
2025 Inspection Forvis Mazars Certified Public Accountants

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

November 20, 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



TABLE OF CONTENTS

2025 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2025 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

2025 INSPECTION

In the 2025 inspection of Forvis Mazars Certified Public Accountants, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) assessed the firm's compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of issuers. Our inspection was conducted in cooperation with the China Securities Regulatory Commission and the Ministry of Finance of the People's Republic of China.

We selected for review 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.

2025 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 2025 INSPECTION

The following information provides an overview of our 2025 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

2025	
Firm data	
Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the lead/principal auditor	0
Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the lead/principal auditor	5
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	4
Audits reviewed	
Total audits reviewed²	3
Audits in which the firm was the lead/principal auditor	0
Audits in which the firm was not the lead/principal auditor	3
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	1
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 certain cases, the firm may have performed remedial actions after the

¹ The number of engagement partners on issuer audit work represents the total number of firm personnel (not necessarily limited to personnel with an ownership interest) who had primary responsibility for an issuer audit (as defined in AS 1201, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*) or for the firm's role in an issuer audit during the twelve-month period preceding the outset of the inspection.

² The population from which audits are selected for review includes both audits for which the firm was the lead/principal auditor and those where the firm was not the lead/principal auditor but played a role in the audit.

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.

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 2025 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.

2025	
Audit area	Audits reviewed
Revenue and related accounts	3
Cash and cash equivalents	3
Long-lived assets	2
Inventory	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, in audit(s) in which it was not the lead/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 fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(s). This section does not discuss instances of apparent non-compliance with rules related to maintaining independence.

Part I.C discusses instances of apparent non-compliance with rules 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 in audit(s) in which it was not the lead/principal auditor, to fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit.

We identify each issuer by a letter (e.g., Issuer A) and industry sector. Each deficiency could relate to several auditing standards, but we reference the PCAOB standard that most directly relates to the requirement with which the firm did not comply.

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

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

None

Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

Issuer A – Information Technology

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review 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 **Inventory** and **Allowance for Doubtful Accounts**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Inventory**:

The principal auditor instructed the firm to use, and evaluate the quality and effectiveness of, the work performed by a third party working under the direction of management as evidence regarding the operating effectiveness of a control related to the review of inventory costing for one of the issuer's components. The firm did not identify that the third party did not evaluate, and the firm did not perform procedures to evaluate, the review procedures that the control owners performed, including the procedures to identify items for follow up and the procedures to determine whether those items were appropriately resolved. (AS 2201.44; AS 2605.24 and .26)

The principal auditor instructed the firm to test the operating effectiveness of a control related to the review of the reserves for slow-moving and obsolete inventories for three of the issuer's components. The firm did not evaluate the review procedures that the control owners performed, including the procedures to identify items for follow up and the procedures to determine whether those items were appropriately resolved. (AS 2201.44)

The principal auditor instructed the firm to test the costing of inventory at one of the issuer's components by comparing inventory costs to vendor invoices, payroll records, labor hours, and machine hours. The firm did not perform these substantive procedures. (AS 2301.08)

With respect to **Allowance for Doubtful Accounts**:

The principal auditor instructed the firm to use, and evaluate the quality and effectiveness of, the work performed by a third party working under the direction of management as evidence regarding the operating effectiveness of a control related to the review of the allowance for doubtful accounts for one of the issuer's components. The firm did not identify that the third party did not test, and the firm did not perform procedures to test, the aspect of the control that addressed the reasonableness of the allowance for doubtful accounts. (AS 2201.44; AS 2605.24 and .26)

Issuer B – Information Technology

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review of an audit in which the firm played a role but was not the principal auditor, we identified deficiencies in connection with the firm's role in the financial statement audit related to **Long-Lived Assets** and **Cash and Cash Equivalents**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Long-Lived Assets**, for which the firm identified a significant risk:

The firm was instructed by the principal auditor to evaluate the reliability of certain external information used by the issuer in its qualitative assessment of impairment of a certain long-lived asset. The firm was unable to evaluate the reliability of this information. Instead, the firm compared the information used by the issuer to other information independently obtained by the firm that it believed was comparable

to information used by the issuer. The firm, however, did not perform any procedures to evaluate the reliability of the information it independently obtained. Further, the firm did not perform procedures to evaluate the relevance of this information, beyond one consideration. (AS 1105.04 and .06)

With respect to **Cash and Cash Equivalents**:

The firm received a positive confirmation response from a financial institution indicating that one of the cash amounts confirmed was a term deposit with an original maturity greater than three months. The firm did not perform any procedures to evaluate whether the issuer properly presented this amount as cash and cash equivalents in conformity with GAAP. (AS 2301.08)

Issuer C – Information Technology

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review of an audit in which the firm played a role but was not the principal auditor, we identified deficiencies in connection with the firm's role in the financial statement audit related to **Revenue**, **Accounts Receivable**, and **Cash and Cash Equivalents**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

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

The firm did not perform any procedures to test certain revenue. (AS 2301.08 and .13)

To test accounts receivable and certain other revenue, the firm sent positive confirmation requests to the issuer's customers. The firm did not perform procedures, beyond inquiry, to evaluate the nature of exceptions in one returned confirmation. (AS 2310.33)

With respect to **Cash and Cash Equivalents**:

The firm received positive confirmation responses from financial institutions indicating that certain of the cash amounts confirmed were term deposits with original maturities greater than three months. The firm did not perform any procedures to evaluate whether the issuer properly presented these amounts as cash and cash equivalents in conformity with GAAP. (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 fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(s). This section does not discuss instances of apparent non-compliance with 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 the three audits reviewed, the engagement partner did not review the work of engagement team members to evaluate whether (1) the work was performed and documented, (2) the objectives of the procedures were achieved, and (3) the results of the work support the conclusions reached. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1201, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*.
- In two of three audits reviewed, the work papers did not contain sufficient information to enable an experienced auditor, having no previous connection with the engagement, to determine who performed the work and the date such work was completed. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1215, *Audit Documentation*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not assemble a complete and final set of audit documentation for retention by the required documentation completion date. 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 two of three audits reviewed, the firm did not inquire of management, the internal audit function, and/or others within the company 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 three audits reviewed, the firm, when testing journal entries for evidence of possible material misstatement due to fraud, did not have an appropriate rationale for limiting its testing of entries it identified as having certain fraud risk characteristics to certain entries. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2401, *Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit*.

PART I.C: INDEPENDENCE

PCAOB Rule 3520, *Auditor Independence*, requires a firm and its personnel to be independent of the firm's audit clients. This requirement encompasses not only an obligation to satisfy the independence criteria set out in PCAOB rules and standards but also an obligation to satisfy all other independence criteria applicable to an engagement, including the independence criteria set out by the SEC in Regulation S-X, 17 C.F.R. § 210.2-01, *Qualifications of Accountants*.

In the 2025 inspection, we did not identify, and the firm did not bring to our attention, any instances of apparent non-compliance with PCAOB Rule 3520. Although this section does not include any instances of apparent non-compliance with PCAOB Rule 3520 that we identified or the firm brought to our attention, there may be instances of non-compliance with 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 apparent non-compliance with PCAOB Rule 3520, the number, large or small, of firm-identified instances of apparent 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 apparent 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.

上海富睿玛泽会计师事务所 (普通合伙)
中国上海市浦东新区银城中路68号
时代金融中心8楼
邮政编码: 200120
电话: +86 21 6168 1088
forvismazars.com/cn

Forvis Mazars Certified Public Accountants
8th Floor, One Lujiazui, 68 Middle Yin
Cheng Road, Pudong District, Shanghai
200120, China
Tel: + 86 21 6168 1088
forvismazars.com/cn



October 20, 2025

Via Electronic Mail

Mrs. Christine Gunia, Director
Division of Registrations and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006

Via Email: ResponsestoDraftReport@pcaobus.org

Re: Response to Part I of the Draft Report on the 2025 Inspection of Forvis Mazars Certified Public Accountants (Headquartered in Shanghai, People's Republic of China) (3305)

Dear Mrs. Gunia:

We are pleased to provide our response to Part I of Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's (the "PCAOB" or "Board") Draft Report on the 2025 Inspection of Forvis Mazars Certified Public Accountants (Headquartered in Shanghai, People's Republic of China) (3305) (the "Draft Report"). We recognize that the PCAOB's inspection process provides a valuable opportunity to further enhance the quality of our audits. We continue to support the PCAOB in its mission and are committed to furthering the public interest through the preparation of informative, accurate, and independent audit reports.

Bringing value to the capital markets by consistently performing quality audits remains our top priority, including addressing the matters raised in the Draft Report in a thorough and thoughtful way. We have evaluated the observations identified by the Board's inspection team described in *Part I Inspection Observations* of the Draft Report and understand our professional responsibilities in accordance with PCAOB standards and our Firm's policies and procedures, including all necessary steps to comply with AS 2901, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and where applicable, AS 2905, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report*.

We are committed to excellence in the execution of our audit engagements. We view the PCAOB's inspection process as critical in assessing our engagement performance and system of quality control. We take the comments received seriously, using the feedback to develop policies and procedures that will drive continuous improvement in our audit quality. We look forward to continuing to work collaboratively with the PCAOB to achieve our shared goals.

Respectfully submitted,

Ying HUA
Partner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ying HUA".

Forvis Mazars Certified Public Accountants
Shanghai, China

