

---

# 2019 Inspection Farmer, Fuqua & Huff, P.C.

(Headquartered in Richardson, Texas)

August 16, 2021

# Table of Contents

2019 Inspection .....	2
Overview of the 2019 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year .....	3
Part I: Inspection Observations .....	5
Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions .....	5
Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules .....	5
Part II: Observations Related To Quality Control .....	6
Appendix A: Firm's Response to the Draft Inspection Report .....	A-1

## 2019 Inspection

During the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (“PCAOB”)’s 2019 inspection of Farmer, Fuqua & Huff, P.C., we assessed the firm’s compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of public companies.

We selected for review three audits of issuers with fiscal years ending in 2018. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm’s system of quality control.

### 2019 Inspection Approach

In selecting issuer audits for review, we use a risk-based method of selection. We make selections based on (1) our internal evaluation of audits we believe have a heightened risk of material misstatement, including those with challenging audit areas, and (2) other risk-based characteristics, including issuer and firm considerations. In certain situations we may select all of the firm’s issuer audits for review.

When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. Rather, we generally focus our attention on audit areas we believe to be of greater complexity, areas of greater significance or with a heightened risk of material misstatement to the issuer’s financial statements, and areas of recurring deficiencies. We may also select some audit areas for review in a manner designed to incorporate unpredictability.

Our selection of audits for review does not constitute a representative sample of the firm’s total population of issuer audits. Additionally, our inspection findings are specific to the particular portions of the issuer audits reviewed. They are not an assessment of all of the firm’s audit work nor of all of the audit procedures performed for the audits reviewed.

View the details on the [scope of our inspections and our inspections procedures](#).

# Overview of the 2019 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year

The following information provides an overview of our inspection in 2019 of the firm’s issuer audits as well as data from the previous inspection. We use a risk-based method to select audits for review and to identify areas on which we focus our review. Because our inspection process evolves over time, it can, and often does, focus on a different mix of audits and audit areas from inspection to inspection and firm to firm. Further, a firm’s business, the applicable auditing standards, or other factors can change from the time of one inspection to the next. As a result of these variations, we caution that our inspection results are not necessarily comparable over time or among firms.

## Firm Data and Audits Reviewed

	2019	2016
<b>Firm Data</b>		
<b>Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures</b>	3	4
<b>Total engagement partners on issuer audit work<sup>1</sup></b>	2	2
<b>Audits Reviewed</b>		
<b>Total audits reviewed<sup>2</sup></b>	3	4
<b>Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	3	4
<b>Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (“ICFR”)</b>	0	0
<b>Audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	0	1

<sup>1</sup> The number of engagement partners on issuer audit work represents the total number of firm personnel (not necessarily limited to personnel with an ownership interest) who had primary responsibility for an issuer audit (as defined in AS 1201) during the twelve-month period preceding the outset of the inspection.

<sup>2</sup> The population of issuer audits from which audits are selected for review may differ from the issuer audits at the outset of the inspection procedures due to variations such as new issuer audit clients for which the firm has not yet issued an opinion or issuer audit clients lost prior to the outset of the inspection.

## Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 2019 inspection and the previous inspection. For the issuer audits selected for review, we selected these areas because they were generally significant to the issuer’s financial statements, may have included complex issues for auditors, and/or involved complex judgments in (1) estimating and auditing the reported value of related accounts and disclosures and (2) implementing and auditing the related controls.

2019		2016	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Long-lived assets	2	Long-lived assets	3
Revenue and related accounts	2	Revenue and related accounts	3
Loans and related accounts	1	Loans and related accounts	2
Allowance for loan losses	1	Allowance for loan losses	2
Other investments	1	Other income	1

## Part I: Inspection Observations

Part I.A of our report discusses deficiencies, if any, that were of such significance that we believe the firm, at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR. Part I.B discusses deficiencies, if any, that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion(s) but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules. Consistent with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act ("the Act"), it is the Board's assessment that nothing in Part I of this report deals with a criticism of or potential defect in the firm's quality control system. Any such criticisms or potential defects are discussed in Part II. Further, you should not infer from any Part I deficiency or combination of deficiencies that a quality control finding is identified in Part II. Section 104(g)(2) of the Act restricts us from publicly disclosing Part II deficiencies unless the firm does not address the criticisms or potential defects to the Board's satisfaction no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

### Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions

In the 2019 inspection, we did not identify any deficiencies that were of such significance that we believe the firm, at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements.

### Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules

This section of our report discusses any deficiencies we identified that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion(s) but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules. When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. As a result, the area below was not necessarily reviewed on every audit. In some cases, we assess the firm's compliance with specific PCAOB standards or rules on other audits that were not otherwise selected for review and may include instances of non-compliance below.

We identified the following deficiencies:

In the three audits reviewed, the firm did not file its report on Form AP by the relevant deadline. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3211, *Auditor Reporting of Certain Audit Participants*.

## Part II: Observations Related To Quality Control

Part II of our report discusses criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control.

Deficiencies are included in Part II if an analysis of the inspection results, including the results of the reviews of individual audits, indicates that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that firm personnel will comply with applicable professional standards and requirements. Generally, the report's description of quality control criticisms is based on observations from our inspection procedures.

Any changes or improvements to its system of quality control that the firm may have brought to the Board's attention may not be reflected in this report, but are taken into account during the Board's assessment of whether the firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

Criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control, to the extent any are identified, are nonpublic when the reports are issued. If a firm does not address to the Board's satisfaction any criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm's system of quality control within 12 months after the issuance of our report, any such deficiency will be made public.

# Appendix A: Firm's Response to the Draft Inspection Report

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the firm's response, excluding any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.

The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.

In addition, pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm's response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.



# FARMER, FUQUA & HUFF P.C.

Accountants and Consultants

2435 N. Central Expy, Suite 700  
Richardson, Texas 75080  
P - 214.473.8000  
F - 214.473.8007

105 Decker Ct, Suite 870  
Irving, Texas 75062  
P - 972.650.1900  
F - 972-619-6111



May 6, 2021

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 Public Company Accounting Oversight Board Draft 2019 Inspection Farmer, Fuqua & Huff, P.C.

Dear Mr. Botic,

We are pleased to respond to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's (PCAOB) April 6, 2021 draft report on the inspection of Farmer, Fuqua & Huff, P.C. (the "Report"). We support the efforts of the PCAOB and, as a firm, benefit from the inspection process and appreciate the work of the inspection team.

The inspection process continues to help us improve our quality control system and audit quality. We use the inspection process and the resulting report and comments to improve our quality controls, processes and, hopefully, the quality and sufficiency of our audit documentation. We have looked into the matters included in our inspection report and have taken/are taking actions to address them in accordance with PCAOB standards and our policies. We will continue to evaluate our quality control procedures in light of the comment received so we can improve our overall audit quality and specifically our public company audit practice.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Farmer, Fuqua &amp; Huff, P.C." in a cursive style.

Farmer, Fuqua & Huff, P.C.

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB)  
AICPA Center for Audit Quality  
Private Companies Practice Section of the AICPA Division for CPA Firms

