
2021 Inspection Boyle CPA, LLC

(Headquartered in Bayville, New Jersey)

October 6, 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. 104-2022-232



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	8
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control	10
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

2021 INSPECTION

In the 2021 inspection of Boyle CPA, LLC 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 three audits of issuers with fiscal years generally ending in 2021. 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	33	8
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	1	1
Audits reviewed		
Total audits reviewed²	3	2
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	3	2
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	0	0
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	2	0

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
Revenue and related accounts	3	Revenue and related accounts	2
Financial reporting and close	1	Other investments	1
Debt	1	Related party transactions	1
Equity and equity-related transactions	1		
Going concern	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.

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

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to **Certain Significant Accounts, Revenue, Deferred Revenue, and Accounts Receivable**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Certain Significant Accounts**:

The firm did not perform any substantive procedures to test the significant accounts for one of the issuer's business units. (AS 2301.08)

The firm did not evaluate whether cash flows associated with these significant accounts were presented in conformity with GAAP. (AS 2810.30)

The firm did not identify, and appropriately address, a GAAP departure related to the issuer's omission of certain required disclosures related to this business unit. (AS 2810.30 and .31)

With respect to **Revenue** and **Deferred Revenue**:

The firm did not perform any substantive procedures to test revenue and deferred revenue. (AS 2301.08)

With respect to **Accounts Receivable**:

The firm sent positive confirmation requests to the issuer's customers for a sample of accounts receivable. For the items in its sample for which the requested confirmations were not returned, the firm did not perform alternative procedures that provided sufficient evidence that these balances represented valid receivable balances as of the confirmation date. (AS 2310.31)

The firm did not perform any substantive procedures to test the collectability of accounts receivable. (AS 2301.08)

Issuer B – Consumer Staples

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to **Revenue** and **Equity-Related Transactions**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Revenue**:

The firm did not perform any substantive procedures to test revenue. (AS 2301.08)

With respect to **Equity-Related Transactions**:

During the year, the issuer recorded various equity-related transactions that included stock-based compensation. The firm did not perform any substantive procedures to test these equity-related transactions. (AS 2301.08) In addition, the firm did not evaluate whether the issuer's stock-based compensation disclosures were in conformity with FASB ASC Topic 718, *Compensation – Stock Compensation*. (AS 2810.30 and .31)

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 reviewed and include any 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 assemble a complete and final set of audit documentation for retention within 45 days following the report release date. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1215, *Audit Documentation*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not obtain the engagement quality reviewer's concurring approval of issuance of the audit report prior to its issuance. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1220, *Engagement Quality Review*.
- In the three audits reviewed, the firm did not communicate to the issuer's audit committee equivalent all of the significant risks identified through its risk assessment procedures. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In two of three audits reviewed, the firm did not make certain required communications to the issuer's audit committee equivalent until after the issuance of the auditor's report. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not make certain required communications to the issuer's audit committee equivalent related to (1) the firm's evaluation of the issuer's ability to continue as a going concern and (2) uncorrected and corrected misstatements. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not communicate to the issuer's audit committee equivalent all critical accounting policies and practices used by the issuer. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In two audits, 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 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.

- In one audit, the firm's communication of a critical audit matter in the audit report did not accurately refer to the relevant financial statement disclosures that related to the critical audit matter. In this instance, 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*.
- In one of three audits reviewed, the firm did not provide the audit committee equivalent the required independence communications prior to accepting the audit. 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.

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 Board provided the firm an opportunity to review and comment on a draft of this report. The firm did not provide a written response.

