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Preface

In 2016, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Zachary Salum Auditors PA ("the Firm") pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

Inspections are designed and performed to provide a basis for assessing the degree of compliance by a firm with applicable requirements related to auditing issuers. 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). The inspection included a review of portions of an issuer audit. This review was intended to identify whether deficiencies existed in the reviewed audit work, and whether such deficiencies indicated defects or potential defects in the Firm's system of quality control over audits. 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. Appendix A presents the text of the paragraphs of the auditing standards that are referenced in Part I.A. in relation to the description of auditing deficiencies there.

### PROFILE OF THE FIRM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>1 (Miami, Florida)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership structure</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners / professional staff</td>
<td>1 / None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuer audit clients</td>
<td>None at the outset of the inspection; however, the Firm had issued at least one audit report with respect to an issuer since the Firm's registration with the PCAOB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead partners on issuer audit work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. 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/strasr/Pages/RASR_Search.aspx](http://pcaobus.org/Registration/strasr/Pages/RASR_Search.aspx).

2. 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. The number of partners cited above represents the number of individuals with an ownership interest in the Firm.

3. The number of lead 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*) since the Firm's registration with the PCAOB.
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 25, 2016 to July 29, 2016.4

A. Review of Audit Engagement

The inspection procedures included review of portions of one issuer audit performed by the Firm. The inspection team identified matters that it considered to be deficiencies in the performance of the work it reviewed.

The descriptions of the deficiencies in Part I.A of this report include, at the end of the description of each deficiency, references to specific paragraphs of the auditing standards that relate to those deficiencies. 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 deficiencies; they do not present a comprehensive list of every auditing standard that applies to the deficiencies. 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.

Certain deficiencies identified were 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 were presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable

---

4 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.
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 one or more deficiencies in an audit reach this level of significance does not necessarily indicate that the financial statements are materially 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.5

The audit deficiencies that reached this level of significance are described below–

A.1. Issuer A

(1) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test revenue and deferred revenue, including the use of sampling with an inadequate sample size developed without consideration of relevant factors (AS 2301, paragraphs .08 and .13; AS 2315, paragraphs .19, .23, .23A, and .25); AS 2810, paragraph .30; and

5 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 comply with these standards, and an inspection may include a review of the adequacy of a firm's compliance with these requirements, either with respect to previously identified deficiencies or deficiencies identified during that inspection. Failure by a firm to take appropriate actions, or a firm's misrepresentations in responding to an inspection report, about whether it has taken such actions, could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions.
(2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to evaluate the accounting for debt and equity transactions (AS 2301, paragraph .08; AS 2810, paragraphs .30 and .31).

B. Auditing Standards

Each deficiency described above could relate to several applicable provisions of the standards that govern the conduct of audits. The paragraphs of the standards that are cited for each deficiency are those that most directly relate to the deficiency. The deficiencies also relate, however, to other paragraphs of those standards and to other auditing standards, including those concerning due professional care, responses to risk assessments, and audit evidence.

Many audit deficiencies involve a lack of due professional care. AS 1015, Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work, 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. AS 1015, paragraphs .07 through .09, and AS 2301, The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement, paragraph .07, 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 2301, paragraphs .03, .05, and .08, requires the auditor to design and implement audit responses that address the risks of material misstatement, and AS 1105, Audit Evidence, paragraph .04, 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 providing support for the related conclusions.

The paragraphs of the standards that are described immediately above are not cited in Part I.A, unless those paragraphs are the most directly related to the relevant deficiency.
B.1. List of Specific Auditing Standards Referenced in Part I.A.

The table below lists the specific auditing standards that are referenced in Part I.A of this report, cross-referenced to the issuer audit for which each standard is cited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCAOB Auditing Standards</th>
<th>Issuer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 2301, <em>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2315, <em>Audit Sampling</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2810, <em>Evaluating Audit Results</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

A Board inspection includes a review of certain portions of selected audit work performed by the inspected firm and a review 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 audits. 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"). For these audits, the inspection team selects certain portions of the audits 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 audits, and the specific portions of those audits, 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, as well as a firm’s failure to perform, or to perform sufficiently, certain necessary audit procedures. An inspection may not involve the review of all of the firm’s audits, nor is it designed to identify every deficiency in the reviewed audits. 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 1215, 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, an inspection team considers whether audit documentation or other evidence that a firm might provide to the inspection team supports the firm’s contention that it performed a procedure,

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 the applicable financial reporting framework, 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.
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.

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.7

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 audits and areas of inspection focus are most often selected on a risk-weighted basis and not randomly. Areas of focus vary among selected audits, 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.

7 The discussion in this report of any deficiency observed in a particular audit 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.
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 audits. 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 audits. Even deficiencies that do not result in an insufficiently supported audit opinion may indicate a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system.\footnote{Not every audit deficiency suggests a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system, and this report may not discuss every audit deficiency the inspection team identified.} 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 audits 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;\footnote{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.} 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.

\textbf{END OF PART I}
PORTIONS OF THE REST OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC AND ARE OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT
PART II

** * * *

B. Issues Related to Quality Controls

The inspection of the Firm included consideration of aspects of the Firm's system of quality control.10

B.1. Audit Performance

A firm's system of quality control should provide reasonable assurance that the work performed on an audit engagement will meet applicable professional standards and regulatory requirements. On the basis of the information reported by the inspection team, including the audit performance deficiencies described in Part II.A (and summarized in Part I.A) and any other deficiencies identified below, the Board has concerns that the Firm's system of quality control fails to provide such reasonable assurance in at least the following respects –

B.1.a. Testing Appropriate to the Audit

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide sufficient assurance that the Firm will conduct all testing appropriate to a particular audit, specifically with respect to the following issues:

B.1.a.i. Revenue and Deferred Revenue

As discussed above, in the audit reviewed, the inspection team identified a significant deficiency related to the Firm's testing of revenue and deferred revenue. Based on review of the work papers and discussions with the engagement personnel, it appeared to the inspection team that the deficiency was attributable, at least in part, to the engagement personnel having approached this aspect of the audit without due

---

10 This report's description of quality control issues is based on the inspection team's observations during the primary inspection procedures. Any changes or improvements that the Firm may have made in its system of quality control since that time may not be reflected in this report, but will be taken into account by the Board during its assessment of whether the Firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects within the twelve months after the issuance of this report.
professional care. This information provides cause for concern regarding the Firm's application of due professional care with respect to auditing revenue and deferred revenue. [Issuer A]

B.1.a.ii. Debt and Equity Transactions

As discussed above, in the audit reviewed, the inspection team identified significant deficiencies related to the Firm's evaluation of the accounting for debt and equity transactions. Based on review of the work papers and discussions with the engagement personnel, it appeared to the inspection team that the deficiencies were attributable, at least in part, to the engagement personnel lacking an appropriate understanding of the accounting standards related to debt modifications and equity transactions with warrants. This information provides cause for concern regarding the Firm's proficiency with respect to auditing debt and equity transactions. [Issuer A]

B.1.b. Fraud Procedures

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide sufficient assurance that the Firm will perform all of the procedures necessary to respond to the risk of material misstatement due to fraud. Specifically, in the Firm's testing of journal entries and other adjustments for evidence of possible material misstatements due to fraud, the Firm failed to consider (1) appropriate factors in determining the nature, timing, and extent of the testing of journal entries and other adjustments, including considering a management-identified material weakness relating to insufficient personnel resources with technical accounting and reporting expertise and segregation of duties and (2) the characteristics of fraudulent journal entries or adjustments identified during planning and selecting journal entries with those characteristics for testing. In addition, the Firm failed to obtain support for some of the manual journal entries selected for testing. [Issuer A]

B.1.c. Engagement Quality Review

In light of certain audit performance deficiencies described in Part II.A (and summarized in Part I.A), questions exist about the effectiveness of the Firm's system of quality control with respect to the execution of engagement quality reviews in compliance with AS 1220, Engagement Quality Review. An engagement quality review performed with due professional care in compliance with AS 1220 should have detected, and resulted in the Firm addressing, the deficiency described in Part II.A related to testing revenue and deferred revenue. [Issuer A]

****
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 Board provided the Firm an opportunity to review and comment on a draft of this report. The Firm did not provide a written response.
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 deficiencies 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 2301, The Auditor’s Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses Involving the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Audit Procedures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS 2301.08</strong></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESPONSES TO FRAUD RISKS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS 2301.13</strong></td>
<td>Addressing Fraud Risks in the Audit of Financial Statements. 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Issuer A
### AS 2315, Audit Sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling In Substantive Tests Of Details</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Samples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2315.19</td>
<td>The second standard of field work states, &quot;A sufficient understanding of the internal control structure is to be obtained to plan the audit and to determine the nature, timing, and extent of tests to be performed.&quot; After assessing and considering the levels of inherent and control risks, the auditor performs substantive tests to restrict detection risk to an acceptable level. As the assessed levels of inherent risk, control risk, and detection risk for other substantive procedures directed toward the same specific audit objective decreases, the auditor's allowable risk of incorrect acceptance for the substantive tests of details increases and, thus, the smaller the required sample size for the substantive tests of details. For example, if inherent and control risks are assessed at the maximum, and no other substantive tests directed toward the same specific audit objectives are performed, the auditor should allow for a low risk of incorrect acceptance for the substantive tests of details.(^3) Thus, the auditor would select a larger sample size for the tests of details than if he allowed a higher risk of incorrect acceptance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuer A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Footnote to AS 2315.19**

\(^3\) Some auditors prefer to think of risk levels in quantitative terms. For example, in the circumstances described, an auditor might think in terms of a 5 percent risk of incorrect acceptance for the substantive test of details. Risk levels used in sampling applications in other fields are not necessarily relevant in determining appropriate levels for applications in auditing because an audit includes many interrelated tests and sources of evidence.

| AS 2315.23 | To determine the number of items to be selected in a sample for a particular substantive test of details, the auditor should take into account tolerable misstatement for the population; the allowable risk of incorrect acceptance (based on the assessments of inherent risk, control risk, and the detection risk related to the substantive analytical procedures or other relevant substantive tests); and the characteristics of the population, including the expected size and frequency of misstatements. |
| Issuer A    |  |
## AS 2315, Audit Sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS 2315.23A</th>
<th>Table 1 of the Appendix describes the effects of the factors discussed in the preceding paragraph on sample sizes in a statistical or nonstatistical sampling approach. When circumstances are similar, the effect on sample size of those factors should be similar regardless of whether a statistical or nonstatistical approach is used. Thus, when a nonstatistical sampling approach is applied properly, the resulting sample size ordinarily will be comparable to, or larger than, the sample size resulting from an efficient and effectively designed statistical sample.</th>
<th>Issuer A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance and Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2315.25</td>
<td>Auditing procedures that are appropriate to the particular audit objective should be applied to each sample item. In some circumstances the auditor may not be able to apply the planned audit procedures to selected sample items because, for example, supporting documentation may be missing. The auditor's treatment of unexamined items will depend on their effect on his evaluation of the sample. If the auditor's evaluation of the sample results would not be altered by considering those unexamined items to be misstated, it is not necessary to examine the items. However, if considering those unexamined items to be misstated would lead to a conclusion that the balance or class contains material misstatement, the auditor should consider alternative procedures that would provide him with sufficient evidence to form a conclusion. The auditor also should evaluate whether the reasons for his or her inability to examine the items have (a) implications in relation to his or her risk assessments (including the assessment of fraud risk), (b) implications regarding the integrity of management or employees, and (c) possible effects on other aspects of the audit.</td>
<td>Issuer A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AS 2810, Evaluating Audit Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATING THE PRESENTATION OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, INCLUDING THE DISCLOSURES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **AS 2810.30** | The auditor must evaluate whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework.  


Note: 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. |
| **Issuer A** |  |
| **AS 2810.31** | As part of the evaluation of the presentation of the financial statements, the auditor should evaluate whether the financial statements contain the information essential for a fair presentation of the financial statements in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework. Evaluation of the information disclosed in the financial statements includes consideration of the form, arrangement, and content of the financial statements (including the accompanying notes), encompassing matters such as the terminology used, the amount of detail given, the classification of items in the statements, and the bases of amounts set forth.  

Note: According to AS 3101, if the financial statements, including the accompanying notes, fail to disclose information that is required by the applicable financial reporting framework, the auditor should express a qualified or adverse opinion and should provide the information in the report, if practicable, unless its omission from the |  |
| **Issuer A** |  |
**AS 2810, Evaluating Audit Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report is recognized as appropriate by a specific auditing standard.(^\text{18/})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Footnote to AS No. 2810.31

\(^{18/}\) AS 3101.41-.44.