

---

# 2024 Inspection

**BDO AG**

**Wirtschaftsprüfungsgesellschaft**

(Headquartered in Hamburg, Germany)

March 26, 2026

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. 104-2026-040

# 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.....	8
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control .....	9
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

## 2024 INSPECTION

In the 2024 inspection of BDO AG Wirtschaftsprüfungsgesellschaft, 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 Auditor Oversight Body of Germany.

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, 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
<b>Firm data</b>	
<b>Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	3
<b>Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor</b>	6
<b>Total engagement partners on issuer audit work<sup>1</sup></b>	13
<b>Audits reviewed</b>	
<b>Total audits reviewed<sup>2</sup></b>	3
<b>Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	1
<b>Audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor</b>	2
<b>Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)</b>	3
<b>Audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	2
<b>Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	67%

<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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

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.

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
Inventory	2
Goodwill and intangible assets	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 area affected

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

### Description of the deficiencies identified

The issuer used multiple information-technology (IT) systems to initiate, process, and record certain revenue transactions within one type of revenue. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm selected for testing two automated controls over the transfer of data between certain of these IT systems. The firm did not test the configuration or operation of certain automated aspects of these controls or perform other procedures that would have provided sufficient appropriate audit evidence that the controls were designed and operated effectively. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm selected for testing another control that consisted of the issuer's review of data transferred between these systems for accuracy and completeness. The firm did not evaluate the procedures the control owners performed to determine whether the items identified for follow-up were appropriately resolved. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm selected for testing another control that consisted of the issuer's review and validation of certain other data used to recognize certain revenue transactions. The firm did not evaluate the specific review procedures that the control owners performed to evaluate the reasonableness of this data. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The sample sizes that the firm used in certain of its substantive procedures to test this revenue at certain locations were too small to provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence because these procedures were designed based on a level of control reliance that was not supported due to the deficiencies in the firm's control testing discussed above. (AS 2301.16, .18, and .37; AS 2315.19, .23, and .23A)

## Issuer B – Industrials

### 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 **Journal Entries**.

### Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Inventory**:

The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of management's review and approval of standard costs for certain inventory. The firm did not evaluate the specific review procedures that the control owner performed to assess the reasonableness of certain components of these standard costs. (AS 2201.42 and .44)

The sample sizes that the firm used in its substantive procedures to test the valuation of this inventory were too small to provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence because these procedures were designed based on a level of control reliance that was not supported due to the deficiency in the firm's control testing discussed above. (AS 2301.16, .18, and .37; AS 2315.19, .23, and .23A)

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

To identify and select journal entries for testing, the firm identified fraud characteristics and obtained a list of all journal entries with these characteristics. The firm did not perform sufficient procedures to test those journal entries because it examined the underlying support for only certain of the journal entries, without having an appropriate rationale for limiting its testing to those journal entries. (AS 2401.61)

## Audits with a Single Deficiency

None

## PART I.B: OTHER INSTANCES OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH PCAOB STANDARDS OR RULES

In the 2024 inspection, we did not identify any deficiencies related to other instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules.

## PART I.C: INDEPENDENCE

In the 2024 inspection, we did not identify, and the firm did not bring to our attention, any instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence. Although this section does not include any instances of potential non-compliance that we identified or the firm brought to our attention, there may be instances of non-compliance with SEC or PCAOB rules related to independence that were not identified through our procedures or the firm's monitoring activities.

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

## PART II: OBSERVATIONS RELATED TO QUALITY CONTROL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



Phone +49 69 95941-0  
Telefax +49 69 95941-111  
frankfurt@bdo.de  
www.bdo.de

Hanauer Landstr. 115  
60314 Frankfurt am Main

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

Contact  
Phone + 49 151 588 33 588  
Email jens.freiberg@bdo.de  
Date: Februray 20, 2026

**Re: Response to Part I of the Draft Report on the 2024 Inspection of  
BDO AG Wirtschaftsprüfungsgesellschaft**

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 BDO AG Wirtschaftsprüfungsgesellschaft. We recognize that the Board's inspection process plays an integral role in enhancing audit quality and support the PCAOB's mission of protecting investors and furthering the public interest in the preparation of informative, accurate and independent audit reports.

We have evaluated each of the matters described in Part I of the Draft Report and have taken appropriate actions under both PCAOB standards and our policies, including steps we considered necessary 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 remain committed in making audit quality our top priority. The PCAOB's inspection process assists us in improving our audit performance and our underlying quality control systems. We look forward to continuing to work with the PCAOB on the most effective means of achieving this objective.

Respectfully submitted,

BDO AG Wirtschaftsprüfungsgesellschaft



Dr. Jens Freiberg

Member of the Executive Board



Michael Strnad

Head of Audit & Assurance Quality Management

Vorsitzender des Aufsichtsrats: WP StB RA Dr. Holger Otte  
Vorstand: WP StB Andrea Bruckner und RA Parwáz Rafiqpoor (Vorsitzende)  
WP StB Roland Schulz • WP Dr. Jens Freiberg • RA StB Dr. Dirk Elbert  
Sitz der Gesellschaft: Hamburg Amtsgericht Hamburg HR B 1981

Berlin • Bielefeld • Bonn • Bremen • Chemnitz • Dortmund • Dresden • Düsseldorf • Erfurt • Essen • Flensburg • Frankfurt am Main • Freiburg  
Hamburg • Hannover • Kassel • Kiel • Köln • Leer • Leipzig • Lübeck • Mainz • München • Münster • Nürnberg • Oldenburg • Rostock • Stuttgart

BDO AG Wirtschaftsprüfungsgesellschaft, eine Aktiengesellschaft deutschen Rechts, ist Mitglied von BDO International Limited, einer britischen  
Gesellschaft mit beschränkter Nachschusspflicht, und gehört zum internationalen BDO Netzwerk voneinander unabhängiger Mitgliedsfirmen.  
BDO ist der Markenname für das BDO Netzwerk und für jede der BDO Mitgliedsfirmen.

