
2023 Inspection AUDIT ALLIANCE LLP

(Headquartered in Singapore, Republic of
Singapore)

September 27, 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. 104-2024-149

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	8
Part I.C: Independence.....	10
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control	11
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

2023 INSPECTION

In the 2023 inspection of AUDIT ALLIANCE 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 Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority.

We selected for review three audits of issuers with fiscal years 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	27
Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	0
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work ¹	5
Audits reviewed	
Total audits reviewed	3
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	3
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	0
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	2
Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies	67%

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.

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.

Our inspection may include a review, on a sample basis, of the adequacy of a firm’s remedial actions, either with respect to previously identified deficiencies or deficiencies identified during the current inspection. If a firm does not take appropriate actions to address deficiencies, we may criticize its system of quality control or pursue a disciplinary action.

If we include a deficiency in our report — other than those deficiencies for audits with incorrect opinions on the financial statements and/or ICFR — it does not necessarily mean that the issuer’s financial statements are materially misstated or that undisclosed material weaknesses in ICFR exist. It is often not possible for us to reach a conclusion on those points based on our inspection procedures and related findings because, for example, we have only the information that the auditor retained and the issuer’s public disclosures. We do not have direct access to the issuer’s management, underlying books and records, and other information.

Our 2023 inspection procedures involved one audit for which the issuer, unrelated to our review, the issuer corrected a misstatement in a subsequent filing by adjusting the prior period financial statements, and the firm revised and reissued its report on the financial statements.

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	3
Cash and cash equivalents	3
Digital assets	2
Goodwill and intangible assets	1
Expenses	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(s) on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR.

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). 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 supporting the firm's opinion on the issuer's financial statements.

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 – Industrials

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to **Digital Assets**, **Revenue**, and **Other Income**. The firm's internal inspection program had inspected this audit and reviewed these areas but did not identify the deficiencies below.

Description of the deficiencies identified

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

The issuer reported digital assets. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm did not test the valuation of certain digital assets at year end. (AS 2501.07)
- The firm did not evaluate the appropriateness of the issuer's presentation of digital assets. (AS 2301.08 and .13)
- The firm did not evaluate the relevance and reliability of external data it used to test digital assets. (AS 1105.04 and .06)
- The firm did not perform any procedures to establish that the issuer had control over the digital assets to support its rights and obligations. (AS 2301.08 and .13)

Unrelated to our review, the issuer reevaluated its accounting for certain digital assets and concluded that a material misstatement existed that had not been previously identified. The issuer did not file an amended Form 10-K or a Form 8-K indicating that its previously issued financial statements should not be relied on. Instead, the issuer corrected this misstatement in a subsequent filing by revising the presentation, and the firm revised and reissued its report on the financial statements.

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

With respect to certain revenue, the firm did not test whether (1) a contractual arrangement was entered into with the customer, (2) the issuer satisfied its performance obligations prior to the recognition of revenue, (3) the issuer had rights and obligations to the customer payments, and (4) the rate charged to the customer was in accordance with the terms of the arrangement. (AS 2301.08 and .13) In addition, the firm did not evaluate the relevance and reliability of external data it used to test this revenue. (AS 1105.04 and .06)

With respect to **Other Income**:

The firm did not perform procedures, beyond obtaining a management representation letter, to test other income, including evaluating whether the issuer's accounting for the recognition of other income was in conformity with GAAP. (AS 2301.08)

Issuer B – Industrials

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to **Significant Accounts** and **Goodwill**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

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

The firm did not perform any procedures to test the fair value of certain significant accounts, including consideration of contradictory information that was included in the work papers. (AS 2501.07; AS 2810.03)

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

The issuer engaged a valuation specialist to perform its annual goodwill impairment analyses. The firm did not perform any procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of certain significant assumptions used by the company's specialist. (AS 1105.A8b; AS 2501.16) In addition, the firm did not perform any procedures to evaluate the relevance and reliability of external data, and test the accuracy and completeness of issuer-prepared data, that the company's specialist used to develop certain significant assumptions. (AS 1105.A8a)

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). 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 two of three audits reviewed, the firm did not make a required communication to the audit committee related to the name, location, and planned responsibilities of an other accounting firm that performed audit procedures in the audit. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm inaccurately communicated to the audit committee that it identified uncorrected misstatements and misstatements that the issuer corrected. In this instance, 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 audit committee related to the firm's evaluation of the issuer's ability to continue as a going concern.

In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.

- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not communicate to the audit committee all of the significant risks identified through its risk assessment procedures. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not provide or discuss with the audit committee a draft of the firm's audit report. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not inquire of the audit committee about whether it was aware of matters relevant to the audit, including, but not limited to, violations or possible violations of laws or regulations. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In two of three audits reviewed, the firm did not provide a copy of the management representation letter to the audit committee. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*, and AS 2805, *Management Representations*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not provide to management and the audit committee the required communications in writing of all material weaknesses 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 one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not inquire of the audit committee about the risks of material misstatement, including fraud risks. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2110, *Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement*.
- In the three 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, or required to be communicated, to the audit committee 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 two 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 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*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm's audit report incorrectly identified one of 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*.

- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not file its report on Form AP by the relevant deadline. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3211, *Auditor Reporting of Certain Audit Participants*.
- In two of three audits reviewed, the firm's report on Form AP either included inaccurate information or 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 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.



AUDIT ALLIANCE LLP®

A Top 18 Audit Firm
10 Anson Road, #20-16 International Plaza, Singapore 079903.

Member of
Allinial GLOBAL.

UEN: T12LL1223B GST Reg No: M90367663E Tel: (65) 6227 5428
Website: www.allianceaudit.com

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

16 August 2024

Response to Part 1 of the Draft Report on the 2024 Inspection of Audit Alliance LLP

Dear Christine,

We are pleased to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (the 'PCAOB') regarding Part 1 of the Draft Report on the 2024 Inspection of Audit Alliance LLP (the 'Report').

We have thoroughly evaluated the matters described in Part 1 – Inspection Procedures and Certain Observations of the Report and have taken actions to address findings in accordance with PCAOB standards and our policies.

The PCAOB's inspection process assists us in identifying areas where we can continue to improve audit quality. We respect and benefit from this process as it aids us in fulfilling our responsibilities to investors, other stakeholders, and the capital markets generally.

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 public company auditing practice.

We would also like to this opportunity thanks the PCAOB Inspection teams ****, who displayed a very high standards of competent and professionalism.

Respectfully submitted,

.....
Bernard Lee
Managing Partner
Audit Alliance LLP

.....
Su Chun Keat
Partner – Assurance Services

****As a matter of policy, the PCAOB redacts from firms' responses to draft inspection reports the names of PCAOB staff, other than senior staff to whom a response letter is addressed.

