
2020 Inspection Ernst & Young LLP

(Headquartered in Toronto, Canada)

April 8, 2022

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. 104-2022-110

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| 2020 Inspection..... | 2 |
| Overview of the 2020 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year | 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 II: Observations Related to Quality Control | 9 |
| Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report..... | A-1 |

2020 INSPECTION

In the 2020 inspection of Ernst & Young LLP, 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 Canadian Public Accountability Board.

We selected for review four audits of issuers with fiscal years ending in 2019. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

2020 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 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 nor 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 2020 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2020 inspection as well as data from the previous 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

| | 2020 | 2018 |
|---|------|------|
| Firm data | | |
| Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures | 30 | 33 |
| Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor | 30 | 34 |
| Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹ | 40 | 38 |
| Audits reviewed | | |
| Total audits reviewed² | 4 | 4 |
| Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor | 3 | 3 |
| Audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor | 1 | 1 |
| Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR) | 4 | 4 |
| Audits with Part I.A deficiencies | 2 | 1 |

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) 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. The population of issuer audits from which audits are selected for review may differ from the issuer audits at the outset of the inspection procedures due to variations such as new issuer audit clients for which the firm has not yet issued an opinion or issuer audit clients lost prior to the outset of the inspection.

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 issue 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 2020 inspection and the previous 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.

| 2020 | | 2018 | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Audit area | Audits reviewed | Audit area | Audits reviewed |
| Revenue and related accounts | 4 | Revenue and related accounts | 3 |
| Long-lived assets | 3 | Long-lived assets | 1 |
| Goodwill and intangible assets | 1 | Goodwill and intangible assets | 1 |
| Cash and cash equivalents | 1 | Business combinations | 1 |
| | | 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, (1) at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion 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 deficiencies, if any, that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion(s) or fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(s) but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules.

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 sole 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 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) and industry sector. Each deficiency could relate to several auditing standards, but we reference the PCAOB standard(s) 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 – Industrials

Type of audit and related areas affected

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

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Revenue and Related Accounts** and **Goodwill**:

The firm selected for testing change management controls over an information technology (“IT”) application the issuer used to process and record revenue and related accounts (“revenue transactions”) and goodwill. The firm did not perform procedures to test the completeness of all types of changes in the population of changes from which it made its selections. (AS 1105.10)

The firm selected for testing automated and IT-dependent manual controls over revenue transactions and goodwill that used data and reports generated by the issuer’s IT application. The firm’s approach to

test the accuracy and completeness of the data and reports depended on effective information technology general controls (“ITGCs”), including those pertaining to change management. As a result of the deficiency in the firm’s testing of change management controls discussed above, the firm’s testing of the automated and IT-dependent manual controls over revenue transactions and goodwill was not sufficient. (AS 2201.46)

With respect to **Revenue and Related Accounts**:

The firm selected for testing certain automated controls over the processing and recording of revenue transactions. The firm’s testing of these automated controls using a sample of only one instance of the controls’ operation was not sufficient because the firm did not test the configuration or programming of these controls, or perform other procedures that would have provided sufficient appropriate audit evidence that these controls were designed and operating effectively. (AS 2201.42 and .44)

The firm identified deficiencies in the design and operating effectiveness of certain controls over revenue transactions. The firm concluded that these deficiencies represented a significant deficiency based on the firm’s testing of various compensating controls. The firm did not sufficiently evaluate the severity of the control deficiencies over the processing and recording of revenue transactions because it did not identify that the compensating controls were dependent on the effectiveness of the deficient controls. (AS 2201.68)

The sample size the firm used in certain of its substantive procedures to test revenue was 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) In addition, the firm did not perform substantive procedures to test, or (as a result of the deficiency related to the firm’s evaluation of the identified control deficiencies discussed above) sufficiently test controls over, the completeness of a system-generated report that the firm used in its substantive testing of revenue transactions. (AS 1105.10)

Audits with a Single Deficiency

Issuer B – Industrials

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 a deficiency in connection with the firm’s role in the financial statement audit related to **Revenue**.

Description of the deficiency identified

The firm’s approach for substantively testing revenue consisted primarily of performing a software-assisted analysis to test the relationships among revenue, accounts receivable, and cash receipts. The firm’s approach to addressing the reliability of the audit evidence obtained from this type of analysis was dependent upon the firm’s testing of certain data underlying the analysis. The firm did not sufficiently test this underlying data because it did not select its sample from the entire population of data that was used in this analysis. (AS 1105.10)

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

This section of our report discusses any deficiencies we identified that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion(s) or fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(s) but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules.

When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. As a result, the area below was 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.

We identified the following deficiency:

In one of three audits reviewed, the firm's report on Form AP omitted information related to the participation in the audit by an other accounting firm. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3211, *Auditor Reporting on Certain Audit Participants*.

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.



Ernst & Young LLP
EY Tower
100 Adelaide Street West, PO Box 1
Toronto, ON M5H 0B3

Tel: +1 416 864 1234
Fax: +1 416 864 1174
ey.com

Mr. George Botic
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

22 November 2021

Response to Part I of the Draft Report on the 2020 Inspection of Ernst & Young LLP

Dear Mr. Botic:

We are pleased to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (the "Board" or the "PCAOB") regarding Part I of the Draft Report on the 2020 Inspection of Ernst & Young LLP (the "Report").

We have thoroughly evaluated all matters described in Part I of the Report and have taken actions to address findings in accordance with AS 2901, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and AS 2905, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report*.

The PCAOB's inspection process assists us in identifying areas where we can continue to improve audit quality. We respect and benefit from this process as it aids us in fulfilling our responsibilities as auditors.

Our top priority continues to be serving the public interest by executing high-quality audits with integrity, independence and professional skepticism. To this end, our commitment to continuous improvement in audit quality never wavers.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our response to the Report and look forward to continuing to work with the PCAOB on matters of interest to our public company auditing practice.

Respectfully submitted,

Jad Shimaly
Chairman

Massimo Marinelli
Managing Partner, Canada - Assurance Services

A member firm of Ernst & Young Global Limited

