

Report on

2018 Inspection of EisnerAmper LLP
(Headquartered in New York, New York)

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

December 21, 2020

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. 104-2021-025

2018 INSPECTION OF EISNERAMPER LLP

Preface

In 2018, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (“PCAOB” or “the Board”) conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm EisnerAmper LLP (“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 reviews of portions of selected issuer audits. 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 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 FIRM¹

Offices	23 ²
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Partners / professional staff ³	180 / 970
Issuer audit clients	66
Lead partners on issuer audit work ⁴	20

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 Firm's offices are located in Carlsbad, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and San Francisco, California; Stamford, Connecticut; Fort Lauderdale and Miami, Florida; Chicago, Illinois; Cambridge, Massachusetts; Hackensack, Iselin, Skillman, and Wall Township, New Jersey; New York and Syosset, New York; Philadelphia and Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania; Dallas, Texas; George Town, Cayman Islands; Bangalore and Mumbai, India; and Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, State of Israel.

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

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, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*) during the twelve-month period preceding the outset of the inspection.

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from September 10, 2018 to September 28, 2018.⁵

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included reviews of portions of eight issuer audits performed by the Firm. The inspection team identified matters that it considered to be deficiencies in the performance of the work it reviewed. In one of the audits described below, after the primary inspection procedures, the Firm revised its audit opinion.⁶

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 the standards that most directly relate to the deficiencies and do not include all standards that apply 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 conformity with the applicable financial

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.

⁶ The 2018 inspection did not include review of any additional audit work related to the restatement.

reporting framework and/or its opinion about whether the issuer had maintained, in all material respects, effective ICFR. In other words, in these audits, the auditor issued an opinion without satisfying its fundamental obligation to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements were free of material misstatement and/or the issuer maintained effective ICFR.

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 or that there are undisclosed material weaknesses in ICFR. 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. As indicated below, however, in one instance, the inspection team identified a failure by the Firm to identify and address appropriately a departure from Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”) that appeared to the inspection team to be material.

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.⁷

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

A.1. Issuer A

the Firm’s failure to identify, or to address appropriately, a departure from GAAP that appeared to the inspection team to be material, which related to the accounting for certain foreign currency gains and losses on intercompany balances and transactions (AS 2810.30-.31).

⁷ 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.

A.2. Issuer B

(1) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of change management controls, and as a result of such deficiencies, the Firm placed unwarranted reliance on the controls over the accuracy and completeness of system-generated reports used in the performance of IT-dependent manual controls over revenue (AS 2201.42 and .44); and

(2) the failure to perform sufficient substantive procedures to test revenue, due to the failure to sufficiently test the accuracy and completeness of issuer-produced reports used as audit evidence (AS 1105.10; AS 2301.13).

A.3. Issuer C

the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the occurrence, completeness, and valuation of revenue and the existence, completeness, and valuation of accounts receivable, including the failure to sufficiently evaluate the effects of certain identified control deficiencies (AS 2201.44, .46-.47, and .68).

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. 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.

PCAOB Auditing Standards	Issuers
AS 1105, <i>Audit Evidence</i>	B
AS 2201, <i>An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>	B and C
AS 2301, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	B
AS 2810, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i>	A

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 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,⁸ 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.

⁸ 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.

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, 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.⁹

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

⁹ 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.

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 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.¹⁰ 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;¹¹ related firm methodology, guidance, and practices; and possible root causes.

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

END OF PART I

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ An evaluation of the frequency of a type of deficiency may include consideration of how often the inspection team reviewed audit work that presented the opportunity for similar deficiencies to occur. In some cases, even a type of deficiency that is observed infrequently in a particular inspection may, because of some combination of its nature, its significance, and the frequency with which it has been observed in previous inspections of the firm, be cause for concern about a quality control defect or potential defect.

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

PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the Firm provided a written response to a draft of this report and that response has received careful consideration. 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.¹²

¹² 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.



EisnerAmper LLP
733 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10017
T 212.949.8700
F 212.891.4100
www.eisneramper.com

November 11, 2020

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

Re: Response to Part I of the Draft Report on the 2018 Inspection of EisnerAmper LLP

Dear Mr. Botic:

We are pleased to provide our response to Part I of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB") Draft Report on 2018 Inspection of EisnerAmper LLP dated October 14, 2020 ("Draft Report").

We believe that the PCAOB's inspection process serves an important role in identifying areas where we can continue to improve audit quality. Those improvements help us to better protect the interests of investors and further the public interest in the preparation of accurate and independent audit reports. We are committed to continuing to work with the PCAOB to strengthen trust in the integrity of our independent audits.

We have evaluated the matters identified by the PCAOB's inspection team for each of the issuer audits described in Part I of the Draft Report and have taken actions as appropriate in accordance with PCAOB standards to comply with our professional responsibilities under 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*.

Consistently executing high-quality audits is our top priority. We remain dedicated to continuous improvement in our audit engagement performance and our system of quality control, including implementing changes to our policies and procedures in order to enhance audit quality. We are confident that the investments we have made and are continuing to make in our people, processes, and methodologies are resulting in significant enhancements to our audit quality.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Weinstein, CEO

Matthew Maulbeck
Managing Partner
Audit & Assurance



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>.¹³

AS 1105, Audit Evidence		
SUFFICIENT APPROPRIATE AUDIT EVIDENCE		
Using Information Produced by the Company		
AS 1105.10	When using information produced by the company as audit evidence, the auditor should evaluate whether the information is sufficient and appropriate for purposes of the audit by performing procedures to:³ ▪ Test the accuracy and completeness of the information, or test the controls over the accuracy and completeness of that information; and ▪ Evaluate whether the information is sufficiently precise and detailed for purposes of the audit.	Issuer B
<u>Footnote to AS 1105.10</u> ³ When using the work of a specialist engaged or employed by management, see AS 1210, <i>Using the Work of a Specialist</i>. When using information produced by a service organization or a service auditor's report as audit evidence, see AS 2601, <i>Consideration of an Entity's Use of a Service Organization</i>, and for integrated audits, see AS 2201, <i>An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>.		

¹³ The text presented in this appendix represents the standards as in effect during the applicable audit period.

AS 2201, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements		
TESTING CONTROLS		
Testing Design Effectiveness		
AS 2201.42	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. 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.	Issuer B
Testing Operating Effectiveness		
AS 2201.44	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. 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.	Issuers B and C

AS 2201, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements		
Relationship of Risk to the Evidence to be Obtained		
AS 2201.46	For each control selected for testing, the evidence necessary to persuade the auditor that the control is effective depends upon the risk associated with the control. The risk associated with a control consists of the risk that the control might not be effective and, if not effective, the risk that a material weakness would result. As the risk associated with the control being tested increases, the evidence that the auditor should obtain also increases Note: Although the auditor must obtain evidence about the effectiveness of controls for each relevant assertion, the auditor is not responsible for obtaining sufficient evidence to support an opinion about the effectiveness of each individual control. Rather, the auditor's objective is to express an opinion on the company's internal control over financial reporting overall. This allows the auditor to vary the evidence obtained regarding the effectiveness of individual controls selected for testing based on the risk associated with the individual control.	Issuer C
AS 2201.47	Factors that affect the risk associated with a control include – ▪ The nature and materiality of misstatements that the control is intended to prevent or detect; ▪ The inherent risk associated with the related account(s) and assertion(s); ▪ Whether there have been changes in the volume or nature of transactions that might adversely affect control design or operating effectiveness; ▪ Whether the account has a history of errors; ▪ The effectiveness of entity-level controls, especially controls that monitor other controls; ▪ The nature of the control and the frequency with which it operates; ▪ The degree to which the control relies on the effectiveness of other controls (e.g., the control environment or information technology general controls);	Issuer C

AS 2201, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements

	▪ The competence of the personnel who perform the control or monitor its performance and whether there have been changes in key personnel who perform the control or monitor its performance; ▪ Whether the control relies on performance by an individual or is automated (<i>i.e.</i>, an automated control would generally be expected to be lower risk if relevant information technology general controls are effective); and Note: A less complex company or business unit with simple business processes and centralized accounting operations might have relatively simple information systems that make greater use of off-the-shelf packaged software without modification. In the areas in which off-the-shelf software is used, the auditor's testing of information technology controls might focus on the application controls built into the pre-packaged software that management relies on to achieve its control objectives and the IT general controls that are important to the effective operation of those application controls. ▪ The complexity of the control and the significance of the judgments that must be made in connection with its operation. Note: Generally, a conclusion that a control is not operating effectively can be supported by less evidence than is necessary to support a conclusion that a control is operating effectively.	
EVALUATING IDENTIFIED DEFICIENCIES		
AS 2201.68	The auditor should evaluate the effect of compensating controls when determining whether a control deficiency or combination of deficiencies is a material weakness. To have a mitigating effect, the compensating control should operate at a level of precision that would prevent or detect a misstatement that could be material.	Issuer C

AS 2301, The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement		
RESPONSES INVOLVING THE NATURE, TIMING, AND EXTENT OF AUDIT PROCEDURES		
Responses to Fraud Risks		
AS 2301.13	<i>Addressing Fraud Risks in the Audit of Financial Statements.</i> In the audit of financial statements, the auditor should perform substantive procedures, including tests of details, that are specifically responsive to the assessed fraud risks. If the auditor selects certain controls intended to address the assessed fraud risks for testing in accordance with paragraphs .16-.17 of this standard, the auditor should perform tests of those controls.	Issuer B

AS 2810, Evaluating Audit Results		
EVALUATING THE RESULTS OF THE AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS		
Evaluating the Presentation of the Financial Statements, Including the Disclosures		
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: AS 2815, <i>The Meaning of "Present Fairly in Conformity With Generally Accepted Accounting Principles,"</i> establishes requirements for evaluating the presentation of the financial statements. AS 2820, <i>Evaluating Consistency of Financial Statements,</i> establishes requirements regarding evaluating the consistency of the accounting principles used in financial statements. Note: The auditor should look to the requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the company under audit with respect to the accounting principles applicable to that company.	Issuer A

AS 2810, Evaluating Audit Results		
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 report is recognized as appropriate by a specific auditing standard.¹⁸	Issuer A
<u>Footnote to AS 2810.31</u> ¹⁸ AS 3101.41-.44.		