

---

# 2024 Inspection

# UHY Haines Norton

(Headquartered in Sydney, Australia)

September 11, 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. 104-2025-142



## 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 .....	7
Part I.C: Independence.....	8
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control .....	10
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

## 2024 INSPECTION

In the 2024 inspection of UHY Haines Norton, 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 Australian Securities and Investments Commission.

We selected for review two audits of issuers, one with a fiscal year ending in 2023 and one with a fiscal year 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.

### 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. 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
<b>Firm data</b>	
<b>Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	2
<b>Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor</b>	0
<b>Total engagement partners on issuer audit work<sup>1</sup></b>	1
<b>Audits reviewed</b>	
<b>Total audits reviewed</b>	2
<b>Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	2
<b>Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)</b>	0
<b>Audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	2
<b>Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	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.

<sup>1</sup> 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
Goodwill and intangible assets	2
A significant account	1
Revenue and related accounts	1
Debt	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 – Health Care

#### Type of audit and related areas affected

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

#### Description of the deficiencies identified

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

The firm did not perform procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of the significant assumptions used to determine an estimate related to a significant account. (AS 2501.16)

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

The firm did not identify and select journal entries and other adjustments for testing to address the potential for material misstatement due to fraud. (AS 2401.58)

## Issuer B – Health Care

### Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to **Intangible Assets** and **Journal Entries**.

### Description of the deficiencies identified

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

The issuer performed an impairment assessment of certain intangible assets. The firm did not perform procedures, beyond obtaining and reading the issuer's sensitivity analysis, to evaluate the reasonableness of the significant assumptions the issuer used in the impairment assessment. (AS 2501.16)

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

The firm did not identify and select journal entries and other adjustments for testing to address the potential for material misstatement due to fraud. (AS 2401.58)

## 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 two 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 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 certain required communications to the audit committee related to (1) the significant risks identified through its risk assessment procedures; (2) the critical accounting policies and practices and critical accounting estimates; and (3) the results of the audit. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not include the country from which the auditor's report had been issued. 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 the two audits reviewed, the firm did not (1) inquire of the audit committee and/or certain members of management about the risks of material misstatement, including fraud risks and (2) make all required inquiries of certain members of management and/or the audit committee about the risks of material misstatement, including fraud risks. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2110, *Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement*.
- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not communicate all accumulated misstatements to management on a timely basis to provide management with an opportunity to correct them. In addition, the firm did not make a required communication to management related to an identified misstatement. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2810, *Evaluating Audit Results*.
- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm's report on Form AP omitted information related to the participation in the audit by an other accounting firm. In this instance, 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 instances 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:

- An audit client's agreement to indemnify its auditor with respect to certain liabilities is inconsistent with the general standard of independence set out in Rule 2-01(b) of Regulation S-X and impairs the accountant's independence with respect to an audit client. In two audits reviewed, we identified one instance for one issuer in which this circumstance appears to have occurred.
- Under Rule 2-01(c)(7), 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 two 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 of the audit engagement.

## 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.



27 June 2025

Ms Christine Gunia  
Director  
Division of Registration and Inspections  
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

**UHY Haines Norton  
Chartered Accountants**

Level 9, 1 York Street  
Sydney NSW 2000

GPO Box 4137  
Sydney NSW 2001

T + 61 2 9256 6600  
E [sydney@uhyhnsyd.com.au](mailto:sydney@uhyhnsyd.com.au)

[uhyhnsydney.com.au](http://uhyhnsydney.com.au)

Dear Ms Gunia,

**Response to the Draft Inspection Report on the 2024 Inspection of UHY Haines Norton  
(Headquartered in Sydney, Australia)**

We are pleased to provide our response to the draft inspection report ("the Report") dated 29 May 2025 from the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("the PCAOB") pertaining to the 2024 year inspection of UHY Haines Norton (Headquartered in Sydney, Australia).

We remain committed to the highest standards of audit quality and appreciate the assistance of the PCAOB in achieving this objective.

We respect the PCAOB's inspection process and understand that judgements are involved in both the audit and inspection process. We have evaluated all matters described in Part I, *Inspection Observations*, and have taken actions, where appropriate, in accordance with PCAOB standards and our quality control policies.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our following response to the Report and look forward to continuing to work with the PCAOB in pursuing our mutual objective of audit quality.

Yours sincerely,

**Michael Coughtrey**  
Managing Partner  
UHY Haines Norton

**Mark Nicholaeff**  
Audit & Assurance Partner  
UHY Haines Norton

**Audit | Tax | Advisory**

**The Firm:** UHY Haines Norton ABN 85 140 758 156 in Sydney ("the Firm") is an independent member of UHY Haines Norton ("the Association"), an association of independent firms in Australia and New Zealand. The Association is an independent member of Urbach Hacker Young International ("UHY International"), a UK company, and is part of the UHY International network of legally independent accounting and consulting firms. Any engagement you have with the Firm and any services are provided by the Firm and not by the Association or UHY International or any other member firm of the Association or UHY International.

"UHY" is the brand name under which members of UHY International provide their services; all rights to the UHY name and logo belong to UHY International, and the use of the UHY name and logo does not constitute any endorsement, representation or implied or express warranty by UHY International. UHY International has no liability whatsoever for services provided by the Firm nor the Association or any other members.

Liability limited by a scheme approved under Professional Standards Legislation.

