

**Report on**

**2015 Inspection of MaloneBailey, LLP  
(Headquartered in Houston, Texas)**

**Issued by the**

**Public Company Accounting Oversight Board**

**July 28, 2016**

**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**



## 2015 INSPECTION OF MALONEBAILEY, LLP

### Preface

In 2015, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm MaloneBailey, LLP ("the Firm") pursuant to the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

Inspections are designed and performed to provide a basis for assessing the degree of compliance by a firm with applicable requirements related to auditing issuers. For a description of the procedures the Board's inspectors may perform to fulfill this responsibility, see Part I.D of this report (which also contains additional information concerning PCAOB inspections generally). The inspection included reviews of portions of selected issuer audits. These reviews were intended to identify whether deficiencies existed in the reviewed work, and whether such deficiencies indicated defects or potential defects in the Firm's system of quality control over audits. In addition, the inspection included a review of policies and procedures related to certain quality control processes of the Firm that could be expected to affect audit quality.

The Board is issuing this report in accordance with the requirements of the Act. The Board is releasing to the public Part I of the report, portions of Appendix A, Appendix B, and Appendix C. Appendix A consists of the Firm's comments, if any, on a draft of the report. If the nonpublic portions of the report discuss criticisms of or potential defects in the Firm's system of quality control, those discussions also could eventually be made public, but only to the extent the Firm fails to address the criticisms to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the issuance of the report. Appendix B presents the text of the paragraphs of the auditing standards that are referenced in Part I.A in relation to the description of auditing deficiencies there.

*Note on this report's citations to auditing standards:* On March 31, 2015, the PCAOB adopted a reorganization of its auditing standards using a topical structure and a single, integrated numbering system. See *Reorganization of PCAOB Auditing Standards and Related Amendments to PCAOB Standards and Rules*, PCAOB Release No. 2015-002 (Mar. 31, 2015). The reorganization will be effective as of December 31, 2016, but the reorganized numbering system may be used before that date. In this report, citations to PCAOB auditing standards use the numbering system and titles of standards that were in effect at the time of the primary inspection procedures. A table cross-referencing the section numbers of those standards included in Part I of this report as reorganized is included at Appendix C.

## **PART I**

### **INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS**

Members of the Board's staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures<sup>1</sup> for the inspection from September 21, 2015 to October 2, 2015. The inspection team performed field work at the Firm's headquarters in Houston, Texas.

#### **A. Review of Audit Engagements**

The inspection procedures included reviews of portions of ten issuer audits performed by the Firm. The inspection team identified matters that it considered to be deficiencies in the performance of the work it reviewed.

The descriptions of the deficiencies in Part I.A of this report include, at the end of the description of each deficiency, references to specific paragraphs of the auditing standards that relate to those deficiencies. The text of those paragraphs is set forth in Appendix B to this report. The references in this sub-Part include only standards that primarily relate to the deficiencies; they do not present a comprehensive list of every auditing standard that applies to the deficiencies. Further, certain broadly applicable aspects of the auditing standards that may be relevant to a deficiency, such as provisions requiring due professional care, including the exercise of professional skepticism; the accumulation of sufficient appropriate audit evidence; and the performance of procedures that address risks, are not included in the references to the auditing standards in this sub-Part, unless the lack of compliance with these standards is the primary reason for the deficiency. These broadly applicable provisions are described in Part I.B of this report.

---

<sup>1</sup> For this purpose, the time span for "primary procedures" includes field work, other review of audit work papers, and the evaluation of the Firm's quality control policies and procedures through review of documentation and interviews of Firm personnel. The time span does not include (1) inspection planning, which may commence months before the primary procedures, and (2) inspection follow-up procedures, wrap-up, analysis of results, and the preparation of the inspection report, which generally extend beyond the primary procedures.

Certain of the deficiencies identified were of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm, at the time it issued its audit report, had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion that the financial statements were presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. In other words, in these audits, the auditor issued an opinion without satisfying its fundamental obligation to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements were free of material misstatement.

The fact that one or more deficiencies in an audit reach this level of significance does not necessarily indicate that the financial statements are misstated. It is often not possible for the inspection team, based only on the information available from the auditor, to reach a conclusion on those points.

Whether or not associated with a disclosed financial reporting misstatement, an auditor's failure to obtain the reasonable assurance that the auditor is required to obtain is a serious matter. It is a failure to accomplish the essential purpose of the audit, and it means that, based on the audit work performed, the audit opinion should not have been issued.<sup>2</sup>

The audit deficiencies that reached this level of significance are described in Part I.A.1 through I.A.2 below.

---

<sup>2</sup> Inclusion in an inspection report does not mean that the deficiency remained unaddressed after the inspection team brought it to the firm's attention. Depending upon the circumstances, compliance with PCAOB standards may require the firm to perform additional audit procedures, or to inform a client of the need for changes to its financial statements or reporting on internal control, or to take steps to prevent reliance on its previously expressed audit opinions. The Board expects that firms will comply with these standards, and an inspection may include a review of the adequacy of a firm's compliance with these requirements, either with respect to previously identified deficiencies or deficiencies identified during that inspection. Failure by a firm to take appropriate actions, or a firm's misrepresentations in responding to an inspection report about whether it has taken such actions, could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions.

*Effects on Audit Opinions*

Of the two issuer audits that appear in Part I.A, deficiencies relate to the substantive testing performed for purposes of the opinion on the financial statement audit only.

*Audit Deficiencies*

A.1. Issuer A

In this audit, the Firm's work papers contained a contract entered into between the issuer and another entity during the year under audit for the purchase of another company subject to certain conditions. The issuer made advances under the contract and reported these advances as capital distributions. In addition, the issuer represented to the Firm that it was likely the purchase of the company would be completed. In the audit of the financial statements –

- The Firm failed to identify and appropriately address a departure from generally accepted accounting principles that appeared to the inspection team to be material in the issuer's audited financial statements concerning payments made by certain of the issuer's customers directly to the other company, on the issuer's behalf, in amounts the customers owed the issuer, to fund the advances due under the contract described above. These payments should have been reported as non-cash transactions in the issuer's statement of cash flows or notes to the financial statements in conformity with Financial Accounting Standards Board Accounting Standards Codification Topic 230, *Statement of Cash Flows*. The issuer, however, reported these payments as cash inflows from operating activities and cash outflows from financing activities, resulting in overstatements of net cash provided by operating activities and net cash used in financing activities. (AS No. 14, paragraphs 30 and 31)
- The Firm otherwise failed to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its audit opinion. Specifically, there was no evidence in the audit documentation, and no persuasive other evidence, that the Firm, in evaluating the accounting for the advances as capital distributions, had performed procedures, beyond inquiry of management, to evaluate the likelihood that the conditions necessary for the completion of the acquisition would occur. (AS No. 14, paragraph 30)

A.2. Issuer B

In this audit, the Firm failed to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its audit opinion on the financial statements, as its procedures to test the issuer's fair value measurements of restricted shares of common stock issued related to a debt conversion and unrestricted stock issued in connection with consulting services were insufficient. Specifically, the Firm's work papers documented that it used the "asking average sales price" of a shell company in developing an independent fair value estimate, however, the Firm failed to perform procedures to support the reasonableness of the significant assumptions in its estimate, including the assumptions that (1) shell companies were a relevant peer group when the issuer was an operating company, (2) the shell companies used as a peer group had readily determinable and reliable values, and (3) no adjustment was required for the restriction on the common stock issued related to the debt conversion. In addition, with respect to the shares issued for consulting services, the Firm failed to sufficiently evaluate the difference between the issuer's recorded amount and the Firm's independent estimate of fair value. Specifically, the Firm concluded that the issuer's estimate was more conservative as it resulted in a higher expense amount being recognized. As a result, the Firm concluded the difference was immaterial even though it was more than six times the Firm's established planning materiality. (AU 328, paragraph .40)

**B. Auditing Standards**

Each deficiency described in Part I.A above could relate to several provisions of the standards that govern the conduct of audits. The paragraphs of the standards that are cited for each deficiency are those that most directly relate to the deficiency. The deficiencies also may relate, however, to other paragraphs of those standards and to other auditing standards, including those concerning due professional care, responses to risk assessments, and audit evidence.

Many audit deficiencies involve a lack of due professional care. AU 230, *Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work*, paragraphs .02, .05, and .06, requires the independent auditor to plan and perform his or her work with due professional care and sets forth aspects of that requirement. AU 230, paragraphs .07 through .09, and AS No. 13, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*, paragraph 7, specify that due professional care requires the exercise of professional skepticism. These standards state that professional skepticism is an attitude that includes a questioning mind and a critical assessment of the appropriateness and sufficiency of audit evidence.

AS No. 13, paragraphs 3, 5, and 8, requires the auditor to design and implement audit responses that address the risks of material misstatement. AS No. 15, *Audit Evidence*, paragraph 4, requires the auditor to plan and perform audit procedures to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to provide a reasonable basis for the audit opinion. Sufficiency is the measure of the quantity of audit evidence, and the quantity needed is affected by the risk of material misstatement (in the audit of financial statements) and the quality of the audit evidence obtained. The appropriateness of evidence is measured by its quality; to be appropriate, evidence must be both relevant and reliable in providing support for the related conclusions.

The paragraphs of the standards that are described immediately above are not cited in Part I.A, unless those paragraphs are the most directly related to the relevant deficiency.

**B.1. List of Specific Auditing Standards Referenced in Part I.A**

The table below lists the specific auditing standards that are referenced in Part I.A of this report, cross-referenced to the issuer audits for which each standard is cited. For each auditing standard, the table also provides the number of distinct deficiencies for which the standard is cited for each of the relevant issuer audits. This information identifies only the number of times that the standard is referenced, regardless of whether the reference includes multiple paragraphs or relates to multiple financial statement accounts.

<b>PCAOB Auditing Standards</b>	<b>Audits</b>	<b>Number of Deficiencies per Audit</b>
AS No. 14, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i>	Issuer A	2
AU 328, <i>Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</i>	Issuer B	1

**B.2. Financial Statement Accounts or Auditing Areas Related to Identified Audit Deficiencies**

The table below lists the financial statement accounts or auditing areas related to each deficiency included in Part I.A of this report and identifies the audits described in Part I.A where deficiencies relating to the respective areas were observed.

	AS No.	AU
	14	328
Equity	A	B
Cash flows	A	

### B.3. Audit Deficiencies by Industry

The table below lists the industries<sup>3</sup> of the issuers for which audit deficiencies were discussed in Part I.A of this report, and cross-references the issuer to the specific auditing standards related to the deficiencies.

	AS No.	AU
	14	328
Consumer Discretionary	A	B

## C. Data Related to the Issuer Audits Selected for Inspection

### C.1. Industries of Issuers Inspected


The chart below categorizes the 10 issuers whose audits were inspected in 2015, based on the issuer's industry.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The majority of industry sector data is based on Global Industry Classification Standard ("GICS") data obtained from Standard & Poor's ("S&P"). In instances where GICS for an issuer was not available from S&P, classifications are assigned based upon North American Industry Classification System data.

<sup>4</sup> See Footnote 4 for additional information on how industry sectors were classified.






Industry	Number of Issuers Inspected	Percentage
Consumer Discretionary	4	40%
Consumer Staples	1	10%
Energy	3	30%
Information Technology	1	10%
Utilities	1	10%

### C.2. Revenue Ranges of Issuers Inspected

The chart below categorizes, based upon revenue, the 10 issuers whose audits were inspected in 2015.<sup>5</sup> This presentation of revenue data is intended to provide information about the size of issuer audits that were inspected and is not indicative of whether the inspection included a review of the Firm's auditing of revenue in the issuer audits selected for review.

<sup>5</sup> The revenue amounts reflected in the chart are for the issuers' fiscal year end that corresponds to the audit inspected by the PCAOB. The revenue amounts were obtained from S&P and reflect a standardized approach to presenting revenue amounts.



Revenue (In US \$)	Number of Audits Inspected	Percentage
> 50 million	3	30%
< 50 million	7	70%

**D. Information Concerning PCAOB Inspections that is Generally Applicable to Annually Inspected Firms**

Board inspections include reviews of certain portions of selected audit work performed by the inspected firm and reviews of certain aspects of the firm's quality control system. The inspections are designed to identify deficiencies in audit work and defects or potential defects in the firm's system of quality control related to the firm's audits. The focus on deficiencies, defects, and potential defects necessarily carries through to reports on inspections and, accordingly, Board inspection reports are not intended to serve as balanced report cards or overall rating tools. Further, the inclusion in an inspection report of certain deficiencies, defects, and potential defects should not be construed as an indication that the Board has made any determination about other aspects of the inspected firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct not included within the report.

**D.1. Reviews of Audit Work**

Inspections include reviews of portions of selected audits of financial statements and, where applicable, audits of internal control over financial reporting ("ICFR"). For these audits, the inspection team selects certain portions of the audits for inspection, and it reviews the engagement team's work papers and interviews engagement personnel regarding those portions. If the inspection team identifies a potential issue

that it is unable to resolve through discussion with the firm and any review of additional work papers or other documentation, the inspection team ordinarily provides the firm with a written comment form on the matter and the firm is allowed the opportunity to provide a written response to the comment form. If the response does not resolve the inspection team's concerns, the matter is considered a deficiency and is evaluated for inclusion in the inspection report.

The inspection team selects the audits, and the specific portions of those audits, that it will review, and the inspected firm is not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the selections. Audit deficiencies that the inspection team may identify include a firm's failure to identify, or to address appropriately, financial statement misstatements, including failures to comply with disclosure requirements,<sup>6</sup> as well as a firm's failure to perform, or to perform sufficiently, certain necessary audit procedures. An inspection of an annually inspected firm does not involve the review of all of the firm's audits, nor is it designed to identify every deficiency in the reviewed audits. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that a firm's audit work, or the relevant issuers' financial statements or reporting on ICFR, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

In some cases, the conclusion that a firm did not perform a procedure may be based on the absence of documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence, even if the firm claimed to have performed the procedure. AS No. 3, *Audit Documentation*, provides that, in various circumstances including PCAOB inspections, a firm that has not adequately documented that it performed a procedure, obtained evidence, or reached an appropriate conclusion must demonstrate with persuasive

---

<sup>6</sup> 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 the applicable financial reporting framework, the Board's practice is to report that information to the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "the Commission"), which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements. Any description in this report of financial statement misstatements or failures to comply with SEC disclosure requirements should not be understood as an indication that the SEC has considered or made any determination regarding these issues unless otherwise expressly stated.

other evidence that it did so, and that oral assertions and explanations alone do not constitute persuasive other evidence. In reaching its conclusions, an inspection team considers whether audit documentation or any other evidence that a firm might provide to the inspection team supports the firm's contention that it performed a procedure, obtained evidence, or reached an appropriate conclusion. In the case of every matter cited in the public portion of a final inspection report, the inspection team has carefully considered any contention by the firm that it did so but just did not document its work, and the inspection team has concluded that the available evidence does not support the contention that the firm sufficiently performed the necessary work.

Identified deficiencies in the audit work that exceed a significance threshold (which is described in Part I.A of the inspection report) are summarized in the public portion of the inspection report.<sup>7</sup>

The Board cautions against extrapolating from the results presented in the public portion of a report to broader conclusions about the frequency of deficiencies throughout the firm's practice. Individual audits and areas of inspection focus are most often selected on a risk-weighted basis and not randomly. Areas of focus vary among selected audits, but often involve audit work on the most difficult or inherently uncertain areas of financial statements. Thus, the audit work is generally selected for inspection based on factors that, in the inspection team's view, heighten the possibility that auditing deficiencies are present, rather than through a process intended to identify a representative sample.

## D.2. Review of a Firm's Quality Control System

QC 20, *System of Quality Control for a CPA Firm's Accounting and Auditing Practice*, provides that an auditing firm has a responsibility to ensure that its personnel comply with the applicable professional standards. This standard specifies that a firm's

---

<sup>7</sup> The discussion in this report of any deficiency observed in a particular audit reflects information reported to the Board by the inspection team and does not reflect any determination by the Board as to whether the Firm has engaged in any conduct for which it could be sanctioned through the Board's disciplinary process. In addition, any references in this report to violations or potential violations of law, rules, or professional standards are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings for purposes of imposing legal liability.

system of quality control should encompass the following elements: (1) independence, integrity, and objectivity; (2) personnel management; (3) acceptance and continuance of issuer audit engagements; (4) engagement performance; and (5) monitoring.

The inspection team's assessment of a firm's quality control system is derived both from the results of its procedures specifically focused on the firm's quality control policies and procedures, and also from inferences that can be drawn from deficiencies in the performance of individual audits. Audit deficiencies, whether alone or when aggregated, may indicate areas where a firm's system has failed to provide reasonable assurance of quality in the performance of audits. Even deficiencies that do not result in an insufficiently supported audit opinion or a failure to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to fulfill the objectives of the Firm's role in an audit may indicate a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system.<sup>8</sup> If identified deficiencies, when accumulated and evaluated, indicate defects or potential defects in the firm's system of quality control, the nonpublic portion of this report would include a discussion of those issues. When evaluating whether identified deficiencies in individual audits indicate a defect or potential defect in a firm's system of quality control, the inspection team considers the nature, significance, and frequency of deficiencies;<sup>9</sup> related firm methodology, guidance, and practices; and possible root causes.

Inspections also include a review of certain of the firm's practices, policies, and processes related to audit quality, which constitute a part of the firm's quality control system. The inspection team customizes the procedures it performs with respect to the firm's practices, policies, and processes related to audit quality, bearing in mind the firm's structure, procedures performed in prior inspections, past and current inspection

---

<sup>8</sup> Not every audit deficiency suggests a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system, and this report does not discuss every audit deficiency the inspection team identified.

<sup>9</sup> An evaluation of the frequency of a type of deficiency may include consideration of how often the inspection team reviewed audit work that presented the opportunity for similar deficiencies to occur. In some cases, even a type of deficiency that is observed infrequently in a particular inspection may, because of some combination of its nature, its significance, and the frequency with which it has been observed in previous inspections of the firm, be cause for concern about a quality control defect or potential defect.

observations, an assessment of risk related to each area, and other factors. The areas generally considered for review include (1) management structure and processes, including the tone at the top; (2) practices for partner management, including allocation of partner resources and partner evaluation, compensation, admission, and disciplinary actions; (3) policies and procedures for considering and addressing the risks involved in accepting and retaining issuer audit engagements, including the application of the firm's risk-rating system; and (4) the firm's processes for monitoring audit performance, including processes for identifying and assessing indicators of deficiencies in audit performance, independence policies and procedures, and processes for responding to defects or potential defects in quality control. A description of the procedures generally applied to these areas is below.

D.2.a. Review of Management Structure and Processes, Including the Tone at the Top

Procedures in this area are designed to focus on (1) how management is structured and operates the firm's business, and the implications that the management structure and processes have on audit performance and (2) whether actions and communications by the firm's leadership – the tone at the top – demonstrate a commitment to audit quality. To assess this area, the inspection team may interview members of the firm's leadership and review significant management reports and documents, as well as information regarding financial metrics and other processes that the firm uses to plan and evaluate its business.

D.2.b. Review of Practices for Partner Management, Including Allocation of Partner Resources and Partner Evaluation, Compensation, Admission, and Disciplinary Actions

Procedures in this area are designed to focus on (1) whether the firm's processes related to partner evaluation, compensation, admission, termination, and disciplinary actions could be expected to encourage an appropriate emphasis on audit quality and technical competence, as distinct from marketing or other activities of the firm; (2) the firm's processes for allocating its partner resources; and (3) the accountability and responsibilities of the different levels of firm management with respect to partner management. The inspection team may interview members of the firm's management and review documentation related to certain of these topics. In addition, the inspection team's evaluation may include the results of interviews of audit partners regarding their responsibilities and allocation of time. Further, the inspection team may review a sample of partners' personnel files.

D.2.c. Review of Policies and Procedures for Considering and Addressing the Risks Involved in Accepting and Retaining Issuer Audit Engagements, Including the Application of the Firm's Risk-Rating System

The inspection team may consider the firm's documented policies and procedures in this area. In addition, the inspection team may select certain issuer audits to (1) evaluate compliance with the firm's policies and procedures for identifying and assessing the risks involved in accepting or continuing the issuer audit engagements and (2) observe whether the audit procedures were responsive to the risks identified during the firm's process.

D.2.d. Review of a Firm's Processes for Monitoring Audit Performance, Including Processes for Identifying and Assessing Indicators of Deficiencies in Audit Performance, Independence Policies and Procedures, and Processes for Responding to Defects or Potential Defects in Quality Control

D.2.d.i. Review of Processes for Identifying and Assessing Indicators of Deficiencies in Audit Performance

Procedures in this area are designed to identify and assess the monitoring processes that the firm uses to monitor audit quality for individual engagements and for the firm as a whole. The inspection team may interview members of the firm's management and review documents relating to the firm's identification and evaluation of, and response to, possible indicators of deficiencies in audit performance. In addition, the inspection team may review documents related to the design, operation, and evaluation of findings of the firm's internal inspection program, and may compare the results of its review of audit work to those from the internal inspection's review of the same audit work.

D.2.d.ii. Review of Response to Defects or Potential Defects in Quality Control

The inspection team may review steps the firm has taken to address possible quality control deficiencies and assess the design and effectiveness of the underlying processes. In addition, the inspection team may inspect audits of issuers whose audits had been reviewed during previous PCAOB inspections of the firm to ascertain whether the audit procedures in areas with previous deficiencies have improved.



D.2.d.iii. Review of Certain Other Policies and Procedures Related to Monitoring Audit Quality

The inspection team may assess policies, procedures, and guidance related to aspects of independence requirements and the firm's consultation processes, as well as the firm's compliance with these requirements and processes. In addition, the inspection team may review documents, including certain newly issued policies and procedures, and interview firm management to consider the firm's methods for developing audit policies, procedures, and methodologies, including internal guidance and training materials.

END OF PART I



PARTS II AND III OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC  
AND ARE OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

## **APPENDIX A**

### **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 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, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> 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 at all. 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.



June 8, 2016

Ms. Helen Munter  
Director  
Division of Registration and Inspections  
1666 K Street NW, suite 800  
Washington, DC 20006

Re: Response to Part I of the Draft Report on the 2015 Inspection of MaloneBailey LLP

Dear Ms. Munter:

We are pleased to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's ("PCAOB") report on the 2015 inspection of MaloneBailey LLP dated May 9, 2016 (the "Draft Report"). We support the PCAOB inspection process to help us identify areas where we may improve our audit performance. We believe the inspection process is a fundamental mission of the PCAOB and intend to use the process to identify areas where we should improve and enhance our audit quality.

We have evaluated each of the matters described in Part I of the Draft Report. In that regard, we have considered whether it was necessary to perform additional procedures in accordance with 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* and, where appropriate, performed such procedures.

We remain committed to improving our audit performance and underlying quality control systems. We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the report and look forward to future constructive dialogue.

Sincerely,

*Malone Bailey, LLP*

Malone Bailey LLP

9801 Westheimer Road, Suite 1100 • Houston, Texas 77042 • 713.343.4200  
#306-307 Ocean International Center (C Tower) No.60, Dongsihuan Middle Road • Chaoyang District, Beijing P.R. China 100025 • 86.010.5282.3662  
Coastal City (West Tower) Hai De San Dao #1502 • Nanshan District Shenzhen P.R. China 518054 • 86.755.8627.8690  
[www.malonebailey.com](http://www.malonebailey.com)



Registered Public Company Accounting Oversight Board • AICPA  
An Independently Owned And Operated Member Of Nexia International

**APPENDIX B**

**AUDITING STANDARDS REFERENCED IN PART I**

This appendix provides the text of the auditing standard paragraphs that are referenced in Part I.A of this report. Footnotes that are included in this appendix, and any other Notes, are from the original auditing standards that are referenced. While this appendix contains the specific portions of the relevant standards cited with respect to the deficiencies in Part I.A of this report, other portions of the standards (including those described in Part I.B of this report) may provide additional context, descriptions, related requirements, or explanations; the complete standards are available on the PCAOB's website at <http://pcaobus.org/STANDARDS/Pages/default.aspx>.

<b>AS No. 14, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i></b>		
<b>Evaluating the Results of the Audit of Financial Statements</b>		
<b>EVALUATING THE PRESENTATION OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, INCLUDING THE DISCLOSURES</b>		
AS No. 14.30	<p>The auditor must evaluate whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework.</p> <p>Note: AU sec. 411, <i>The Meaning of Present Fairly in Conformity With Generally Accepted Accounting Principles</i>, establishes requirements for evaluating the presentation of the financial statements. Auditing Standard No. 6, <i>Evaluating Consistency of Financial Statements</i>, establishes requirements regarding evaluating the consistency of the accounting principles used in financial statements.</p> <p>Note: The auditor should look to the requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the company under audit with respect to the accounting principles applicable to that company.</p>	Issuer A
AS No. 14.31	As part of the evaluation of the presentation of the financial statements, the auditor should evaluate whether the financial statements contain the information	Issuer A

<b>AS No. 14, Evaluating Audit Results</b>		
	<p>essential for a fair presentation of the financial statements in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework. Evaluation of the information disclosed in the financial statements includes consideration of the form, arrangement, and content of the financial statements (including the accompanying notes), encompassing matters such as the terminology used, the amount of detail given, the classification of items in the statements, and the bases of amounts set forth.</p> <p>Note: According to AU sec. 508, if the financial statements, including the accompanying notes, fail to disclose information that is required by the applicable financial reporting framework, the auditor should express a qualified or adverse opinion and should provide the information in the report, if practicable, unless its omission from the report is recognized as appropriate by a specific auditing standard.<sup>18/</sup></p>	

<b>AU 328, Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</b>		
<b>Testing The Entity's Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</b>		
<b>Developing Independent Fair Value Estimates for Corroborative Purposes</b>		
AU 328.40	<p>The auditor may make an independent estimate of fair value (for example, by using an auditor-developed model) to corroborate the entity's fair value measurement.<sup>fn 6</sup> When developing an independent estimate using management's assumptions, the auditor evaluates those assumptions as discussed in paragraphs .28 to .37. Instead of using management's assumptions, the auditor may develop his or her own assumptions to make a comparison with management's fair value measurements. In that situation, the auditor nevertheless understands management's assumptions. The auditor uses that understanding to ensure that his or her independent estimate takes into consideration all significant variables and to evaluate any significant difference from management's estimate. The auditor also should test the data used to develop the fair value measurements and disclosures as discussed in paragraph .39.</p>	Issuer B

**AU 328, Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures**

Footnote to AU 328.40

<sup>fn 6</sup> See section 329, *Analytical Procedures*.

**APPENDIX C**

**REORGANIZED STANDARDS REFERENCED IN REPORT**

On March 31, 2015, the PCAOB adopted the reorganization of its auditing standards using a topical structure and a single, integrated numbering system. See *Reorganization of PCAOB Auditing Standards and Related Amendments to PCAOB Standards and Rules*, PCAOB Release No. 2015-002 (Mar. 31, 2015). On September 17, 2015, the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") approved the PCAOB's adoption of the reorganization. The reorganized standards will be effective as of December 31, 2016. The citations to PCAOB auditing standards included in this report use the numbering system and titles of standards that were in effect at the time of the primary inspection procedures. This table provides the section numbers of those standards included in Part I of this report as reorganized, as well as the titles of the standards both before and after the reorganization. The complete standards are available on the PCAOB's website at <http://pcaobus.org/STANDARDS/Pages/default.aspx>.

<b>Auditing Standards – before the reorganization</b>		<b>Auditing Standards – as reorganized</b>	
AS No. 3	<i>Audit Documentation</i>	AS 1215	<i>Audit Documentation</i>
AS No. 13	<i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	AS 2301	<i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>
AS No. 14	<i>Evaluating Audit Results</i>	AS 2810	<i>Evaluating Audit Results</i>
AS No. 15	<i>Audit Evidence</i>	AS 1105	<i>Audit Evidence</i>
AU 230	<i>Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work</i>	AS 1015	<i>Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work</i>
AU 328	<i>Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</i>	AS 2502	<i>Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</i>