



1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 207-9100
Facsimile: (202) 862-8430
www.pcaobus.org

Inspection of Michael R Ferraro CPA

**Issued by the
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board**

April 6, 2006

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. 104-2006-104A
(Includes portions of Parts II and IV of the full report that
were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2006-104)



Notes Concerning this Report

1. Portions of this report may describe deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct of the firm that is the subject of this report. The express inclusion of certain deficiencies and potential deficiencies, however, should not be construed to support any negative inference that any other aspect of the firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct is approved or condoned by the Board or judged by the Board to comply with laws, rules, and professional standards.
2. Any references in this report to violations or potential violations of law, rules, or professional standards should be understood in the supervisory context in which this report was prepared. Any such references are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings of fact or of violations for purposes of imposing legal liability. Similarly, any description herein of a firm's cooperation in addressing issues constructively should not be construed, and is not construed by the Board, as an admission, for purposes of potential legal liability, of any violation.
3. Board inspections encompass, among other things, whether the firm has failed to identify departures from Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") in its audits of financial statements. This report's descriptions of any such auditing failures necessarily involve descriptions of the related GAAP departures. The Board, however, has no authority to prescribe the form or content of an issuer's financial statements. That authority, and the authority to make binding determinations concerning an issuer's compliance with GAAP, rests with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission"). Any description, in this report, of perceived departures from GAAP should not be understood as an indication that the Commission has considered or made any determination regarding these GAAP issues unless otherwise expressly stated.



INSPECTION OF MICHAEL R FERRARO CPA

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") has conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Michael R Ferraro CPA ("the Firm"). The Board is issuing this report of that inspection in accordance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

The Board is making portions of the report publicly available. Specifically, the Board is releasing to the public Part I of the report and portions of Part IV of the report. Part IV of the report consists of the Firm's comments, if any, on a draft of the report.^{1/}

The Board has elsewhere described in detail its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions.^{2/} A substantial portion of the Board's criticisms of a firm (specifically criticisms of the firm's quality control system), and the Board's dialogue with the firm about those criticisms, occurs out of public view, unless the firm fails to make progress to the Board's satisfaction in addressing those criticisms. In addition, the Board generally does not disclose otherwise nonpublic information, learned through inspections, about the firm or its clients. Accordingly, information in those categories generally does not appear in the publicly available portion of an inspection report.

^{1/} The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report. 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 at all. The Board notes that it routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any of a firm's comments that identify factually inaccurate statements in the draft that the Board corrects in the final report.

^{2/} See Statement Concerning the Issuance of Inspection Reports, PCAOB Release No. 104-2004-001 (August 26, 2004).

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted fieldwork for the inspection from May 23, 2005 to May 25, 2005. The fieldwork included procedures tailored to the nature of the Firm, certain aspects of which the inspection team understood at the outset of the inspection to be as follows:

Number of offices	1 (Matawan, New Jersey)
Ownership structure	Sole proprietorship
Number of partners	1
Number of professional staff ^{3/}	3
Number of issuer audit clients ^{4/}	1

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audits. To achieve that goal, Board inspections include reviews of certain aspects of selected audits performed by the firm and reviews of other matters related to the firm's quality control system.

In the course of reviewing aspects of selected audits, an inspection may identify ways in which a particular audit is deficient, including failures by the firm to identify, or to address appropriately, respects in which an issuer's financial statements do not present

^{3/} "Professional staff" includes all personnel of the Firm, except partners or shareholders and administrative support personnel. The number of partners and professional staff is provided here as an indication of the size of the Firm, and does not necessarily represent the number of the Firm's professionals who participate in audits of issuers or are "associated persons" (as defined in the Act) of the Firm.

^{4/} The number of issuer audit clients shown here is based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information for inspection planning purposes. It does not reflect any Board determination concerning which, or how many, of the Firm's audit clients are "issuers" as defined in the Act.

fairly the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP.^{5/} It is not the purpose of an inspection, however, to review all of a firm's audits or to identify every respect in which a reviewed audit is deficient. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that the firm's audits, or its issuer clients' financial statements, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

A. Review of Audit Engagement

The scope of the inspection procedures performed included a review of aspects of the performance of the Firm's audit of the financial statements of its issuer audit client. Those aspects were selected according to the Board's criteria, and the Firm was not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the selection process.

The inspection team identified matters that it considered to be audit deficiencies.^{6/} The deficiencies identified in the audit reviewed included a deficiency of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm did not obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements. That deficiency was the failure to perform and document sufficient testing of the allowance for loan losses.

^{5/} When it comes to the Board's attention that an issuer's financial statements appear not to present fairly, in a material respect, the financial position, results of operations or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP, the Board reports that information to the SEC, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

^{6/} PCAOB standards require a firm to take appropriate actions to assess the importance of audit deficiencies identified after the date of the audit report to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed opinions. See AU 390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and AU 561, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report* (both included among the PCAOB's interim auditing standards, pursuant to PCAOB Rule 3200T). Failure to comply with these PCAOB standards could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions.

B. Review of Quality Control System

In addition to evaluating the quality of the audit work performed on a specific audit, the inspection included review of certain of the Firm's practices, policies and procedures related to audit quality. This review addressed practices, policies and procedures concerning audit performance, training, compliance with independence standards, client acceptance and retention, and the establishment of policies and procedures. As described above, any defects in, or criticisms of, the Firm's quality control system are discussed in the nonpublic portion of this report and will remain nonpublic unless the Firm fails to address them to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the date of this report.

END OF PART I



PCAOB Release No. 104-2006-104A
Inspection of Michael R. Ferraro, CPA
April 6, 2006
Page 5

PORTIONS OF THE REST OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC AND ARE OMITTED
FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

PART II

* * * *

B. Issues Related to Quality Controls

The inspection of the Firm included consideration of aspects of the Firm's system of quality control. Assessment of a firm's quality control system rests both on review of a firm's stated quality control policies and procedures and on inferences that can be drawn from respects in which a firm's system has failed to assure quality in the actual performance of engagements.^{7/} On the basis of the information reported by the inspection team, the Board has the following concerns about aspects of the Firm's system of quality control.

1. Audit Performance

A firm's system of quality control should provide reasonable assurance that the work performed on an audit engagement will meet applicable professional standards and regulatory requirements. On the basis of the information reported by the inspection team, including the audit performance deficiency described in Part II.A and any other deficiencies identified below, the Board has concerns that the Firm's system of quality control fails to provide such reasonable assurance in at least the following respects –

a. Technical Competence, Due Care, and Professional Skepticism

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to do enough to ensure technical competence and the exercise of due care or professional skepticism.

b. Concurring Partner Review

Questions exist about the effectiveness of the Firm's existing arrangement for concurring partner reviews. Having procedures for concurring partner review by a competent reviewer is an important element of quality control. Such reviews should

^{7/} A firm's failure to comply with the requirements of PCAOB standards when performing an audit may be an indication of a potentially significant defect in a firm's quality control system even if that failure did not result in an insufficiently supported audit opinion.

involve the performance of appropriate procedures using due care and professional skepticism, with the Firm appropriately addressing the reviewer's findings and documenting the process. The Firm used the services of an accountant not affiliated with the Firm to perform the concurring partner review of the issuer audit included in the inspection. The information reported by the inspection team suggests that there is no evidence that the concurring partner review procedure used by the Firm resulted in the identification of the deficiency noted by the inspection team. This may result from a lack of competency, due care or professional skepticism on the part of the concurring partner; deficiencies in the scope of the concurring partner's procedures; and/or the Firm's failure to properly address the concurring partner findings. Apparent deficiencies in documentation of the scope and results of the concurring partner's reviews preclude the Board from determining the relative contribution of each of these potential causes to the failure of the concurring partner process to prevent the deficiency reported by the inspection team.

* * * *

PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO 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 provided a written response.

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act 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 of a firm's comments that identify factually inaccurate statements in the draft that the Board corrects in the final report.

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the Firm's response, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report. In any version of this report that the Board makes publicly available, any portions of the Firm's response that address nonpublic portions of the report are omitted.

MICHAEL R. FERRARO

CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT

278 ROUTE 34
MATAWAN, NJ 07747

MICHAEL R. FERRARO
MEMBER OF AICPA, NJSCPA

(732) 583-6500
FAX (732) 583-0559
mrfcpa@optonline.net

December 19, 2005

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Attention: George H. Diacont, Director
Division of Registrations and Inspections

Gentlemen:

Re: Written response to Draft Report of Inspection

In reply to: The PCAOB's Draft Report of Issuer A,
Part I-Inspection Procedures and Certain Observations

A. Review of Audit Engagement: Audit deficiency in regards to failure to perform and document sufficient testing of the allowance for loan losses.

I disagree with this position on adequacy of audit workpapers in regard to the allowance for loan losses. My workpapers include a very extensive review of the loan portfolio and audit steps necessary to determine the soundness of the loan portfolio and the adequacy of the collateral and the collectibility of the loans. I realize the reserve set up by management for the allowance for loan losses is very subjective. My review of this account may have seemed inadequate by the inspection team, but my experience with this client for over 20 years and with my background in public accounting for over 30 years, I feel this must be considered when it becomes a judgment call on the adequacy of the reserve. Besides my schedule on computing the reserve of loan losses, I have taken into consideration management's position on the loans and their best estimate on the impact of them on the reserve and management's conservative position of estimating the reserve on the high end of the range.

I also considered management's position on the reserve for loan losses to its peers. In regard to this matter, I have attached for your review the issuer's position on this and the Uniform Bank Performance Report of June 30, 2005.

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
Page Two
December 19, 2005

I also had a certain comfort level with the allowance for loan losses based on the extensive review of the various agencies that also reviewed it in the past and did not criticize the reserve. The FDIC and State Banking authorities have extensively reviewed the issuer's loan portfolio and the allowance for loan losses over the past years and have never found fault with the accounting estimate.

My previous concurrent reviewers of this audit and my peer reviews since the early 1990's did not find fault with my audit of the allowance for loan losses.

Finally, because the inspectors felt that my firm did not document enough in regard to the allowance for loan losses, I intend to go back to my audit files and explain my position and document it better. Future audits will have more supporting documents for the allowance for loan losses and the basis of the percentages used in the calculation of the allocated and the unallocated loan loss reserve, so that outside parties can better understand the thought processes of the audit.

Part II - Detailed Discussion of Inspection Results:

REDACTED

Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report

REDACTED

Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report

B. Issues Related to Quality Controls

As previously mentioned, I intend to go back to my audit files and explain my position and document it better. In the future, my audits will have more supporting documents for the allowance for loan losses and the basis of the percentages used in the calculation of the allocated and the unallocated loan loss reserve.

In regard to my concurring review by another firm, over the past 15 years I have used three different concurring review firms, none of whom ever questioned my audit work papers in reference to allowance for loan loss reserves. The present firm has over 20 years in auditing financial institutions and I felt was qualified to review my audit engagement. Since the issuance of the draft report of inspection, I have since sent a copy of this report and I have had dialogue with them in regard to this issue on allowance for loan losses. In the next few weeks, I am meeting with my concurrent reviewer and intend to discuss with him the necessary improvements to be made in documenting my audit on the allowance for loan losses.


REDACTED

Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report

REDACTED

Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report

Respectfully submitted:



Michael R Ferraro CPA

REDACTED

Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report