# 2020 Inspection Marcum Bernstein & Pinchuk LLP

(Headquartered in New York, New York)

April 21, 2022

**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. 104-2022-124**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

2020 Inspection..... 2
Overview of the 2020 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

# 2020 INSPECTION

In the 2020 inspection of Marcum Bernstein & Pinchuk LLP, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) assessed the firm's compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of public companies.

We selected for review two audits of issuers with fiscal years ending in 2019. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

## 2020 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 2020 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2020 inspection 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 Selected for Review

| | 2020 | 2018 |
|---|---|---|
| **Firm data** | | |
| **Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures** | 22 | 19 |
| **Total engagement partners on issuer audit work**[1] | 3 | 3 |
| **Audits reviewed** | | |
| **Total audits reviewed**[2] | 2 | 3 |
| **Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor** | 2 | 3 |
| **Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)** | 1 | 1 |
| **Audits with Part I.A deficiencies** | 0 | 1 |

[1] 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.

[2] 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 2020 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.

| 2020 | | 2018 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Audit area** | **Audits reviewed** | **Audit area** | **Audits reviewed** |
| **Revenue and related accounts** | 2 | **Revenue and related accounts** | 3 |
| **Cash and cash equivalents** | 2 | **Cash and cash equivalents** | 3 |
| **Deposit liabilities** | 1 | **Loans and related accounts** | 2 |
| | | **Allowance for loan losses** | 1 |
| | | **Long-lived assets** | 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 ("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. We discuss any such criticisms or potential defects in Part II. Further, you should not infer from any Part I deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, that we identified a quality control finding 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 2020 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 and/or ICFR.

# 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 reviewed and include any instances of non-compliance below.

We identified the following deficiencies:

In one other audit, the firm did not file its report on Form AP by the relevant deadline. In an additional other audit, the firm's report on Form AP contained inaccurate information regarding the issuer name. 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.

We include deficiencies 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.

This report does not reflect changes or improvements to the firm's system of quality control that the firm may have made subsequent to the period covered by our inspection. The Board does consider such changes or improvements in assessing whether the firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

When we issue our reports, we do not make public criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control, to the extent any are identified. 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, we will make public any such deficiency.

# 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.

MBP |

New York Office
7 Penn Plaza, Suite 830
New York, NY 10001
T 212.279.7900

October 22, 2021

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

Re: Response to the Draft Report on 2020 Inspection of Marcum Bernstein & Pinchuk LLP

Dear Mr. Botic:

Marcum Bernstein & Pinchuk LLP (the "Firm") is pleased to provide this response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's (the "PCAOB") draft report on the 2020 inspection of Marcum Bernstein & Pinchuk LLP (the "Draft Report").

The Firm continues to support the PCAOB's mission and we believe the inspection process has been effective. While we are very pleased your inspection team reported no audit deficiencies or quality control criticisms, the Firm is committed to continuously improving audit quality.

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Draft Report and we look forward to working with the PCAOB staff on future inspections.

Sincerely,

Marcum Bernstein & Pinchuk LLP