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Preface

In 2017, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Salles, Sáinz - Grant Thornton, S.C. ("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 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). The inspection included a review of portions of one issuer audit performed by the Firm and the Firm's audit work on two other issuer audit engagements in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor. These reviews were 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 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. 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>9 (Aguascalientes, Guadalajara, Ciudad Juarez, Mexico City, Monterrey, Puebla, Puerto Vallarta, Queretaro, and Tijuana, United Mexican States)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ownership structure</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners / professional staff</td>
<td>37 / 650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuer audit clients</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other issuer audits in which the Firm plays a role</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead partners on issuer audit work</td>
<td>7</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/rasr/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 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).

4. 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,
PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from February 13, 2017 to February 17, 2017.5

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included a review of portions of one issuer audit performed by the Firm and the Firm's audit work on two other issuer audit engagements in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor. 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.

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.

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.
Certain deficiencies identified were of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm, in two audits in which it played a role but was not the principal auditor, had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit. The deficiencies that reached this level of significance are described below—

Issuer A

(1) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the occurrence and valuation of revenue (AS 2301.13; AS 2315.26 and .27; AS 2810.12 and .17);

(2) the failure, in connection with its role in an audit of an issuer’s internal control over financial reporting ("ICFR"), to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the valuation of inventory (AS 2201.39, .42, and .44); and

(3) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the existence and valuation of inventory (AS 1105.10; AS 2301.45).

Issuer B

(1) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the completeness of revenue (AS 2301.08 and .11); and

(2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the existence of accounts receivable (AS 2301.08 and .11; AS 2310.28 and .29).

B. Auditing Standards

Each deficiency described above could relate to several applicable provisions of the standards that govern the conduct of audit work. 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. Paragraphs .02, .05, and .06 of AS 1015, *Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work*, require the
independent auditor to plan and perform his or her work with due professional care and set forth aspects of that requirement. AS 1015.07-.09 and paragraph .07 of AS 2301, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*, 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 2301.03, .05, and .08 require the auditor to design and implement audit responses that address the risks of material misstatement. Paragraph .04 of AS 1105, *Audit Evidence*, 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) or the risk associated with the control (in the audit of ICFR) 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 audits for which each standard is cited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCAOB Auditing Standards</th>
<th>Issuers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 1105, <em>Audit Evidence</em></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2301, <em>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</em></td>
<td>A and B</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 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 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 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 audit work, 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 any other evidence that a firm might provide to the inspection team supports the 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.

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.
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.\textsuperscript{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 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, \textit{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

\textsuperscript{7} 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.
appropriate audit evidence to fulfill the objectives of its role in an audit may indicate a
defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system.\textsuperscript{8} 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;\textsuperscript{9}
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 and the following eight functional areas (1) tone at the top; (2) practices for
partner evaluation, compensation, admission, assignment of responsibilities, and
disciplinary actions; (3) independence implications of non-audit services; business
ventures, alliances, and arrangements; personal financial interests; and commissions
and contingent fees; (4) practices for client acceptance and retention; (5) practices for
consultations on accounting, auditing, and SEC matters; (6) the firm's internal inspection
program; (7) practices for establishment and communication of audit policies,
procedures, and methodologies, including training; and (8) the supervision by the firm's
audit engagement teams of the work performed by foreign affiliates.

END OF PART I

\textsuperscript{8} 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.

\textsuperscript{9} 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.
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.\textsuperscript{10}

* * * *

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 (QC 20.17). 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 –

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 particular audit work, specifically with respect to the following issues:

\textsuperscript{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 * * * * [have been] 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.
Revenue

As discussed above, in two of the audit engagements reviewed, the inspection team identified significant deficiencies related to the Firm's testing of revenue. 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 having approached this aspect of the audit without due professional care. This information provides cause for concern regarding the Firm's application of due professional care with respect to auditing revenue. [Issuers A and B]

ICFR

As discussed above, in one of the audit engagements reviewed, the inspection team identified a significant deficiency related to the Firm's testing of the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the valuation of inventory in its role in an audit of ICFR. 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 lacking an appropriate understanding of the PCAOB requirements related to auditing ICFR. This information provides cause for concern regarding the proficiency of the Firm's engagement personnel with respect to auditing ICFR. [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 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.
October 30, 2017

Ms. Holon A. Munter
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(Via Email)

Re: Response to Draft Report of Inspection

Dear Ms. Munter,

We are pleased to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board’s ("the Board") draft report on the inspection of Salles Sainz-Grant Thornton, S.C. dated September 29, 2017. We are supportive of the Board inspection process which helps us identify areas where we can improve our audit performance and/or enhance our ability to improve our quality control system. We are committed to the highest standards of audit quality.

We continually monitor our assurance practice, and take seriously the inspection team’s matters that it considered to be deficiencies in the performance of the work it reviewed. We have assessed carefully the nature and implications of those deficiencies and, while we may not concur with the Board’s views in some of them, and we are confident of the fulfillment of the objectives in our audits’ roles; we will take appropriate action to remedy all the reported deficiencies.

By recognizing the constructive manner of the inspection process, we have made every effort to cooperate fully, understand the inspection team’s views and carefully consider their judgments. Therefore, we are committed to identify suitable steps to address the firm’s deficiencies based on our organizational structure and operation.

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Draft Report and look forward to future constructive dialogue.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Mauricio Brizuela Arias
Managing Partner
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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS 1105, Audit Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUFFICIENT APPROPRIATE AUDIT EVIDENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Using Information Produced by the Company</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 1105.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuer A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnote to AS 1105.10

3 When using the work of a specialist engaged or employed by management, see AS 1210, Using the Work of a Specialist. When using information produced by a service organization or a service auditor’s report as audit evidence, see AS 2601, Consideration of an Entity’s Use of a Service Organization, and for integrated audits, see AS 2201, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements.

### USING A TOP-DOWN APPROACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selecting Controls to Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS 2201.39</strong></td>
<td>The auditor should test those controls that are important to the auditor's conclusion about whether the company's controls sufficiently address the assessed risk of misstatement to each relevant assertion. Issuer A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TESTING CONTROLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing Design Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS 2201.42</strong></td>
<td>The auditor should test the design effectiveness of controls by determining whether the company's controls, if they are operated as prescribed by persons possessing the necessary authority and competence to perform the control effectively, satisfy the company's control objectives and can effectively prevent or detect errors or fraud that could result in material misstatements in the financial statements. Issuer A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A smaller, less complex company might achieve its control objectives in a different manner from a larger, more complex organization. For example, a smaller, less complex company might have fewer employees in the accounting function, limiting opportunities to segregate duties and leading the company to implement alternative controls to achieve its control objectives. In such circumstances, the auditor should evaluate whether those alternative controls are effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing Operating Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS 2201.44</strong></td>
<td>The auditor should test the operating effectiveness of a control by determining whether the control is operating as designed and whether the person performing the control possesses the necessary authority and competence to perform the control effectively. Issuer A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In some situations, particularly in smaller companies, a company might use a third party to

| Provide assistance with certain financial reporting functions. When assessing the competence of personnel responsible for a company's financial reporting and associated controls, the auditor may take into account the combined competence of company personnel and other parties that assist with functions related to financial reporting. |

**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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS 2301.08</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses to Significant Risks**

| **AS 2301.11** |
| For significant risks, the auditor should perform substantive procedures, including tests of details, that are specifically responsive to the assessed risks. |

**Note:** AS 2110 discusses identification of significant risks and states that fraud risks are significant risks.

**Footnote to AS 2301.11**

10 See AS 2110.71 for factors that the auditor should evaluate in determining which risks are significant risks.

**Responses to Fraud Risks**

| **AS 2301.13** |
| 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. |
### AS 2301, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUBSTANTIVE PROCEDURES</strong></th>
<th><strong>Timing of Substantive Procedures</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS 2301.45</strong></td>
<td>When substantive procedures are performed at an interim date, the auditor should cover the remaining period by performing substantive procedures, or substantive procedures combined with tests of controls, that provide a reasonable basis for extending the audit conclusions from the interim date to the period end. Such procedures should include (a) comparing relevant information about the account balance at the interim date with comparable information at the end of the period to identify amounts that appear unusual and investigating such amounts and (b) performing audit procedures to test the remaining period.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AS 2310, *The Confirmation Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>THE CONFIRMATION PROCESS</strong></th>
<th><strong>Performing Confirmation Procedures</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AS 2310.28</strong></td>
<td>During the performance of confirmation procedures, the auditor should maintain control over the confirmation requests and responses. Maintaining control means establishing direct communication between the intended recipient and the auditor to minimize the possibility that the results will be biased because of interception and alteration of the confirmation requests or responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnote to AS 2310.28**

3 The need to maintain control does not preclude the use of internal auditors in the confirmation process. AS 2605, *Consideration of the Internal Audit Function*, provides guidance on considering the work of internal auditors and on using internal auditors to provide direct assistance to the auditor.
### AS 2310, The Confirmation Process

| AS 2310.29 | There may be situations in which the respondent, because of timeliness or other considerations, responds to a confirmation request other than in a written communication mailed to the auditor. When such responses are received, additional evidence may be required to support their validity. For example, facsimile responses involve risks because of the difficulty of ascertaining the sources of the responses. To restrict the risks associated with facsimile responses and treat the confirmations as valid audit evidence, the auditor should consider taking certain precautions, such as verifying the source and contents of a facsimile response in a telephone call to the purported sender. In addition, the auditor should consider requesting the purported sender to mail the original confirmation directly to the auditor. Oral confirmations should be documented in the workpapers. If the information in the oral confirmations is significant, the auditor should request the parties involved to submit written confirmation of the specific information directly to the auditor. |
| Issuer B |

### AS 2315, Audit Sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAMPLING IN SUBSTANTIVE TESTS OF DETAILS</th>
<th>Performance and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 2315.26</td>
<td>The auditor should project the misstatement results of the sample to the items from which the sample was selected. There are several acceptable ways to project misstatements from a sample. For example, an auditor may have selected a sample of every twentieth item (50 items) from a population containing one thousand items. If he discovered overstatements of $3,000 in that sample, the auditor could project a $60,000 overstatement by dividing the amount of misstatement in the sample by the fraction of total items from the population included in the sample. The auditor should add that projection to the misstatements discovered in any items examined 100 percent. This total projected misstatement should be compared with the tolerable misstatement for the account balance or class of transactions, and appropriate consideration should be given to sampling risk. If the total projected misstatement is less than tolerable misstatement for the account balance or class of transactions, the auditor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuer A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AS 2315, Audit Sampling

| should consider the risk that such a result might be obtained even though the true monetary misstatement for the population exceeds tolerable misstatement. For example, if the tolerable misstatement in an account balance of $1 million is $50,000 and the total projected misstatement based on an appropriate sample (see paragraph .23) is $10,000, he may be reasonably assured that there is an acceptably low sampling risk that the true monetary misstatement for the population exceeds tolerable misstatement. On the other hand, if the total projected misstatement is close to the tolerable misstatement, the auditor may conclude that there is an unacceptably high risk that the actual misstatements in the population exceed the tolerable misstatement. An auditor uses professional judgment in making such evaluations. |

---

#### Footnotes to AS 2315.26

5 If the auditor has separated the items subject to sampling into relatively homogeneous groups (see paragraph .22), he separately projects the misstatement results of each group and sums them.

6 AS 2810.10 through .23 discuss the auditor’s consideration of differences between the accounting records and the underlying facts and circumstances.

---

#### AS 2315.27

In addition to the evaluation of the frequency and amounts of monetary misstatements, consideration should be given to the qualitative aspects of the misstatements. These include (a) the nature and cause of misstatements, such as whether they are differences in principle or in application, are errors or are caused by fraud, or are due to misunderstanding of instructions or to carelessness, and (b) the possible relationship of the misstatements to other phases of the audit. The discovery of fraud ordinarily requires a broader consideration of possible implications than does the discovery of an error.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AS 2810, <em>Evaluating Audit Results</em></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVALUATING THE RESULTS OF THE AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulating and Evaluating Identified Misstatements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AS 2810.12 | The auditor's accumulation of misstatements should include the auditor's best estimate of the total misstatement in the accounts and disclosures that he or she has tested, not just the amount of misstatements specifically identified. This includes misstatements related to accounting estimates, as determined in accordance with paragraph .13 of this standard, and projected misstatements from substantive procedures that involve audit sampling, as determined in accordance with AS 2315, *Audit Sampling*.  

Issuer A |
| Footnote to AS 2810.12 |  |
| 5 | AS 2315.26. |
| AS 2810.17 | *Evaluation of the Effect of Uncorrected Misstatements*. The auditor should evaluate whether uncorrected misstatements are material, individually or in combination with other misstatements. In making this evaluation, the auditor should evaluate the misstatements in relation to the specific accounts and disclosures involved and to the financial statements as a whole, taking into account relevant quantitative and qualitative factors. (See Appendix B.)  

Note: In interpreting the federal securities laws, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that a fact is material if there is "a substantial likelihood that the ...fact would have been viewed by the reasonable investor as having significantly altered the 'total mix' of information made available." As the Supreme Court has noted, determinations of materiality require "delicate assessments of the inferences a 'reasonable shareholder' would draw from a given set of facts and the significance of those inferences to him ...." |
| Issuer A |
AS 2810, *Evaluating Audit Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note: As a result of the interaction of quantitative and qualitative considerations in materiality judgments, uncorrected misstatements of relatively small amounts could have a material effect on the financial statements. For example, an illegal payment of an otherwise immaterial amount could be material if there is a reasonable possibility that it could lead to a material contingent liability or a material loss of revenue. Also, a misstatement made intentionally could be material for qualitative reasons, even if relatively small in amount.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note: If the reevaluation of the established materiality level or levels, as set forth in Auditing Standard No. 11, results in a lower amount for the materiality level or levels, the auditor should take into account that lower materiality level or levels in the evaluation of uncorrected misstatements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Footnotes to AS 2810.17**

7. If the financial statements contain material misstatements, AS 3101, *Reports on Audited Financial Statements*, indicates that the auditor should issue a qualified or an adverse opinion on the financial statements. AS 3101.35 discusses situations in which the financial statements are materially affected by a departure from the applicable financial reporting framework.


10. There is a reasonable possibility of an event, as used in this standard, when the likelihood of the event is either "reasonably possible" or "probable," as those terms are used in the FASB Accounting Standards Codification, Contingencies Topic, paragraph 450-20-25-1.


12. AS 2105.11-.12.