

---

# 2022 Inspection MNP LLP

(Headquartered in Calgary, Canada)

May 23, 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. 104-2024-086



# 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 .....	5
Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules .....	5
Part I.C: Independence.....	6
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control .....	8
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

## 2022 INSPECTION

In the 2022 inspection of MNP LLP, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) assessed the firm's compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of public companies. Our inspection was conducted in cooperation with the Canadian Public Accountability Board.

We selected for review two audits of issuers with fiscal years 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.

### 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>	31	32
<b>Total issuer audits in which the firm was not the principal auditor</b>	2	0
<b>Total engagement partners on issuer audit work<sup>1</sup></b>	18	15
<b>Audits reviewed</b>		
<b>Total audits reviewed</b>	2	3
<b>Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor</b>	2	3
<b>Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)</b>	0	0
<b>Audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	0	2
<b>Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies</b>	0%	67%

<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*) or for the firm's role in an issuer audit during the twelve-month period preceding the outset of the inspection.

## Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 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
Revenue and related accounts	2	Revenue and related accounts	3
Cash and cash equivalents	1	Cash and cash equivalents	3
Business combinations	1	Business combinations	2
Goodwill and intangible assets	1	Investment securities	1
		A significant estimate	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, (1) 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 or (2) in audit(s) in which it was not the principal auditor, had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit.

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) or fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(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.

### PART I.A: AUDITS WITH UNSUPPORTED OPINIONS

In the 2022 inspection, we did not identify any deficiencies that were of such significance that we believe the firm, at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements.

### 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) or fulfill the objectives of its role in the audit(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 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 deficiency:

In one audit reviewed, the firm did not make a required communication to the issuer's audit committee related to the name, location, and planned responsibilities of other accounting firms and other persons not employed by the firm that performed audit procedures in the audit. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.

## 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 the firm brought to our attention, 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 did not identify any instances of potential non-compliance with SEC rules or instances of non-compliance with PCAOB rules related to maintaining independence.

### Firm-Identified

During the inspection, the firm brought to our attention that it had identified, through its independence monitoring activities, 21 instances across three issuers<sup>2</sup> in which the firm appeared to have impaired its independence because it may not have complied with Rule 2-01(b) or Rule 2-01(c) of Regulation S-X or PCAOB Rule 3523 related to maintaining independence.

While we have not evaluated the underlying reasons for the 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 any 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 these firm-identified instances of potential non-compliance across firms.

The instances of potential non-compliance related to indemnification clauses in engagement letters, audit committee pre-approval, and tax services for a person in a financial reporting oversight role:

- The firm reported 14 instances of potential non-compliance with Rule 2-01(c)(7) of Regulation S-X regarding audit committee pre-approval.

---

<sup>2</sup> The firm-identified instances of potential non-compliance do not necessarily relate to the issuer audits that we selected for review.

- The firm reported three instances of potential non-compliance with the general standard of independence set out in Rule 2-01(b) of Regulation S-X regarding an audit client's agreement to indemnify its auditor with respect to certain liabilities.
- The firm reported four instances of non-compliance with PCAOB Rule 3523 regarding tax services provided to a person in a financial reporting oversight role at the issuer.

The firm has reported to us that it has evaluated these instances of potential non-compliance and determined in all instances that its objectivity and impartiality were not impaired.



## PART II: OBSERVATIONS RELATED TO QUALITY CONTROL

Part II of our report discusses criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control.

We include deficiencies in Part II if an analysis of the inspection results, including the results of the reviews of individual audits, indicates that the firm's system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that firm personnel will comply with applicable professional standards and requirements. Generally, the report's description of quality control criticisms is based on observations from our inspection procedures.

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

When we issue our reports, we do not make public criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control, to the extent any are identified. If a firm does not address to the Board's satisfaction any criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm's system of quality control within 12 months after the issuance of our report, we will make public any such deficiency.

## APPENDIX A: FIRM'S RESPONSE TO THE DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the firm's response, excluding any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.

The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.

In addition, pursuant to Section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm's response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.



April 4, 2024

Ms. Christine Gunia  
Acting Director  
Division of Registration and Inspections  
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board  
1666 K Street NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
USA

Re: MNP LLP Response to PCAOB Draft Report of Inspection

Dear Ms. Gunia,

We appreciate the opportunity to provide the following response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's (PCAOB) draft report of the 2022 inspection of MNP LLP.

We remain dedicated to investing in our system of quality management, with the recent implementation of the Canadian Standards of Quality Management (which are fully converged with the International Standards on Quality Management 1 and 2). We continue to monitor the effectiveness of our systems of quality management to ensure the consistent execution of high-quality audits and compliance with both professional standards and our internal policies. Where necessary, we amend our policies and processes to enhance audit quality.

We appreciate and respect the role played by the PCAOB in protecting the public interest and its inspection process which assists in the overall goal of achieving high audit quality.

Sincerely,  
MNP LLP

Jason Tuffs, CPA, CA  
Chief Executive Officer

MNP LLP  
Suite 2000, 330 - 5th Avenue SW, Calgary AB, T2P 0L4

T: 403.444.0150 F: 403.444.0198



MNP.ca

