
2023 Inspection Rose, Snyder & Jacobs LLP

(Headquartered in Encino, California)

October 24, 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. 104-2024-172



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	9
Part I.C: Independence.....	9
Part II: Observations Related to Quality Control	10
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report.....	A-1

2023 INSPECTION

In the 2023 inspection of Rose, Snyder & Jacobs 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.

We selected for review two audits of issuers with fiscal years ending in 2022. For each 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	6	4
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	3	2
Audits reviewed		
Total audits reviewed	2	1
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	2	1
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	2	0
Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies	100%	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 internal control over financial reporting (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	2	Revenue and related accounts	1
Equity and equity-related transactions	1	Equity and equity-related transactions	1
Cash and cash equivalents	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(s) on the issuer's financial statements and/or ICFR.

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 – Health Care

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement and ICFR audits related to **Revenue**, **Accounts Receivable**, and **Journal Entries**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

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

The issuer's revenue included revenue recognized from contracts over time based on hours incurred to date relative to total estimated hours to complete. The following deficiencies were identified:

- The firm selected for testing controls that included the review of revenue. The firm did not evaluate the specific review procedures performed by the control owners to assess (i) that revenue was recognized in the appropriate period and (ii) the reasonableness of estimated hours to complete. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm selected for testing a control over the review of hours incurred. The firm did not evaluate the review procedures that the control owners performed, including the procedures to identify items for follow up and the procedures to determine whether those items were appropriately resolved. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm did not identify and test any controls over the accuracy and completeness of certain issuer-produced information used in the operation of the above controls. (AS 2201.39)
- The firm did not identify and test any controls over the identification of performance obligations in contracts, determination of the transaction price, and allocation of the transaction price to the identified performance obligations. (AS 2201.39)
- The firm selected for testing two controls that included the review of the presentation and disclosure of the financial statements. The firm did not evaluate the specific review procedures performed by the control owners to evaluate the reasonableness of a disclosure related to revenue. (AS 2201.42 and .44)
- The firm did not test, or (as discussed above) test controls over, the accuracy and completeness of issuer-produced information used in its substantive testing. (AS 1105.10)
- The firm did not perform procedures to test, or identify and test controls over, the accuracy and completeness of certain other issuer-produced information used in its substantive testing. (AS 1105.10)
- The firm did not perform procedures to test disclosures related to performance obligations expected to be recognized at year end and the periods over which the issuer expects to recognize those amounts beyond obtaining issuer-produced reports. (AS 2501.07)
- The firm did not perform procedures, beyond inquiry of management, to evaluate the reasonableness of significant assumptions related to estimated hours to complete. (AS 2501.16)

With respect to **Accounts Receivable**, for which the firm identified a significant risk:

The firm did not identify and test any controls over the existence and completeness of accounts receivable. (AS 2201.39)

The firm selected for testing two controls over the review of the allowance for doubtful accounts. The firm did not identify and test controls over the accuracy and completeness of the accounts receivable aging used in the operation of these two controls, beyond identifying and testing a control over the accurate aging of outstanding invoices. (AS 2201.39) In addition, with respect to the control over the accurate aging of outstanding invoices, the firm did not directly test this control because its procedures were substantive in nature. (AS 2201.42, .44, and .B9)

The firm sent positive confirmation requests to test accounts receivable. For certain positive confirmation requests for which it did not receive a response, the firm did not perform alternative procedures that provided sufficient appropriate audit evidence to address the existence and accuracy of the accounts receivable. (AS 2310.31)

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

The firm identified fraud criteria for journal entries. The firm did not perform sufficient procedures to test the journal entries that met the criteria, because it limited its procedures to certain journal entries without having an appropriate rationale. (AS 2401.61)

Issuer B – Health Care

Type of audit and related areas affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement audit related to **Revenue** and **Journal Entries**.

Description of the deficiencies identified

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

The firm did not perform procedures to test that the issuer satisfied its performance obligations prior to the recognition of revenue, beyond obtaining an issuer-produced report and issuer-produced data. (AS 2301.08 and .13)

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

The firm identified fraud criteria for journal entries. The firm did not perform sufficient procedures to test the journal entries that met the criteria, because it limited its procedures to certain journal entries without having an appropriate rationale. (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(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 both audits reviewed, the firm did not include all relevant work papers in the final set of audit documentation it was required to assemble. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1215, *Audit Documentation*.
- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm did not communicate to the audit committee all of the significant risks identified through its risk assessment procedures. 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 internal audit function about the risks of material misstatement. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2110, *Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement*.

PART I.C: INDEPENDENCE

In the 2023 inspection, we did not identify, and 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. Although this section does not include any instances of potential non-compliance that we identified or the firm brought to our attention, there may be 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.

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.

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.



September 16, 2024

Ms. Christine Gunia
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K St. NW
Washington, DC 20006-2803

Re: Response to draft report on the 2023 inspection of Rose, Snyder & Jacobs, LLP

Dear Ms. Gunia:

We are pleased to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or the "Board") regarding Part 1 of the Draft Report on 2023 inspection of Rose, Snyder and Jacobs LLP (the "Draft Report"). We believe that the PCAOB's inspection process serves an important role in the achievement of our shared objectives of improving audit quality and serving investors and the public interest.

As with any audit process, judgments are necessarily involved in the inspection process and professionals can reach different conclusions about the sufficiency and appropriateness of audit evidence in a particular circumstance. We believe the totality of the audit work performed, with respect to the audits described in Part 1 of the Draft Report, supported our opinions on the financial statements and internal controls over financial reporting.

The PCAOB's inspection process assists us in identifying areas where we can continue to improve audit quality. We respect and benefit from this process as it aids us in fulfilling our responsibility to make all aspects of our auditing and quality control processes of the highest quality in the interest of investors.

Respectfully submitted,

Rose, Snyder and Jacobs LLP

15821 VENTURA BOULEVARD, SUITE 490, ENCINO, CALIFORNIA 91436
PHONE: (818) 461-0600 • FAX: (818) 461-0610

 Russell Bedford
Helping you thrive
Member of Russell Bedford International –
a global network of independent
professional services firms

