2024 Inspection Haskell & White LLP

(Headquartered in Irvine, California)

September 25, 2025

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. 104-2025-147

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2024 Inspection 2
Overview of the 2024 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 9
Appendix A: Firm's Response to the Draft Inspection Report A-1

2024 INSPECTION

In the 2024 inspection of Haskell & White 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, one with a fiscal year ending in 2024 and one with a fiscal year ending in 2023. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

2024 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 2024 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2024 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

	2024	2022
Firm data		
Total issuer audit clients in which the firm was the principal auditor	18	16
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work[1]	5	4
Audits reviewed		
Total audits reviewed	2	2
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	2	2
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	1	1
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	1	2
Percentage of audits with Part I.A deficiencies	50%	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.

[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.

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 2024 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.

2024		2022	
Audit area	**Audits reviewed**	**Audit area**	**Audits reviewed**
Revenue and related accounts	2	**Revenue and related accounts**	2
Leases	1	**Leases**	1
Inventory	1	**Goodwill and intangible assets**	1
		Accruals and other liabilities	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 area affected

In our review, we identified deficiencies in the financial statement and ICFR audits related to **Revenue and Related Accounts**, for which the firm identified a fraud risk.

Description of the deficiencies identified

The issuer used multiple information-technology (IT) systems to initiate, process, and record transactions related to revenue and related accounts. In its testing of controls over revenue and related accounts, the firm tested various automated and IT-dependent manual controls that used data and reports generated or maintained by these IT systems. As a result of the following audit deficiencies

related to the firm's testing of IT general controls (ITGCs), the firm's testing of these automated and IT-dependent manual controls was not sufficient. (AS 2201.46).

- The firm identified control deficiencies related to change management for one of the issuer's IT systems. The firm did not evaluate the severity of these control deficiencies, individually or in combination, to determine whether they represented a material weakness, beyond identifying a mitigating factor that did not address the risk that changes could be migrated into production without appropriate approval and testing. (AS 2201.62)

- The firm used certain system change reports to select its samples for testing certain ITGCs for these systems but did not test, or test any controls over, the completeness of these reports. (AS 1105.10)

The firm designed certain of its substantive procedures to test certain revenue as dual-purpose tests. The firm performed its substantive procedures using the sample size it determined for its control testing. This sample size was too small to provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence for the substantive procedure because the firm did not use the larger of the sample sizes that would otherwise have been designed for the two separate purposes. (AS 2315.44)

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 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, when testing journal entries for evidence of possible material misstatement due to fraud, did not appropriately consider the characteristics of potentially fraudulent journal entries in determining the criteria it used to identify and select

journal entries for testing. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2401, *Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit*.

- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm, when testing journal entries for evidence of possible material misstatement due to fraud, did not have an appropriate rationale for limiting its testing of entries it identified as having certain fraud risk characteristics to certain entries. In these instances, the firm was non-compliant with AS 2401, *Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit*.

- In one of two audits reviewed, the firm's report on Form AP omitted information related to the participation in the audit by other accounting firms. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with PCAOB Rule 3211, *Auditor Reporting of Certain Audit Participants*.

PART I.C: INDEPENDENCE

In the 2024 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.

HASKELLWHITE
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS | BUSINESS ADVISORS

THE VALUE OF EXPERIENCE

July 31, 2025

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

Public Response to Draft Report on 2024 Inspection of Haskell & White LLP

Ms. Gunia:

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to Part I of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB") Draft Report on the 2024 Inspection of Haskell & White LLP dated July 1, 2025 (the "Report"). We have thoughtfully evaluated the matters described in Part I of the Report and have taken appropriate actions to address the engagement-specific findings in accordance with PCAOB standards and our Firm's policies.

The PCAOB's inspection process consistently provides us with valuable insights that we use to improve the quality of our audits and the technical skills of our team members. Consistent with our Firm's long-standing "Operating Values" of Constant Learning and Excellence, we continue to support the PCAOB's inspection process and the resulting opportunity to improve our Firm's audit performance.

Specific actions we have taken to further promote a culture of audit quality and to improve audit performance include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Increased our knowledge of PCAOB standards: We have designed, implemented, and we maintain, a best-in-class PCAOB education program that includes annual department-wide training on a "core curriculum" of the most critical PCAOB standards, rotational training on less frequently applied PCAOB standards, mandatory completion of knowledge checks by all participants, and leadership by the Firm's partners and managers with supplemental instruction from former PCAOB inspectors. In addition, each of the Firm's partners has completed a tailored EQR "mentoring program" led by former PCAOB inspectors.

- Obtained additional PCAOB-specific technical expertise: We engaged a qualified, third-party consulting firm to advise our Firm on improving audit quality and to assist our Firm improve its application of PCAOB standards. This has been achieved through our implementation of improvements derived from challenging post-issuance reviews of audit documentation and relevant, direct feedback to audit engagement teams. Our limited use of pre-issuance reviews has also favorably impacted audit quality. These post-issuance and pre-issuance review services are provided to our Firm by professionals who possess experience as former PCAOB inspectors.

300 Spectrum Center Drive, Suite 300
Irvine, CA 92618
949.450.0200 Fax 949.450.0201
hwcpa.com

LEA global

4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 820
San Diego, CA 92122
858.429.5000 Fax 858.429.5100
hwcpa.com

- Enhanced resources utilized on PCAOB engagements: In addition to utilizing third-party experts to advise us on PCAOB compliance matters, we have added partner resources and information technology expertise to our audit department. We have also implemented best-in-class software tools to improve the nature and extent of our audit testing of journal entries.

As these actions demonstrate, we are committed to a culture of continuous improvement and increased audit quality. We also remain committed to working with the PCAOB to advance its mission to protect investors and further the public interest.

Very truly yours.

HASKELL & WHITE LLP