
2024 Inspection J&S Associate PLT

(Headquartered in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia)

March 27, 2025

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. 104-2025-056

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2024 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2024 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

2024 INSPECTION

In the 2024 inspection of J&S Associate PLT, 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 generally ending in 2023. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

2024 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 2024 INSPECTION

The following information provides an overview of our 2024 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

	2024
Firm data	
Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the principal auditor	6
Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	0
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work ¹	2
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	3
Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies	100%

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.

Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 2024 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.

2024	
Audit area	Audits reviewed
Cash and cash equivalents	3
Revenue and related accounts	2
Significant transactions	1
Goodwill and intangible assets	1
Significant accounts	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 opinions. 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). 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 audit related to **Intangible Assets** and a **Significant Transaction**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Intangible Assets**:

The issuer performed a quantitative assessment of impairment of its intangible assets. The firm did not perform procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of certain significant assumptions used in the issuer's quantitative assessment, beyond (1) inquiry, (2) obtaining and reading the issuer's analysis, certain internal documentation, and letters of intent from customers, and (3) performing a sensitivity analysis. (AS 2501.16) In addition, the firm did not sufficiently evaluate the reasonableness of the significant assumption related to the discount rate the issuer used in the quantitative assessment, because it limited its procedures to comparing this assumption to the issuer's cost of borrowing. (AS 2501.16)

With respect to a **Significant Transaction**:

During the year, the issuer completed a significant transaction. The firm did not identify and evaluate departures from GAAP related to the issuer's presentation of this transaction in the financial statements. (AS 2810.30 and .31) In addition, the firm did not identify and evaluate departures from GAAP related to the issuer's omission of certain required disclosures related to this transaction. (AS 2810.30 and .31)

Issuer B - Industrials

Type of audit and related area affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to **Revenue**, for which the firm identified a fraud risk.

Description of the deficiencies identified

The issuer recognized certain revenue based on its estimated progress toward complete satisfaction of the performance obligations. The firm did not perform procedures to test this revenue beyond selecting a sample of revenue transactions and vouching them to contracts and invoices. (AS 2501.07) In addition, the firm did not perform any procedures to test a disclosure related to this revenue. (AS 2301.08)

Issuer C

Type of audit and related area affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to a **Significant Account**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

The issuer recorded a significant account based on an agreement with an external party. The firm did not perform sufficient procedures to evaluate whether the issuer appropriately accounted for this significant account in accordance with GAAP because it limited its procedures to concluding that the significant account was appropriately recorded based on certain GAAP guidance that specifically excluded the significant account. (AS 2301.08) In addition, the firm did not evaluate the effect of the issuer's non-compliance with a requirement of the agreement on the accounting for the significant account. (AS 2301.08)

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 one of three audits reviewed, the firm provided certain services to the issuer but did not document that the audit committee had approved the engagements before the issuer engaged the firm to provide the services. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1215, *Audit Documentation*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm added audit documentation subsequent to the 45-day period following the report release date and did not indicate the date the information was added, the name of the person who prepared the additional documentation, and the reason for adding it. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1215, *Audit Documentation*.
- In the three audits reviewed, the work papers did not contain sufficient information to enable an experienced auditor, having no previous connection with the engagement, to understand all of the procedures performed by the engagement quality reviewer, including the procedures that the engagement quality reviewer performed to evaluate the engagement team's responses to the significant risks identified. In these instances, the documentation of the engagement quality review was non-compliant with AS 1220, *Engagement Quality Review*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not make certain required communications to the audit committee related to (1) the timing of the audit and (2) the critical accounting policies and practices and critical accounting estimates. In addition, in this audit, the firm did not provide to, and discuss with, the audit committee a draft of the firm's audit report. In another audit reviewed, the firm did not make certain required communications to the audit committee related to (1) the reasons for changes in the significant risks initially identified through its risk assessment procedures and (2) the name, location, and planned responsibilities of other

persons not employed by the firm that performed audit procedures in the audit. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.

- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not provide a copy of the management representation letter to the audit committee. In addition, in another audit reviewed, the firm did not document that it provided 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 significant deficiencies and 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 make certain required communications to the audit committee related to its evaluation of the issuer's identification of, accounting for, and disclosure of its relationships and transactions with related parties. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2410, *Related Parties*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not take appropriate action with respect to the issuer's disclosure in its annual filing with the SEC that its internal control over financial reporting was effective despite the firm's awareness that the issuer's internal control over financial reporting was not effective. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2710, *Other Information in Documents Containing Audited Financial Statements*.
- 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 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 did not file its report on Form AP by the relevant deadline. In addition, in this audit, the firm's report on Form AP included inaccurate 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

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 an instance of potential non-compliance that we identified, 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 identified the following instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence:

Under Rule 2-01(c)(7) of Regulation S-X, an accountant is not independent if it is engaged to render audit or non-audit services to an issuer or its subsidiaries without that engagement having been pre-approved by the audit committee. In three audits reviewed, we identified one instance for one issuer in which the firm could provide no persuasive evidence of the necessary audit committee pre-approval.

Firm-Identified

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.

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.



J&S ASSOCIATE PLT
202206000037 (LLP0033395-LCA) & AF002380
(Registered with PCAOB and MIA)
B-11-14, Megan Avenue II
12, Jalan Yap Kwan Seng, 50450 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Tel: +603-4813 9469
Email: info@jns-associate.com
Website: jns-associate.com

February, 07, 2025
Ms. Christine Gunia

Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street NW Washington, DC 20006
United States of America

Dear Ms Gunia,

Re: Firm ID: 6743 -Response to the Draft Report on the 2024 Inspection of J&S Associate Plt

We are pleased to submit our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB") Draft Report on the 2024 inspection of J&S Associate Plt. We continue to support the PCAOB's goal of improving audit quality in order to protect investors and promote public trust through promoting informative, accurate, and independent audit reports.

We have evaluated each of matters described in the Draft Report, and have taken appropriate actions in accordance with PCAOB standards and rules, as well as our own policies. We are taking necessary steps to comply with PCAOB standards noted in the inspection report

Our firm is steadfast in its dedication to making audit quality our top priority. We appreciate the PCAOB's inspection process as it aids in enhancing our audit performance and improving our internal quality control systems. We eagerly anticipate our ongoing collaboration with the PCAOB in determining the most effective methods for achieving our shared objectives.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We remain committed to working with the PCAOB to ensure the highest standards of audit quality.

Yours sincerely
J&S ASSOCIATE PLT

.....
SUGANTHAMALA A/P NAVARATNAM
Managing Partner

