

---

# 2019 Inspection BPM LLP

(Headquartered in San Francisco, California)

September 9, 2021



**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. 104-2021-164A**

(Includes portions of Part II of the full report that were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2021-164)

# 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 ..... 6

Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules ..... 8

Part II: Observations Related To Quality Control ..... 9

Appendix A: Firm's Response to the Draft Inspection Report .....A-1

## 2019 Inspection

During the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (“PCAOB”)’s 2019 inspection of BPM LLP, 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	2017
<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>	22	22
<b>Total engagement partners on issuer audit work<sup>1</sup></b>	5	9
<b>Audits Reviewed</b>		
<b>Total audits reviewed<sup>2</sup></b>	3	3
<b>Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	3	3
<b>Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting ("ICFR")</b>	3	2
<b>Audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	2	2

If a deficiency is included in Part I.A of our report, it does not necessarily mean that the firm has not addressed the deficiency. In many cases, the firm has performed remedial actions after the issue was identified. Depending on the circumstances, remedial actions may include performing additional audit procedures, informing management of the issuer of the need for changes to the financial statements or reporting on ICFR, or taking steps to prevent reliance on prior audit reports. Our inspection may include a

<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.

review, on a sample basis, of the adequacy of a firm's remedial actions, either with respect to previously identified deficiencies or deficiencies identified during the current inspection. If a firm does not take appropriate actions to address deficiencies, we may criticize its system of quality control or pursue a disciplinary action.

The fact that we have included a deficiency in our report — other than those deficiencies for audits with incorrect opinions on the financial statements and/or ICFR — does not necessarily mean that the issuer's financial statements are materially misstated or that undisclosed material weaknesses in ICFR exist. It is often not possible for us to reach a conclusion on those points based on our inspection procedures and related findings because, for example, we have only the information that the auditor retained and the issuer's public disclosures. We do not have direct access to the issuer's management, underlying books and records, and other information.

## Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 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		2017	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Revenue and related accounts	3	Revenue and related accounts	2
Inventory	2	Inventory	1
Cash and cash equivalents	2	Cash and cash equivalents	1
		Equity and equity-related transactions	1
		Income taxes	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.

## Classification of Audits with Part I.A Deficiencies

Within Part I.A of this report, we classify each issuer audit in one of the categories discussed below based on the Part I.A deficiency or deficiencies identified in our review.

The sole purpose of this classification system is to group and present issuer audits by the number of Part I.A deficiencies we identified within the audit as well as to highlight audits with an incorrect opinion on the financial statements and/or ICFR.

### Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

This classification includes instances where a deficiency was identified in connection with our inspection and, as a result, an issuer's financial statements were determined to be materially misstated, and the issuer restated its financial statements. It also includes instances where a deficiency was identified in connection with our inspection and, as a result, an issuer's ICFR was determined to be ineffective, or there were additional material weaknesses that the firm did not identify, and the firm withdrew its opinion, or modified its report, on ICFR. This classification does not include instances where, unrelated to our review, an issuer restated its financial statements and/or an issuer's ICFR was determined to be ineffective. Any deficiencies identified in connection with our reviews of these audits would be included in the audits with multiple deficiencies or audits with a single deficiency classification below.

### Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

This classification includes instances where multiple deficiencies were identified that related to a combination of one or more financial statement accounts, disclosures, and/or important controls in an ICFR audit.

### Audits with a Single Deficiency

This classification includes instances where a single deficiency was identified that related to a financial statement account or disclosure or to an important control in an ICFR audit.

## Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions

This section of our report discusses the deficiencies identified, by specific issuer audit reviewed, in the audit work supporting the firm's opinion on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR.

We identify each issuer by a letter (e.g., Issuer A). Each deficiency could relate to several auditing standards, but we reference the PCAOB standard(s) that most directly relates to the requirement with which the firm did not comply.

Issuer audits are presented below within their respective deficiency classifications (as discussed previously). Within the classifications, we generally present the audits based on our assessment as to the relative significance of the identified deficiencies taking into account the significance of the financial statement accounts and/or disclosures affected, and/or the nature or extent of the deficiencies.

### Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

None

### Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

#### Issuer A

##### Type of audit and related areas affected

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

##### Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Revenue, Accounts Receivable, and Inventory**:

The issuer's main information technology ("IT") application processed financial transactions and maintained related data. The firm selected for testing IT general controls ("ITGCs") that consisted of controls over access and change management. The firm did not test administrator access to the database and the operating system supporting this application. (AS 2201.42 and .44) In addition, the firm did not identify and test any controls that addressed the risk of developers migrating changes to production without proper approval and testing. (AS 2201.39)

The firm selected for testing certain IT-dependent controls. The firm did not identify and test any controls over the accuracy and completeness of data used in the operation of these controls. (AS 2201.39)

The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of the issuer's monthly review of the financial results. The firm did not evaluate the review procedures that the control owners performed, including the procedures to identify items for follow up and the procedures to determine whether those items were appropriately resolved. (AS 2201.42 and .44) In addition, the firm did not identify and test any controls over the accuracy and completeness of data used in the operation of the control. (AS 2201.39)

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

The firm selected for testing three controls that consisted of the configuration of the application to (1) only allow key fields to be populated with certain data, (2) sequentially assign sales order, customer invoice, and cash receipt numbers, and (3) not allow customer invoices and journal entries to be posted when the accounting period is closed. The firm did not sufficiently test the configuration of the application because it did not test the operation of the control over all types of revenue transactions that occurred during the year. Further, the sample sizes the firm used to test these controls were too small due to the deficiencies in the firm's testing of access and change management controls described above. (AS 2201.42, .44, and .46)

With respect to **Revenue**:

The firm did not identify and test any controls that addressed whether transactions processed by the issuer's revenue application were accurately recorded. (AS 2201.39)

The firm did not identify and test any controls to address revenue adjustments. (AS 2201.39)

The firm did not test the completeness of data used in its substantive procedures to test cut-off. (AS 1105.10)

The sample size the firm used in certain of its substantive procedures to test certain revenue was too small to provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence because the firm did not use the appropriate (1) tolerable misstatement for the population and (2) risk assessment in its sampling tool. (AS 2315.16, .23, and .23A)

## Issuer B

### Type of audit and related area affected

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

### Description of the deficiencies identified

The firm selected for testing a control that consisted of the issuer's review of the allowance for doubtful accounts. The firm did not evaluate the review procedures that the control owner performed, including the procedures performed to investigate certain accounts receivable balances and the procedures to determine whether those items were appropriately resolved. (AS 2201.42 and .44)

The firm's approach for substantively testing the valuation of accounts receivable was to review and test management's process. The firm did not sufficiently evaluate the reasonableness of the allowance for doubtful accounts for one customer because, in response to the customer indicating in its written confirmation reply that its balance to the issuer was zero, the firm limited its procedures to obtaining a written representation from the issuer's management. (AS 2501.09, .10, and .11; AS 2810.03)

## Audits with a Single Deficiency

None

## 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 areas below were 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.

The deficiencies below are presented in numerical order based on the PCAOB standard or rule with which the firm did not comply. We identified the following deficiencies:

- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not make a required communication to the issuer's audit committee related to the significant risks identified through its risk assessment procedures. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not include, in its annual communication to the issuer's audit committee, a relationship that, as of the date of the communication, may have been reasonably thought to bear on the independence of the firm. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3526, *Communication with Audit Committees Concerning Independence*.

## 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.

### A. Testing Controls

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the work performed by the firm's personnel to test controls will meet the requirements of AS 2201. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In two audits,<sup>3</sup> both of which are included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to the firm's (1) identification and testing of controls that addressed risks of material misstatement, (2) testing of controls that included a review element, (3) testing of controls over the accuracy and completeness of data used in the operation of controls that the firm tested, and (4) testing of ITGCs.

### B. Engagement Quality Review

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the review procedures performed by the firm's engagement quality review ("EQR") partners will meet the requirements of AS 1220. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In two audits,<sup>4</sup> both of which are included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified one or more deficiencies in an area that the EQR partner was required to evaluate. In these audits, the EQR partner did not identify a deficiency in an area of significant risk, including in one case a fraud risk.

---

<sup>3</sup> Issuers A and B

<sup>4</sup> Issuers A and B

# 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.



10 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 1000, San Jose, CA 95113  
Phone 408-961-6300 | Fax 408-961-6324 | bpm@bpmcpa.com

April 2, 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 Part I of the Draft Report on the 2019 Inspection of BPM 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 the 2019 Inspection of BPM LLP (the "Draft Report").

We have evaluated the observations identified by the inspection team for each of the issuer audits described in Part I.A and I.B 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 where applicable, AS 2905, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report*.

We believe the PCAOB's inspection process serves an important role in improving audit quality for the benefit of investors and the public interest. We remain committed to improving our audit quality and underlying quality control systems. We look forward to continued dialogue with the PCAOB on matters of interest to our public company audit practice.

Sincerely,

BPM LLP

[bpmcpa.com](http://bpmcpa.com)

