
2023 Inspection Raul Carrega, CPA

(Headquartered in Newport Beach, California)

March 21, 2024

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. 104-2024-060A

(Includes portions of Part II of the full report that were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2024-060)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

2023 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2023 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 I.C: Independence.....	9
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control	11
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

2023 INSPECTION

In the 2023 inspection of Raul Carrega, CPA, 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 one audit of an issuer with a fiscal year ending in 2021. For the issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

2023 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 2023 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2023 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

	2023	2020
Firm data		
Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the principal auditor	1	1
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	1	1
Audits reviewed		
Total audits reviewed	1	1
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	1	1
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	0	0
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	1	1
Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies	100%	100%

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.

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

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.

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 2023 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.

2023		2020	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Revenue and related accounts	1	Revenue and related accounts	1
Debt	1	Debt	1
Derivatives	1	Derivatives	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 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) and industry sector. 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

Issuer A – Industrials

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to **Revenue**, **Convertible Debt**, **Derivative Liabilities**, and **Journal Entries**. The firm's internal inspection program inspected this audit and reviewed certain of these areas but did not identify the deficiencies below.

Description of the deficiencies identified

With respect to **Revenue**, for which the firm identified a fraud risk:

To test revenue, the firm selected revenue transactions that exceeded a monetary threshold. The following deficiencies were identified:

- For the selected transactions, the firm did not perform any substantive procedures to test whether the issuer's performance obligations had been satisfied when revenue was recognized. (AS 2301.08 and .13)
- The firm did not perform any procedures to test the remaining revenue transactions. (AS 1105.27; AS 2301.08 and .13)

The firm did not identify and evaluate departures from GAAP related to the issuer's omission of certain disclosures related to revenue that were required by FASB ASC Topic 606, *Revenue from Contracts with Customers*. (AS 2810.30 and .31)

With respect to **Convertible Debt**, for which the firm identified a significant risk:

The issuer issued convertible debt during the current and prior years. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm did not perform any procedures to evaluate the issuer's equity classification of and accounting for (1) warrants and (2) embedded conversion options associated with certain convertible debt. (AS 2301.08 and .11)
- The firm did not perform any procedures to test the intrinsic value of the beneficial conversion feature associated with certain convertible debt at the date of issuance. (AS 2301.08 and .11)
- The firm did not perform any procedures to test the amortization of debt discount associated with certain convertible debt. (AS 2301.08 and .11)
- The firm did not identify and evaluate errors related to convertible debt in the issuer's consolidated statement of shareholders' deficit and consolidated statement of cash flows. (AS 2810.30 and .31)
- The firm did not identify and evaluate errors in the issuer's convertible debt disclosures. (AS 2810.30 and .31)

To test convertible debt, the firm's substantive procedures included confirmation of the balances. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The issuer sent the confirmation requests on behalf of the firm. The firm did not maintain control of the confirmation requests through direct communication with the intended recipients of the confirmation requests. (AS 2310.28)
- The firm received electronic responses to certain confirmation requests. The firm did not consider performing procedures to address the risks associated with electronic responses, such as verifying the source and contents of the confirmation responses. (AS 2310.29)

- For certain of the confirmation requests that were not returned, the firm did not perform alternative procedures that provided sufficient appropriate audit evidence that the recorded amounts of the convertible debt were accurate as of the confirmation date. (AS 2310.31)
- For certain other confirmation requests that were not returned, the firm did not perform alternative procedures. (AS 2310.31)

With respect to **Derivative Liabilities**, for which the firm identified a significant risk:

The issuer reported derivative liabilities at fair value. The firm's approach for testing the fair value of the derivative liabilities was to test the issuer's process. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm did not evaluate whether the model the issuer used to develop the fair value was in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework and appropriate for the nature of the related account. (AS 2501.10)
- The firm did not perform any substantive procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of a significant assumption developed by the issuer. (AS 2501.16)

With respect to **Journal Entries**, for which the firm identified a fraud risk:

The firm identified fraud criteria for journal entries and obtained a listing of all journal entries that met the criteria. The firm did not perform sufficient substantive procedures to test those journal entries, because it limited its procedures to certain journal entries, without having an appropriate rationale for limiting its testing to those journal entries. (AS 2401.61)

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 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. 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. 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 the audit 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 the audit reviewed, the firm did not make any of the required communications to the entire audit committee. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In the audit reviewed, the firm did not include a required matter related to its responsibilities in the engagement letter. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.
- In the audit reviewed, the firm did not provide a copy of the management representation letter to the entire audit committee. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*, and AS 2805, *Management Representations*.
- In the audit reviewed, the firm did not provide to management and the audit committee the required communications in writing of all material weaknesses identified during the audit. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1305, *Communications About Control Deficiencies in an Audit of Financial Statements*.
- In the audit reviewed, the year the firm began serving consecutively as the company's auditor that was included in the firm's audit report was incorrect. 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 the audit reviewed, the engagement team did not perform any procedures to comply with the requirements related to critical audit matters. 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 the audit reviewed, the firm did not provide the entire audit committee the required independence communications. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3526, *Communication with Audit Committees Concerning Independence*.

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 an instance 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. In one audit reviewed, we identified one instance for one issuer in which this circumstance appears to have occurred related to audit services, including quarterly reviews.

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.

Technical Competence

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the firm assigns work to personnel who have the technical training and proficiency required by PCAOB standards. (QC 20.03, .13, and .17)

In one audit,² which is included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies that were attributable, at least in part, to the engagement personnel lacking sufficient technical knowledge, experience, or training necessary to enable them to fulfill the responsibilities of the work assigned. Specifically, the engagement personnel did not have an appropriate understanding of the relevant accounting and PCAOB standards.

Evaluating Conformity with GAAP

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 evaluating whether the issuer's financial statements were presented in conformity with GAAP will meet the requirements of AS 2810. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,³ which is included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to the firm not identifying and evaluating GAAP departures related to (1) the issuer's omission of certain disclosures related to revenue and (2) errors related to convertible debt in the consolidated financial statements and disclosures.

² Issuer A

³ Issuer A

Testing Revenue

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 revenue will meet the requirements of AS 1105 and AS 2301. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,⁴ which is included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to the firm's testing of revenue.

Testing Convertible Debt

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 convertible debt will meet the requirements of AS 2301. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,⁵ which is included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to the firm's testing of convertible debt.

Testing Estimates, Including Fair Value Measurements

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 estimates, including fair value measurements, will meet the requirements of AS 2501. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,⁶ which is included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to the firm's evaluation of the (1) reasonableness of a significant assumption and (2) appropriateness of the model used to develop an estimate.

Confirmation Procedures

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 confirmation procedures will comply with the requirements of AS 2310. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,⁷ which is included in Part I.A, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to the firm's confirmation procedures.

⁴ Issuer A

⁵ Issuer A

⁶ Issuer A

⁷ Issuer A

Fraud Procedures

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the firm's personnel will perform the procedures necessary to comply with AS 1105 and AS 2401 related to journal entries. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,⁸ which is included in Part I.A and Part I.B, the inspection team identified deficiencies related to the firm's fraud procedures with respect to testing journal entries. In addition, in this audit, the firm did not perform procedures to obtain an understanding of the issuer's financial reporting process and the controls over journal entries and other adjustments.

Critical Audit Matters

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 3101 with respect to critical audit matters. (QC 20.03 and .17)

In one audit,⁹ which is included in Part I.B, the firm did not perform any procedures to comply with the requirements related to critical audit matters.

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,¹⁰ 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 did not identify a deficiency in an area in which the engagement team had identified a significant risk, including in some cases a fraud risk. In addition, in this audit, the EQR did not identify that the engagement team did not perform any procedures to comply with the requirements related to critical audit matters.

Practice Monitoring

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the firm is effectively monitoring its accounting and auditing practice. (QC 20.20)

⁸ Issuer A

⁹ Issuer A

¹⁰ Issuer A

The firm uses internal inspections as monitoring procedures of its accounting and auditing practice. The PCAOB reviewed one issuer audit¹¹ that had also been reviewed under the firm's internal inspection program. In this audit where certain of the same areas were reviewed, the PCAOB identified Part I.A deficiencies that were not detected by the internal inspectors.

Independence

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the firm and its personnel will comply with independence-related regulatory requirements. (QC 20.03, .09, and .10)

In one audit,¹² which is included in Part I.C, the firm appeared not to have satisfied an applicable independence-related regulatory requirement.

Assignment of EQR

The inspection results indicate that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that the firm will assign EQR responsibilities to personnel who have the competence, independence, integrity, and objectivity necessary, in accordance with QC 20, to perform the engagement quality review in accordance with the standards of the PCAOB. (QC 20.03, .12, .13, .17, and .18)

The firm does not have policies and procedures over the assignment of EQRs to issuer audit work that are intended to establish that the EQR has sufficient competence, independence, integrity, and objectivity to perform the engagement quality review. In addition, in one audit,¹³ the EQR was the son of the engagement partner, which could have adversely affected whether the EQR had sufficient objectivity to perform the engagement quality review in accordance with the standards of the PCAOB.

* * * *

¹¹ Issuer A

¹² Issuer A

¹³ 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 Board provided the firm an opportunity to review and comment on a draft of this report. The firm did not provide a written response.

