) or fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(s). This section does not discuss instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence.

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 one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not establish an understanding of the terms of the audit engagement with the audit committee, record such understanding in an engagement letter, and provide the engagement letter to the audit committee. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of two 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 two audits reviewed, the engagement team performed procedures to determine whether or not matters were critical audit matters but, in performing those procedures, did not include certain matters that were communicated to the issuer's audit committee and that related to accounts or disclosures that were material to the financial statements. 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*. This instance of non-compliance does not necessarily mean that other critical audit matters should have been communicated in the auditor's report.

PART I.C: INDEPENDENCE

This section of our report discusses instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence. An instance of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or an instance of non-compliance with PCAOB rules does not necessarily mean that the Board has concluded the firm was not objective and impartial throughout the audit and professional engagement period. Although this section includes instances of potential non-compliance that the firm brought to our attention, there may be other instances of non-compliance with SEC or PCAOB rules related to independence that were not identified through our procedures or the firm's monitoring activities.

PCAOB-Identified

We did not identify any instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence.

Firm-Identified

During the inspection, the firm brought to our attention that it had identified, through its independence monitoring activities, three instances across three issuers³ in which the firm or its personnel appeared to have impaired the firm's independence because it may not have complied with Rule 2-01(c) of Regulation S-X related to maintaining independence.

³ The firm-identified instances of potential non-compliance do not necessarily relate to the issuer audits that we selected for review.

While we have not evaluated the underlying reasons for the instances of potential non-compliance, the number, large or small, of firm-identified instances of potential non-compliance may be reflective of the size of the firm, including any associated firms; the design and effectiveness of the firm's independence monitoring activities; and the size and/or complexity of the issuers it audits, including the number of affiliates of those issuers. Therefore, we caution against making any comparison of these firm-identified instances of potential non-compliance across firms.

The firm reported three instances of potential non-compliance with Rule 2-01(c)(1) of Regulation S-X regarding financial relationships, which occurred at the firm or involved its personnel. Of these instances, one related to an investment in an audit client and two related to other financial relationships with audit clients. One of these financial relationships was an instance where a partner equivalent in the same office as the engagement partner for an issuer had a financial relationship with that issuer. Two of these instances related to a member of an engagement team.

The firm has reported to us that it has evaluated these instances of potential non-compliance and determined in all instances that its objectivity and impartiality were not impaired.

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.

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 Auditores Independentes Ltda.
Rua Verbo Divino, 1400, Conjunto Térreo ao 801 - Parte,
Chácara Santo Antônio, CEP 04719-911, São Paulo - SP
Caixa Postal 79518 - CEP 04707-970 - São Paulo - SP - Brasil
Telefone +55 (11) 3940-1500
kpmg.com.br

August 28, 2023

Mr. George Botic
Director – Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-2803
United States of America

Response to Part I of Public Company Accounting Oversight Board Draft Report on 2022 Inspection of KPMG Auditores Independentes Ltda.

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 2022 Inspection of KPMG Auditores Independentes Ltda. dated August 7, 2023 ("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, SEC or PCAOB Rules, and KPMG policies and procedures.

KPMG Auditores Independentes Ltda., uma sociedade simples brasileira, de responsabilidade limitada e firma-membro da organização global KPMG de firmas-membro independentes licenciadas da KPMG International Limited, uma empresa inglesa privada de responsabilidade limitada.

KPMG Auditores Independentes Ltda., a Brazilian limited liability company 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.

1



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 for 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 continuing to work constructively with the PCAOB to improve audit quality and build confidence in the auditing profession

Yours sincerely,

KPMG Auditores Independentes Ltda.

Danilo Siman Simões
Country Risk Management Partner

Carlos Augusto Pires
Head of Audit

KPMG Auditores Independentes Ltda., uma sociedade simples brasileira, de responsabilidade limitada e firma-membro da organização global KPMG de firmas-membro independentes licenciadas da KPMG International Limited, uma empresa inglesa privada de responsabilidade limitada.

KPMG Auditores Independentes Ltda., a Brazilian limited liability company 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.

