
2021 Inspection Wolf & Company, P.C.

(Headquartered in Boston, Massachusetts)

August 31, 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. 104-2022-192A

(Includes portions of Part II of the full report that were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2022-192)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

2021 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2021 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	7
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control	9
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

2021 INSPECTION

In the 2021 inspection of Wolf & Company, P.C., 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 2020. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

2021 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 necessarily 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 2021 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2021 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

	2021	2018
Firm data		
Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures	20	24
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	11	9
Audits reviewed		
Total audits reviewed²	2	4
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	2	4
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	2	2
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	2	1

If we include a deficiency 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 deficiency 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.

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, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*) 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 audit report or issuer audit clients lost prior to the outset of the inspection.

Our inspection may include a 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.

If we include a deficiency in our report — other than those deficiencies for audits with incorrect opinions on the financial statements and/or ICFR — it 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 2021 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.

2021		2018	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Allowance for loan losses	1	Allowance for loan losses	3
Certain assets	1	Investment securities	2
Loans and related accounts	1	Loans and related accounts	1
Revenue and related accounts	1	Revenue and related accounts	1
		Deposit liabilities	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.

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 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 revised 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. We include any deficiencies identified in connection with our reviews of these audits 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.

We present issuer audits 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 – Financials

Type of audit and related area affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement and ICFR audits related to the **Allowance for Loan Losses (ALL)**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

The issuer determined the qualitative reserve component of the ALL for loans that were collectively evaluated for impairment. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm selected for testing a control that included the issuer's review of (1) certain loans for potential impairment and (2) the qualitative component of the ALL. The firm did not evaluate the specific review procedures that the control owners performed to (1) determine whether all loans identified for potential impairment were reviewed and (2) assess the reasonableness of the qualitative component of the ALL. (AS 2201. 42 and .44)

- The firm’s approach for substantively testing the ALL was to test the issuer’s process. The firm did not sufficiently evaluate whether the issuer had a reasonable basis for the significant assumptions it used to determine the qualitative component of the ALL because the firm’s procedures were limited to (1) reading the issuer’s ALL analysis and (2) comparing the significant assumptions the issuer used at year end to those used in prior periods. (AS 2501.16)

Issuer B

Type of audit and related area affected

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

Description of the deficiencies identified

The firm selected for testing a control over the existence of certain assets. The firm did not evaluate how the issuer determined how frequently asset items would be reviewed and whether the issuer reviewed those items as frequently as intended. (AS 2201.42 and .44)

The firm did not identify and test any controls over the accuracy and completeness of system-generated information used by the issuer in the operation of certain controls. (AS 2201.39)

The firm did not perform any substantive procedures to test, or (as discussed above) identify and test any controls over, the accuracy and completeness of system-generated information used in its substantive testing of these assets. (AS 1105.10) In addition, the sample sizes the firm used to test these assets were too small to provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence because these procedures were designed based on a level of control reliance that was not supported due to the deficiencies in the firm’s control testing discussed above. (AS 2301.16, .18, and .37; AS 2315.19, .23, and .23A)

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 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 audit reviewed, the engagement team performed procedures to determine whether or not matters were critical audit matters but did not include in those procedures certain matters that were communicated to the issuer's audit committee and that related to accounts or disclosures that were material to the financial statements. In addition, the engagement team did not take into account certain required factors in determining whether or not certain other matters were critical audit matters. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 3101, *The Auditor's Report on an Audit of Financial Statements When the Auditor Expresses an Unqualified Opinion*. These instances of non-compliance do not necessarily mean that other critical audit matters should have been communicated in the auditor's report.

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.

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 with respect to testing controls will meet the requirements of AS 2201. (QC 20.03 and .17)

The inspection team identified deficiencies in the firm's testing of controls in two audits,³ both of which are included in Part I.A, related to testing the design and operating effectiveness of controls, including testing a control that included a review element. In addition, as discussed below (** * * * Reliance on Data and Reports*), the inspection team identified deficiencies in which the firm did not identify and test controls over the accuracy and completeness of data or reports that the issuer used in the operation of controls.

* * * *

Reliance on Data and Reports

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 establish a basis for reliance on data or reports will meet the requirements of AS 1105 and AS 2201. (QC 20.03 and .17)

³ Issuers A and B

In one audit,⁴ which is included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to unwarranted reliance on data and reports. In this audit, the firm did not test, or in the alternative, test controls over, the accuracy and completeness of certain data and reports that it used in its substantive testing. In addition, the firm did not identify and test controls over the accuracy and completeness of certain data or reports that the issuer used in the operation of controls that the firm tested.

* * * *

⁴ Issuer 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.



June 22, 2022

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

Dear Mr. Botic:

We appreciate the opportunity to submit our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB") draft report (the "Report") on the 2021 inspection of Wolf & Company, P.C. Our firm remains committed to the highest levels of audit quality and to that end has made, and will continue to make, significant investments in advancing quality in all that we do.

We have considered and evaluated the matters described in Part 1 of the Report and have addressed those matters in accordance with PCAOB standards. We continue to enhance our policies and procedures as part of our commitment to audit quality.

We reiterate our commitment to the integrity of the audit process and we continue to share the Board's objective of enhancing audit quality.

Sincerely,

Wolf & Company, P.C.

Wolf & Company, P.C.

MEMBER OF ALLINIAL GLOBAL,
AN ASSOCIATION OF LEGALLY INDEPENDENT FIRMS

255 STATE STREET, BOSTON, MA 02109
P: 617.439.9700

