
2024 Inspection KPMG AG

(Headquartered in Zurich, Switzerland)

September 25, 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. 104-2025-148



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	9
Part I.C: Independence.....	11
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control	13
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

2024 INSPECTION

In the 2024 inspection of KPMG AG, 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 Swiss Federal Audit Oversight Authority.

We selected for review three audits of issuers with fiscal years 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. 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	4
Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	11
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	12
Audits reviewed	
Total audits reviewed²	3
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	2
Audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor	1
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	3
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

¹ The number of engagement partners on issuer audit work represents the total number of persons who provide professional services on behalf of the firm 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.

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 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
Revenue and related accounts	3
Goodwill and intangible assets	3
Long-lived assets	1
Certain liability	1
Use of other auditors	1

PART I: INSPECTION OBSERVATIONS

Part I.A of our report discusses deficiencies, if any, that were of such significance that we believe the firm, (1) at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion(s) on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR or (2) in audit(s) in which it was not the principal auditor, had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit.

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

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

Consistent with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act ("Act"), it is the Board's assessment that nothing in Part I of this report deals with a criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm's quality control system. We discuss any such criticisms or potential defects in Part II. Further, you should not infer from any Part I deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, that we identified a quality control finding in Part II. Section 104(g)(2) of the Act restricts us from publicly disclosing Part II deficiencies unless the firm does not address the criticisms or potential defects to the Board's satisfaction no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

Classification of Audits with Part I.A Deficiencies

Within Part I.A of this report, we classify each issuer audit in one of the categories discussed below based on the Part I.A deficiency or deficiencies identified in our review.

The purpose of this classification system is to group and present issuer audits by the number of Part I.A deficiencies we identified within the audit as well as to highlight audits with an incorrect opinion on the financial statements and/or ICFR.

Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

This classification includes 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). Each deficiency could relate to several auditing standards, but we reference the PCAOB standard that most directly relates to the requirement with which the firm did not comply.

We present issuer audits below within their respective deficiency classifications (as discussed previously). Within the classifications, we generally present the audits based on our assessment as to the relative significance of the identified deficiencies, taking into account the significance of the financial statement accounts and/or disclosures affected, and/or the nature or extent of the deficiencies.

Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

None

Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

Issuer A

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement and ICFR audits related to **Revenue**, a **Certain Liability**, and **Intangible Assets**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Revenue**:

The issuer entered into sales contracts with third-party customers, which outlined the specific terms and conditions with the customers. For certain revenue transactions, sales orders were generated (and revenue was recognized) based on the quantities of goods sold to the customers that were manually entered into the issuer's accounting system. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm selected for testing a control over the recognition of this revenue that consisted of the issuer's review of new and amended sales contracts. The firm identified a deficiency in the design effectiveness of the control during its interim testing. To test the remediation of this control deficiency, the firm selected and tested a sample of new and amended sales contracts once the issuer remediated the deficiency. The firm did not perform procedures to test, or test any controls over, the completeness of the population of new and amended sales contracts from which it made its selections for testing. (AS 1105.10) In addition, the firm did not perform sufficient procedures to test the effectiveness of the issuer's remediation of the control deficiency because approximately 44 percent of the new and amended sales contracts selected to test the remediation were entered into or amended prior to the issuer's remediation of the deficiency. (AS 2201.44)
- The firm identified a process risk point over the recognition of this revenue that did not have an associated control and concluded that a design effectiveness deficiency existed. The firm identified and tested compensating controls that it believed would mitigate the deficiency. The firm did not identify that these compensating controls did not address the risk of material misstatement related to the entry of incorrect quantities of goods sold into the issuer's accounting system. (AS 2201.68)

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

The firm used an auditor-employed specialist to assist it with evaluating the reasonableness of a significant assumption used by the issuer to estimate the fair value of a certain liability. To evaluate the reasonableness of the assumption, the auditor-employed specialist developed an expectation of the assumption using certain external data. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of the issuer's review of the assumption. The firm did not evaluate the criteria the control owners used to identify matters for follow-up when assessing the reasonableness of the assumption. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm did not sufficiently evaluate the work of the auditor-employed specialist, as it did not identify that the auditor-employed specialist's work did not provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence regarding the significant assumption, as described below, and perform additional procedures or request the auditor-employed specialist to perform additional procedures, as necessary, to address the deficiency. (AS 1201.C6 and .C7)

- The auditor-employed specialist did not perform sufficient procedures to evaluate the relevance of the external data when developing the expectation of the significant assumption. (AS 1105.04 and .06)

With respect to **Intangible Assets**:

The firm did not identify and evaluate a departure from the applicable financial reporting framework related to the issuer's omission of certain disclosures related to intangible assets required by the framework. (AS 2810.30 and .31)

Issuer B

Type of audit and related areas affected

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

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Goodwill**:

The issuer evaluated certain goodwill for impairment using a discounted cash flow model, which was developed using various assumptions. The firm's approach for substantively testing this goodwill for impairment was to test the issuer's process. The firm did not perform procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of certain significant assumptions used by the issuer to evaluate this goodwill for impairment beyond, for certain assumptions, comparing the assumptions to the most recent approved budget and prior year impairment tests, performing a sensitivity analysis, and inquiring of management and, for certain other assumptions, comparing the assumptions to the most recent approved budget and prior year impairment tests. (AS 2501.16)

With respect to **Intangible Assets**:

The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm's substantive procedures to test certain inputs used by the issuer to record intangible assets included the performance of analytical procedures. For certain of these inputs, the firm did not (1) determine, for one of these inputs, whether the expectation used in the analytical procedures was based on predictable relationships and (2) perform procedures to evaluate significant differences between the expected input and actual input used by the issuer, beyond inquiry of management. (AS 2305.13, .14, and .21)
- The firm did not identify and evaluate a departure from the applicable financial reporting framework related to the issuer's omission of certain disclosures related to intangible assets required by the framework. (AS 2810.30 and .31)

Issuer C

Type of audit and related area 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 financial statement and ICFR audits related to **Long-Lived Assets**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

The principal auditor identified certain long-lived assets as a significant account and the existence and valuation of those assets as relevant assertions. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm did not identify and test any controls over the existence and valuation of these long-lived assets. (AS 2201.39)
- The firm did not perform any substantive procedures to test the existence and valuation of these long-lived assets. (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) or fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(s). This section does not discuss instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence.

When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. As a result, the areas below were not necessarily reviewed on every audit. In some cases, we assess the firm's compliance with specific PCAOB standards or rules on other audits that were not reviewed and include any instances of non-compliance below.

The deficiencies below are presented in numerical order based on the PCAOB standard or rule with which the firm did not comply. We identified the following deficiencies:

- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not make (or timely make) certain required communications to the audit committee related to the name, location, and planned responsibilities of other accounting firms or other persons not employed by the 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 two audits reviewed, the firm did not perform procedures to determine whether all individuals who participated in the audit were in compliance with independence requirements. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2101, *Audit Planning*.

PART I.C: INDEPENDENCE

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

PCAOB-Identified

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

Firm-Identified

During the inspection, the firm brought to our attention that it had identified, through its independence monitoring activities, two instances for one issuer,³ in which the firm appeared to have impaired its independence because it may not have complied with Rule 2-01(c) of Regulation S-X related to maintaining independence. Both of these instances of potential non-compliance involved associated firms.

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

The instances of potential non-compliance related to non-audit services and audit committee pre-approval:

- The firm reported one instance of potential non-compliance with Rule 2-01(c)(4) of Regulation S-X regarding non-audit services. This instance related to services provided by an associated firm that the firm determined to be prohibited, such as performing management functions for the issuer.
- The firm reported one instance of potential non-compliance with Rule 2-01(c)(7) of Regulation S-X regarding audit committee pre-approval. This instance related to non-audit services provided by an associated firm without the engagement having been pre-approved by the audit committee.

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

The firm has reported to us that it has evaluated these instances of potential non-compliance and determined in both instances that its objectivity and impartiality were not impaired. The firm also reported to us that it communicated these instances to the issuer's audit committee as required by PCAOB Rule 3526.

PART II: OBSERVATIONS RELATED TO QUALITY CONTROL

Part II of our report discusses criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control.

We include deficiencies in Part II if an analysis of the inspection results, including the results of the reviews of individual audits, indicates that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that firm personnel will comply with applicable professional standards and requirements. Generally, the report's description of quality control criticisms is based on observations from our inspection procedures.

This report does not reflect changes or improvements to the firm's system of quality control that the firm may have made subsequent to the period covered by our inspection. The Board does consider such changes or improvements in assessing whether the firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

When we issue our reports, we do not make public criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control, to the extent any are identified. If a firm does not address to the Board's satisfaction any criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm's system of quality control within 12 months after the issuance of our report, we will make public any such deficiency.

APPENDIX A: FIRM'S RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the firm's response, excluding any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.

The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.

In addition, pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm's response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.



KPMG AG
Badenerstrasse 172
PO Box
CH-8036 Zurich

+41 58 249 31 31
kpmg.ch

July 30, 2025

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

Response to Part I of Public Company Accounting Oversight Board Draft Report on the 2024 Inspection of KPMG AG

Dear Ms. Gunia,

We are pleased to provide our response to Part I of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB") Draft Report on the 2024 Inspection of KPMG AG dated July 8, 2025 ("Draft Report").

Consistently executing high-quality audits is our top priority. We take findings from the PCAOB inspection process seriously and believe the inspection process serves to assist us in identifying areas where we can continue to improve our performance and strengthen our system of audit quality control. We remain committed to full cooperation with the PCAOB, appreciate the professionalism and commitment of the PCAOB staff and value the important role the PCAOB plays in improving audit quality.

We conducted a thorough evaluation of the matters identified in Part I of the Draft Report and have taken appropriate actions to address the engagement-specific findings in a manner consistent with PCAOB auditing standards, SEC or PCAOB Rules, and KPMG policies and procedures.

We remain dedicated to evaluating and improving our system of quality control, including monitoring audit quality and implementing changes to our policies and practices in order to enhance audit quality. We understand our responsibility for our policies and practices in order to enhance audit quality. We understand our responsibility to investors and other participants in the capital markets and are committed to continuing to work constructively with the PCAOB to improve audit quality and build confidence in the auditing profession.

Yours sincerely,

KPMG AG

Stefan Pfister
CEO

Lukas Marty
Head of Audit

© 2025 KPMG AG, a Swiss corporation, is a group company of KPMG Holding LLP, which is a member of the KPMG global organization of independent firms affiliated with KPMG International Limited, a private English company limited by guarantee. All rights reserved.



