
2023 Inspection Ernst & Young Hua Ming LLP

(Headquartered in Beijing, People's Republic of
China)

May 23, 2024

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. 104-2024-083

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2023 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2023 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	9
Part I.C: Independence.....	9
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control	10
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

2023 INSPECTION

In the 2023 inspection of Ernst & Young Hua Ming 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 China Securities Regulatory Commission and the Ministry of Finance of the People's Republic of China.

We selected for review four audits of issuers with fiscal years generally ending in 2022. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

2023 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 2023 INSPECTION

The following information provides an overview of our 2023 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

	2023
Firm data	
Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the principal auditor	25
Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	93
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work ¹	65
Audits reviewed	
Total audits reviewed ²	4
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	3
Audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	1
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	4
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	3
Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies	75%

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

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.

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 2023 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.

2023	
Audit area	Audits reviewed
Revenue and related accounts	4
Cash and cash equivalents	4
Goodwill and intangible assets	2
Other investments	2
Related party transactions	2

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 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(s) 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 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 – Information Technology

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement and ICFR audits related to **Goodwill** and **Variable Interest Entities (VIEs)**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Goodwill**, for which the firm identified a significant risk:

The issuer determined that it had certain reporting units, including one reporting unit that consisted of two components (“Reporting Unit”). The issuer performed a quantitative assessment to test goodwill for impairment at the Reporting Unit, and the firm’s approach for substantively testing this assessment was to test the issuer’s process. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of the issuer’s review of the determination of the reporting units. The firm did not test an aspect of this control that addressed the considerations for the aggregation of the two components into one reporting unit, including the similarity of the economic characteristics of the components and various qualitative factors, as required by FASB ASC Topic 350, *Intangibles – Goodwill and Other*. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm selected for testing another control that consisted of the issuer’s review of the reasonableness of significant assumptions used in the quantitative assessment of goodwill. The firm did not evaluate the specific review procedures the control owner performed to evaluate the reasonableness of the projected amounts for revenue growth and certain costs used in this assessment. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm did not perform sufficient procedures to evaluate whether the issuer identified the reporting units in conformity with FASB ASC Topic 350 because it did not perform any procedures to evaluate the similarities in the economic characteristics of the components and the various qualitative factors considered by the issuer when determining whether the two components should be aggregated into one reporting unit. (AS 2301.08 and .11)
- The firm did not evaluate whether the issuer had a reasonable basis for the significant assumptions related to revenue growth rates used in its quantitative assessment of goodwill at the Reporting Unit, including consideration of the recent declines in the Reporting Unit’s revenue growth rate. (AS 2501.16)
- The firm did not perform sufficient procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of the significant assumptions related to the revenue growth rates and certain costs for the Reporting Unit because it did not take into account, beyond reading the issuer’s overall business plan, the issuer’s ability to carry out its intended courses of action. (AS 2501.17)
- For one component within the Reporting Unit, the firm did not evaluate whether the significant assumptions the issuer used in its quantitative assessment were consistent with the issuer’s historical and recent experience, taking into account changes in conditions and events affecting the issuer, beyond observing that the assumptions were directionally consistent with the issuer’s overall business plan and strategy. (AS 2501.16 and .17)

With respect to **VIEs**:

The issuer derives revenue through consolidated VIEs and relies on contractual arrangements with the VIEs and their shareholders to control the business operations of the consolidated VIEs. The issuer engaged an external specialist to provide a legal opinion regarding the validity and enforceability of contractual arrangements with the issuer’s consolidated VIEs and their shareholders, and the firm used the work of the company’s specialist as audit evidence.

The firm did not sufficiently evaluate the relevance and reliability of the work performed by the company's specialist and whether the specialist's findings support or contradict the issuer's rights and obligations related to the consolidation of the VIEs because it did not evaluate the nature of uncertainties described in the legal opinion prepared by the company's specialist and perform additional procedures to address the risks associated with those uncertainties. (AS 1105.A9 and .A10)

Issuer B – Industrials

Type of audit and related areas 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 **Revenue** and **Inventory**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Revenue**, for which the firm identified a fraud risk:

The firm did not identify and test any controls over the accuracy of information that the issuer used to record certain revenue. (AS 2201.39)

With respect to **Inventory**:

The firm did not identify and test any controls over the existence of inventory held at customers' warehouses. (AS 2201.39)

Audits with a Single Deficiency

Issuer C – Consumer Discretionary

Type of audit and related area affected

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

Description of the deficiency identified

The issuer derives revenue through a consolidated VIE and relies on contractual arrangements with the VIE and its shareholders to control the business operations of the consolidated VIE. The issuer engaged an external specialist to provide a legal opinion regarding the validity and enforceability of contractual arrangements with the issuer's consolidated VIE and its shareholders, and the firm used the work of the company's specialist as audit evidence.

The firm did not sufficiently evaluate the relevance and reliability of the work performed by the company's specialist and whether the specialist's findings support or contradict the issuer's rights and obligations related to the consolidation of the VIE because it did not evaluate the nature of uncertainties described in the legal opinion prepared by the company's specialist and perform additional procedures to address the risks associated with those uncertainties. (AS 1105.A9 and .A10)

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

We identified the following deficiency:

In one of four audits reviewed, the firm did not include all relevant work papers in the final set of audit documentation it was required to assemble. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1215, *Audit Documentation*.

PART I.C: INDEPENDENCE

In the 2023 inspection, we did not identify, and the firm did not bring to our attention, any instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence. Although this section does not include any instances of potential non-compliance that we identified or the firm brought to our attention, there may be 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.

While the firm did not bring to our attention any 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 the number of 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 firm-identified instances of potential non-compliance across firms.

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.



Ernst & Young Hua Ming LLP
Level 16, Ernst & Young Tower
Oriental Plaza, 1 East Chang An Avenue
Dongcheng District
Beijing, China 100738

安永华明会计师事务所（特殊普通合伙）
中国北京市东城区东长安街1号
东方广场安永大楼16层
邮政编码: 100738

Tel 电话: +86 10 5815 3000
Fax 传真: +86 10 8518 8298
ey.com

May 6, 2024

Ms. Christine Gunia
Director, Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-2803

Response to the Draft Inspection Report on the 2023 Inspection of Ernst & Young Hua Ming LLP (Headquartered in Beijing, The People's Republic of China)

Dear Ms. Gunia,

We are pleased to provide our response to the draft inspection report (the Report) from the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (the Board or PCAOB) pertaining to the 2023 inspection of Ernst & Young Hua Ming LLP (Headquartered in Beijing, The People's Republic of China).

Our overriding objective is to make certain that all aspects of our auditing and quality control processes are of the highest quality for the continued benefit of the capital markets in which the public participates and on which they rely. The PCAOB's inspection process assists us in achieving that objective.

We respect the PCAOB's inspection process and understand that judgments are involved in performing audits, as well as in subsequent inspections of those audits. We have thoroughly evaluated all matters described in Part I, *Inspection Observations*, and have taken actions, where appropriate, in accordance with PCAOB standards and our policies. These actions did not change our audit conclusion, nor did the actions affect our reports on the issuer's financial statements. We have reviewed the remainder of the Report and have no further comments.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our response to the Report and look forward to continuing to work with the PCAOB on matters of interest to our U.S. SEC issuer auditing practice.

Respectfully submitted,

Tony Mao
Chief Partner and Assurance Leader

A member firm of Ernst & Young Global Limited

