

Report on

2014 Inspection of Mazars LLP
(Headquartered in Singapore, Republic of Singapore)

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

April 2, 2015

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**

2014 INSPECTION OF MAZARS LLP

Preface

In 2014, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Mazars LLP ("the Firm") pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").¹

Inspections are designed and performed to provide a basis for assessing the degree of compliance by a firm with applicable requirements related to issuer audit work. For a description of the procedures the Board's inspectors may perform to fulfill this responsibility, see Part I.C of this report (which also contains additional information concerning PCAOB inspections generally). Overall, the inspection process included reviews of portions of one issuer audit performed by the Firm and the Firm's audit work on one other issuer audit engagement in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor. These reviews were intended to identify whether deficiencies existed in those portions of the inspected audit work, and whether such deficiencies indicated defects or potential defects in the Firm's system of quality control over audit work. In addition, the inspection included a review of policies and procedures related to certain quality control processes of the Firm that could be expected to affect audit quality.

The Board is issuing this report in accordance with the requirements of the Act. The Board is releasing to the public Part I of the report and portions of Part IV of the report. Part IV of the report consists of the Firm's comments, if any, on a draft of the report. If the nonpublic portions of the report discuss criticisms of or potential defects in the firm's system of quality control, those discussions also could eventually be made public, but only to the extent the firm fails to address the criticisms to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the issuance of the report.

¹ The Board's inspection was conducted in cooperation with the Accounting and Corporate Regulatory Authority.

PROFILE OF THE FIRM²

Number of offices	1 (Singapore, Republic of Singapore)
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Number of partners	7
Number of professional staff ³	105
Number of issuer audit clients	1
Number of other issuer audits in which the Firm plays a role ⁴	1

² The information presented here is as understood by the inspection team, generally as of the outset of the inspection, based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information. Additional information, including additional detail on audit reports issued by the Firm, is available in the Firm's filings with the Board, available at http://pcaobus.org/Registration/rasr/Pages/RASR_Search.aspx.

³ The number of partners and professional staff is provided here as an indication of the size of the Firm, and does not necessarily represent the number of the Firm's professionals who participate in audits of issuers.

⁴ The number of other issuer audits encompasses audit work performed by the Firm in engagements for which the Firm was not the principal auditor, including audits, if any, in which the Firm plays a substantial role as defined in PCAOB Rule 1001(p)(ii).

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from July 14, 2014 to July 18, 2014.⁵

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included reviews of portions of one issuer audit performed by the Firm and the Firm's audit work on one other issuer audit engagement in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor. The inspection team identified matters that it considered to be a deficiency in the performance of the work it reviewed.

The description of the deficiency in Part I.A of this report includes, at the end of the description of the deficiency, references to specific paragraphs of the auditing standards that relate to that deficiency. The text of those paragraphs is set forth in Appendix A to this report. The references in this sub-Part include only standards that primarily relate to the deficiency; they do not present a comprehensive list of every auditing standard that applies to the deficiency. Further, certain broadly applicable aspects of the auditing standards that may be relevant to a deficiency, such as provisions requiring due professional care, including the exercise of professional skepticism; the accumulation of sufficient appropriate audit evidence; and the performance of procedures that address risks, are not included in any references to the auditing standards in this sub-Part, unless the lack of compliance with these standards is the primary reason for the deficiency. These broadly applicable provisions are described in Part I.B of this report.

One of the deficiencies identified was of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm, at the time it issued its audit report, had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion that the financial statements

⁵ For this purpose, "primary procedures" include field work, other review of audit work papers, and the evaluation of the Firm's quality control policies and procedures through review of documentation and interviews of Firm personnel. Primary procedures do not include (1) inspection planning, which is performed prior to primary procedures, and (2) inspection follow-up procedures, wrap-up, analysis of results, and the preparation of the inspection report, which extend beyond the primary procedures.

were presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. In other words, in this audit, the auditor issued an opinion without satisfying its fundamental obligation to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements were free of material misstatement.

The fact that the deficiency reaches this level of significance does not necessarily indicate that the relevant issuer financial statements are misstated. It is often not possible for the inspection team, based only on the information available from the auditor, to reach a conclusion on those points.

Whether or not associated with a disclosed financial reporting misstatement, an auditor's failure to obtain the reasonable assurance that the auditor is required to obtain is a serious matter. It is a failure to accomplish the essential purpose of the audit, and it means that, based on the audit work performed, the audit opinion should not have been issued.⁶

The audit deficiency that reached this level of significance is described below—

Issuer A

the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test revenue (AS No. 13 paragraphs 8 and 13 and AS No. 14, paragraph 30).

B. Auditing Standards

The deficiency described above could relate to several applicable provisions of the standards that govern the conduct of audit work, including both the paragraphs of the standards that are cited at the end of the description of the deficiency included in Part I.A of this report and one or more of the specific paragraphs discussed below.

⁶ Inclusion in an inspection report does not mean that the deficiency remained unaddressed after the inspection team brought it to the Firm's attention. Depending upon the circumstances, compliance with PCAOB standards may require the Firm to perform additional audit procedures, or to inform a client of the need for changes to its financial statements or reporting on internal control, or to take steps to prevent reliance on its previously expressed audit opinions. The Board expects that firms will take appropriate action, and the inspections staff may include in its procedures monitoring or assessing a firm's actions taken.

Many audit deficiencies involve a lack of due professional care. AU 230, *Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work* ("AU 230"), paragraphs .02, .05, and .06, requires the independent auditor to plan and perform his or her work with due professional care and sets forth aspects of that requirement. AU 230, paragraphs .07 through .09, and Auditing Standard ("AS") No. 13, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement* ("AS No. 13"), paragraph 7, specify that due professional care requires the exercise of professional skepticism. These standards state that professional skepticism is an attitude that includes a questioning mind and a critical assessment of the appropriateness and sufficiency of audit evidence.

AS No. 13, paragraphs 3, 5, and 8, requires the auditor to design and implement audit responses that address the risks of material misstatement, and AS No. 15, *Audit Evidence* ("AS No. 15"), paragraph 4, requires the auditor to plan and perform audit procedures to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to provide a reasonable basis for the audit opinion. Sufficiency is the measure of the quantity of audit evidence, and the quantity needed is affected by the risk of material misstatement (in the audit of financial statements) and the quality of the audit evidence obtained. The appropriateness of evidence is measured by its quality; to be appropriate, evidence must be both relevant and reliable in support of the related conclusions.

The table below lists the specific auditing standards that are referenced for the deficiency included in Part I.A of this report. See the description of the deficiency in Part I.A for identification of the specific paragraphs, in addition to those noted above, that relate to that deficiency. Standards discussed above are cited again in the table only if the particular deficiency relates to aspects of the standard that are not discussed above.

PCAOB Auditing Standards	Issuer
AS No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	A
AS No. 14, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i>	A

C. Information Concerning PCAOB Inspections Generally Applicable to Triennially Inspected Firms

Board inspections include reviews of certain portions of selected audit work performed by the inspected firm and reviews of certain aspects of the firm's quality control system. The inspections are designed to identify deficiencies in audit work and defects or potential defects in the firm's system of quality control related to the firm's audit work. The focus on deficiencies, defects, and potential defects necessarily carries through to reports on inspections and, accordingly, Board inspection reports are not intended to serve as balanced report cards or overall rating tools. Further, the inclusion in an inspection report of certain deficiencies, defects, and potential defects should not be construed as an indication that the Board has made any determination about other aspects of the inspected firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct not included within the report.

C.1. Reviews of Audit Work

Inspections include reviews of portions of selected audits of financial statements and, where applicable, audits of internal control over financial reporting ("ICFR") and the firm's audit work on other issuer audit engagements in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor. For these audit engagements, the inspection team selects certain portions of the engagements for inspection, and it reviews the engagement team's work papers and interviews engagement personnel regarding those portions. If the inspection team identifies a potential issue that it is unable to resolve through discussion with the firm and any review of additional work papers or other documentation, the inspection team ordinarily provides the firm with a written comment form on the matter and the firm is allowed the opportunity to provide a written response to the comment form. If the response does not resolve the inspection team's concerns, the matter is considered a deficiency and is evaluated for inclusion in the inspection report.

The inspection team selects the audit engagements, and the specific portions of those audit engagements, that it will review, and the inspected firm is not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the selections. Audit deficiencies that the inspection team may identify include a firm's failure to identify, or to address appropriately, financial

statement misstatements, including failures to comply with disclosure requirements,⁷ as well as a firm's failures to perform, or to perform sufficiently, certain necessary audit procedures. The inspection may not involve the review of all of a firm's audit work, nor is it designed to identify every deficiency in the reviewed audit engagements. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that a firm's audit work, or the relevant issuers' financial statements or reporting on ICFR, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

In some cases, the conclusion that a firm did not perform a procedure may be based on the absence of documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence, even if the firm claimed to have performed the procedure. AS No. 3, *Audit Documentation*, provides that, in various circumstances including PCAOB inspections, a firm that has not adequately documented that it performed a procedure, obtained evidence, or reached an appropriate conclusion, must demonstrate with persuasive other evidence that it did so, and that oral assertions and explanations alone do not constitute persuasive other evidence. In reaching its conclusions, the inspection team considers whether audit documentation or any persuasive other evidence that a firm might provide to the inspection team supports a firm's contention that it performed a procedure, obtained evidence, or reached an appropriate conclusion. In the case of every matter cited in the public portion of a final inspection report, the inspection team has carefully considered any contention by the firm that it did so but just did not document its work, and the inspection team has concluded that the available evidence does not support the contention that the firm sufficiently performed the necessary work.

⁷ When it comes to the Board's attention that an issuer's financial statements appear not to present fairly, in a material respect, the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with applicable accounting principles, the Board's practice is to report that information to the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "the Commission"), which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements. Any description in this report of financial statement misstatements or failures to comply with SEC disclosure requirements should not be understood as an indication that the SEC has considered or made any determination regarding these issues unless otherwise expressly stated.

Identified deficiencies in the audit work that exceed a significance threshold (which is described in Part I.A of the inspection report) are summarized in the public portion of the inspection report.⁸

The Board cautions against extrapolating from the results presented in the public portion of a report to broader conclusions about the frequency of deficiencies throughout the firm's practice. Individual audit engagements and areas of inspection focus are most often selected on a risk-weighted basis and not randomly. Areas of focus vary among selected audit engagements, but often involve audit work on the most difficult or inherently uncertain areas of financial statements. Thus, the audit work is generally selected for inspection based on factors that, in the inspection team's view, heighten the possibility that auditing deficiencies are present, rather than through a process intended to identify a representative sample.

C.2. Review of a Firm's Quality Control System

QC 20, *System of Quality Control for a CPA Firm's Accounting and Auditing Practice*, provides that an auditing firm has a responsibility to ensure that its personnel comply with the applicable professional standards. This standard specifies that a firm's system of quality control should encompass the following elements: (1) independence, integrity, and objectivity; (2) personnel management; (3) acceptance and continuance of issuer audit engagements; (4) engagement performance; and (5) monitoring.

The inspection team's assessment of a firm's quality control system is derived both from the results of its procedures specifically focused on the firm's quality control policies and procedures, and also from inferences that can be drawn from deficiencies in the performance of individual audit engagements. Audit deficiencies, whether alone or when aggregated, may indicate areas where a firm's system has failed to provide reasonable assurance of quality in the performance of audit work. Even deficiencies that do not result in an insufficiently supported audit opinion or a failure to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to fulfill the objectives of its role in an audit may

⁸ The discussion in this report of any deficiency observed in a particular audit engagement reflects information reported to the Board by the inspection team and does not reflect any determination by the Board as to whether the Firm has engaged in any conduct for which it could be sanctioned through the Board's disciplinary process. In addition, any references in this report to violations or potential violations of law, rules, or professional standards are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings for purposes of imposing legal liability.

indicate a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system.⁹ If identified deficiencies, when accumulated and evaluated, indicate defects or potential defects in the firm's system of quality control, the nonpublic portion of this report would include a discussion of those issues. When evaluating whether identified deficiencies in individual audit engagements indicate a defect or potential defect in a firm's system of quality control, the inspection team considers the nature, significance, and frequency of deficiencies;¹⁰ related firm methodology, guidance, and practices; and possible root causes.

Inspections also include a review of certain of the firm's practices, policies, and processes related to audit quality, which constitute a part of the firm's quality control system. This review addresses practices, policies, and procedures concerning audit performance, training, compliance with independence standards, client acceptance and retention, and the establishment of policies and procedures.

END OF PART I

⁹ Not every audit deficiency suggests a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system.

¹⁰ An evaluation of the frequency of a type of deficiency may include consideration of how often the inspection team reviewed audit work that presented the opportunity for similar deficiencies to occur. In some cases, even a type of deficiency that is observed infrequently in a particular inspection may, because of some combination of its nature, its significance, and the frequency with which it has been observed in previous inspections of the firm, be cause for concern about a quality control defect or potential defect.

PARTS II AND III OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC
AND ARE OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO 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, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.¹¹

¹¹ 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 at all. 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.



15 January 2015

Ms. Helen A. Munter, Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20006
U. S. A.

Dear Ms. Munter,

Re: Response to Part I of the Draft Report on the 2014 Inspection of Mazars LLP

We are pleased to submit our response to your draft report dated December 19, 2014 ("Draft Report"), relating to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's (hereinafter "PCAOB" or the "Board") July 2014 inspection of our Firm and request that this letter be made part of the final Report.

We believe and appreciate that the PCAOB's comments and observations enhance the ability of our Firm to meet our shared goals of achieving the highest level of audit quality. While we may have differing views on specific audit engagement matters such as materiality and audit approach, as would be expected based on the judgmental nature of such matters, consideration of different views is a useful means to promote best practices.

It remains as our top priority to continuously improve audit quality through improving our audit methodology, engagement execution and holding training sessions on topic related to matters raised during the inspections.

Our comments below respond to the Inspection team's observations during the inspection included in Part I – *Inspection Procedures and Certain Observations* of the Draft Report relating to the sufficiency of our audit procedures to test revenue.

In accordance with AS No. 12 *Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement* paragraph 4, we carried out procedures which we assessed as sufficient to provide us a reasonable basis for identifying and assessing the risks of material misstatement, whether due to error or fraud, and designing further audit procedures over revenue. The procedures included, but were not limited to, inquiry and discussions with key management personnel, those charged with governance, component auditors and major customer on significant matters related to revenue; the assessment of the control environment, as well as the design and implementation of the relevant key controls over the revenue process; and regular reviews of the financials, including the gross margin analysis.

Based on our findings and leveraging on our past audit experience with the Issuer, we assessed the risks of material misstatement, considering two main factors being the likelihood and magnitude of any risks of material misstatement, in revenue on the consolidated and individual component's level.

1

133 CECIL STREET, #15-02 KECK SENG TOWER, SINGAPORE 069535
TEL: (65) 6224 4022 - FAX: (65) 6225 3974 - WWW.MAZARS.SG

MAZARS LLP
玛泽有限责任会计师事务所
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS OF SINGAPORE

MAZARS LLP IS THE SINGAPORE FIRM OF MAZARS, AN INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY AND ACCOUNTANCY GROUP THAT OPERATES AS A SINGLE INTEGRATED PARTNERSHIP.

MAZARS LLP IS A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP REGISTERED IN SINGAPORE WITH REGISTERED NUMBER T07L0916H AND ITS REGISTERED OFFICE AS ABOVE.





We designed and performed audit procedures, being test of controls and substantive procedures, which we assessed to be sufficient to address our assessed risks of material misstatement in revenue. Our audit strategy included an element of unpredictability by us designing and performing specific audit procedures on revenue of components whose revenue contributions to the Group were not assessed to be significant. Hence, we do not agree we failed to perform sufficient procedures to test revenue and we have complied with AS No. 13 *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement* paragraphs 8 and 13.

Our report was issued subsequent to our evaluation of the findings from our execution of the planned auditing procedures to address our assessed risks of material misstatements in revenue with reference to AS No. 14 *Evaluating Audit Results* paragraph 30.

We take a serious view of the Inspection observations and have conducted a retrospective review of our work. We however conclude that we have performed sufficient audit procedures at the time of our audit in the circumstances then existing.

We appreciate this opportunity to provide our response to the PCAOB and reiterate our dedication to join with PCAOB in fulfilling the mission of protecting the interest of investors and furthering public interest.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mazars LLP', with the company name printed below it in a small, sans-serif font.

APPENDIX A

AUDITING STANDARDS REFERENCED IN PART I

This Appendix provides the text of the auditing standard paragraphs that are referenced in Part I.A of this report. Footnotes that are included in this Appendix, and any other Notes, are from the original auditing standards that are referenced. While this Appendix contains the specific portions of the relevant standards cited with respect to the deficiency in Part I.A of this report, other portions of the standards (including those described in Part I.B of this report) may provide additional context, descriptions, related requirements, or explanations; the complete standards are available on the PCAOB's website at <http://pcaobus.org/STANDARDS/Pages/default.aspx>.

AS No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>		
RESPONSES INVOLVING THE NATURE, TIMING, AND EXTENT OF AUDIT PROCEDURES		
AS No. 13.8	The auditor should design and perform audit procedures in a manner that addresses the assessed risks of material misstatement for each relevant assertion of each significant account and disclosure.	Issuer A
Responses to Fraud Risks		
AS No. 13.13	<i>Addressing Fraud Risks in the Audit of Financial Statements.</i> In the audit of financial statements, the auditor should perform substantive procedures, including tests of details, that are specifically responsive to the assessed fraud risks. If the auditor selects certain controls intended to address the assessed fraud risks for testing in accordance with paragraphs 16-17 of this standard, the auditor should perform tests of those controls.	Issuer A
AS No. 14, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i>		
Evaluating the Presentation of the Financial Statements, Including the Disclosures		
AS No. 14.30	The auditor must evaluate whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework. Note: AU sec. 411, <i>The Meaning of Present Fairly in Conformity With Generally Accepted Accounting</i>	Issuer A

	<i>Principles</i>, establishes requirements for evaluating the presentation of the financial statements. Auditing Standard No. 6, <i>Evaluating Consistency of Financial Statements</i>, establishes requirements regarding evaluating the consistency of the accounting principles used in financial statements. Note: The auditor should look to the requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the company under audit with respect to the accounting principles applicable to that company.	
--	---	--