

---

# 2022 Inspection Kronick Kalada Berdy & Co, P.C.

(Headquartered in Kingston, Pennsylvania)

May 11, 2023

**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. 104-2023-071A**

(Includes portions of Part II of the full report that were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2023-071)



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

2022 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2022 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 I.C: Independence.....	8
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control .....	10
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

## 2022 INSPECTION

In the 2022 inspection of Kronick Kalada Berdy & Co, 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.

### 2022 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 or 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 2022 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2022 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

	2022	2019
<b>Firm data</b>		
<b>Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	8	8
<b>Total engagement partners on issuer audit work<sup>1</sup></b>	3	2
<b>Audits reviewed</b>		
<b>Total audits reviewed</b>	2	2
<b>Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	2	2
<b>Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)</b>	0	0
<b>Audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	1	1
<b>Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	50%	50%

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.

<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, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*) during the twelve-month period preceding 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 2022 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.

2022		2019	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
A significant account	2	A significant account	1
Investment securities	1	Investment securities	1
		A significant estimate	1
		Participant distributions	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(s) on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR.

Part I.B discusses certain deficiencies, if any, that relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules other than those where the firm had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion(s). This section does not discuss instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence.

Part I.C discusses instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules, if any, related to maintaining independence.

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 audits 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 audits 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 audits 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 audits 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 audits 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 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

None

## Audits with a Single Deficiency

Issuer A

### Type of audit and related area affected

In our review, we identified a deficiency in the financial statement audit related to a **Significant Account**, for which the firm identified a fraud risk.

## Description of the deficiency identified

The sample size used to test a significant account was too small to provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence because the firm did not take into account the relevant factors in determining its sample size, including tolerable misstatement for the population, the allowable risk of incorrect acceptance, and the characteristics of the population, including the expected size and frequency of misstatements. (AS 2315.16, .19, .23, and .23A)

## PART I.B: OTHER INSTANCES OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH PCAOB STANDARDS OR RULES

This section of our report discusses certain deficiencies that relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules other than those where the firm had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion(s). This section does not discuss instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence.

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 two audits reviewed, the firm, when testing journal entries for evidence of possible material misstatement due to fraud, did not perform procedures to determine whether the journal entry population from which it made its selections was complete. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1105, *Audit Evidence*.
- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not make a required communication to the issuer's audit committee related to the issuer's critical accounting policies and practices. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not inquire of the issuer's audit committee about whether it was aware of matters relevant to the audit, including, but not limited to, violations or possible violations of laws or regulations. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not provide a copy of the management representation letter to the issuer's audit committee. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*, and AS 2805, *Management Representations*.
- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not inquire of the audit committee about the risks of material misstatement, including fraud risks. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2110, *Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement*.

- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not make certain required communications to the issuer’s audit committee related to its evaluation of the issuer’s identification of, accounting for, and disclosure of its relationships and transactions with related parties. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2410, *Related Parties*.
- In one audit, the engagement team performed procedures to determine whether or not matters were critical audit matters but, in performing those procedures, did not include 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 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*. This instance of non-compliance does 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 included language that was inconsistent with information in the firm’s audit documentation. 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 two audits reviewed, the firm did not discuss with the audit committee the potential effects of tax services on the independence of the firm and document the substance of its discussions. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3524, *Audit Committee Pre-Approval of Certain Tax Services*.

## PART I.C: INDEPENDENCE

This section of our report discusses instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence. An instance of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or an instance of non-compliance with PCAOB rules does not necessarily mean that the Board has concluded the firm was not objective and impartial throughout the audit and professional engagement period. Although this section includes instances of potential non-compliance that we identified, there may be other instances of non-compliance with SEC or PCAOB rules related to independence that were not identified through our procedures or the firm’s monitoring activities.

### PCAOB-Identified

We identified the following instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence:

Under Rule 2-01(c)(7) of Regulation S-X, an accountant is not independent if it does not obtain audit committee pre-approval for audit and non-audit services. We identified two instances for one issuer in one audit reviewed in which this circumstance appears to have occurred related to permissible tax services and certain audit services.

## Firm-Identified

The firm did not bring to our attention any instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence.

While the firm did not bring to our attention any instances of potential non-compliance, the number, large or small, of firm-identified instances of potential non-compliance may be reflective of the size of the firm, including the number of associated firms; the design and effectiveness of the firm's independence monitoring activities; and the size and/or complexity of the issuers it audits, including the number of affiliates of those issuers. Therefore, we caution against making any comparison of firm-identified instances of potential non-compliance across firms.

## 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.

### Communications with Audit Committees

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the firm's personnel will comply with the requirements of AS 1301, AS 2110, AS 2410, \* \* \* and PCAOB Rule 3524. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,<sup>2</sup> which is included in Part I.B, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to the firm's communications with the issuer's audit committee.

### 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 reviewers (EQR) will meet the requirements of AS 1220. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,<sup>3</sup> which is included in Part I.A and Part I.B, the inspection team identified deficiencies in areas that the EQR was required to evaluate. In this audit, the EQR partner did not identify a deficiency in an area in which the engagement team had identified a fraud risk. In addition, in this audit, the EQR partner did not identify a deficiency in the engagement team's (1) determination of whether or not matters were critical audit matters and (2) communication of a critical audit matter in the audit report.

\* \* \* \*

---

<sup>2</sup> Issuer A

<sup>3</sup> Issuer A

## 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.



**Kronick  
Kalada  
Berdy & Co.**  
*A Professional Corporation*

Certified Public Accountants

Officers/Shareholders

Deborah A. Eastwood, CPA  
Kevin R. Foley, CPA  
Mario Ercolani, CPA  
Anthony R. Caravaggio, CPA  
Ronald H. Ulitchney, CPA  
Louis E. Marcin, CPA  
Jason C. Williams, CPA

---

Donald M. Kronick, CPA  
Paul Berdy, CPA  
William R. Lazor, CPA/PFS, CFE  
William Fromel, CPA

**PUBLIC RESPONSE TO DRAFT REPORT OF INSPECTION**

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 Part I of the PCAOB's Draft Report on its  
2022 Inspection of Kronick Kalada Berdy & Co, P.C.

Dear Mr. Botic

Kronick Kalada Berdy & Co. P.C. is pleased to provide this response to Part I of the Draft Report (the "Draft Report") of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB") on the 2022 Inspection of "Kronick Kalada Berdy & Co, P.C. ("KKB" or the "Firm") and to assert that KKB is committed to maintaining the highest level of audit quality and that we fully support the PCAOB's inspection process.

We have thoroughly evaluated the matters described in Part I of the Draft Report and have taken steps to fulfil our responsibilities with PCAOB rules and auditing standards and our policies.

KKB respects the inspection process and we believe that, through formal communications and through interactions with PCAOB staff, it has led to improved audit quality. As we have after every inspection, we carefully considered the matters brought to our attention in connection with the 2022 inspection and have taken actions to enhance our policies and procedures as part of our commitment to the highest standards of audit quality.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our response and remain committed to improving audit quality.

Sincerely,

*Kronick Kalada Berdy & Co. P.C.*  
Kronick Kalada Berdy & Co. P.C.

---

190 Lathrop Street, Kingston, PA 18704 Phone: 570-283-2727 Fax: 570-283-1670

