

Report on

**2018 Inspection of Dixon Hughes Goodman LLP
(Headquartered in Charlotte, North Carolina)**

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

January 16, 2020

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**

2018 INSPECTION OF DIXON HUGHES GOODMAN LLP

Preface

In 2018, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Dixon Hughes Goodman 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.C 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 audit 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 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. 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 A 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.

PROFILE OF THE FIRM¹

Offices	36 ²
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Partners / professional staff ³	222 / 1,487
Issuer audit clients	47
Lead partners on issuer audit work ⁴	21

¹ The information presented here is as understood by the inspection team, generally as of the outset of the inspection, based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information. Additional information, including additional detail on audit reports issued by the Firm, is available in the Firm's filings with the Board, available at http://pcaobus.org/Registration/rasr/Pages/RASR_Search.aspx.

² The Firm's offices are located in Birmingham, Alabama; Los Angeles, California; Jacksonville and Tampa Bay, Florida; Atlanta, Georgia; Baltimore and Gaithersburg, Maryland; New York (2), New York; Asheville, Charlotte (2), Greenville, Hendersonville, High Point (2), Pinehurst, Raleigh, and Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Cleveland (2), Ohio; Charleston, Greenville (2), Spartanburg, and Summerville, South Carolina; Brentwood and Memphis, Tennessee; Fort Worth, Texas; Chesterfield, Newport News, Norfolk, Richmond, and Tysons, Virginia; and Charleston and Morgantown, West Virginia.

³ 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. The number of partners cited above represents the number of individuals with an ownership interest in the Firm.

⁴ The number of lead 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.

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from November 12, 2018 to November 16, 2018 and from December 3, 2018 to December 7, 2018.⁵

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included reviews of portions of five 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 A to this report. The references in this sub-Part include only the standards that most directly relate to the deficiencies and do not include all standards that apply 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 any 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.

Certain 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 conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework and/or its opinion about whether the issuer had maintained, in all material respects, effective internal control over financial reporting ("ICFR"). In other words, in these audits, the auditor issued an opinion without satisfying its fundamental

⁵ For this purpose, "primary procedures" include 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. Primary procedures do not include (1) inspection planning, which is performed prior to primary procedures, and (2) inspection follow-up procedures, wrap-up, analysis of results, and the preparation of the inspection report, which extend beyond the primary procedures.

obligation to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements were free of material misstatement and/or the issuer maintained effective ICFR.

The fact that one or more deficiencies in an audit reach this level of significance does not necessarily indicate that the financial statements are materially misstated or that there are undisclosed material weaknesses in ICFR. 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.⁶

The audit deficiencies that reached this level of significance are described below –

A.1. Issuer A

- (1) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test complementary user entity controls related to the use of a service organization (AS 2201.42, .44, and .B22); and
- (2) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to identify and test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the allowance for loan losses ("ALL"), including the failure to sufficiently test controls with a review element, and in the financial statement audit, as a result of the unsupported level of reliance on controls, the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the ALL, including the use of an inadequate sample size to

⁶ 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.

evaluate assigned loan grades (AS 2201.39, .42, and .44; AS 2301.16, .18, and .37; AS 2315.19, .23, and .23A).

A.2. Issuer B

(1) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over net premiums written revenue, including the failure to ascertain and evaluate the nature of the actions performed by control owners, and in the financial statement audit, as a result of the unsupported level of reliance on controls, the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test net premiums written revenue, including the use of an inadequate sample size (AS 2201.18, .19, .42, .44, .55, and .56; AS 2301.16, .18, and .37; AS 2315.19, .23, and .23A; AS 2605.10-.11, and .20-.21); and

(2) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to identify and test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the reserve for claims, including the failure to obtain an understanding of the likely sources of potential misstatements and obtain evidence regarding the design of relevant controls at a service organization (AS 2201.34, .39, .42, .44, .B18, and .B19).

A.3. Issuer C

(1) the failure, in an audit of ICFR, to perform sufficient procedures to identify and test the design and operating effectiveness of controls over the ALL, including the failure to identify a control that addressed the assignment of loan grades for a material portion of the loan portfolio (AS 2201.39, .42, and .44); and

(2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the ALL, including the failure to sufficiently test loan grades (AS 2301.11; AS 2501.11).

A.4. Issuer D

the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the existence of loans acquired and the existence and completeness of deposit liabilities assumed in a business combination (AS 2301.08).

B. Auditing Standards

Each deficiency described above could relate to several applicable 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 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. Paragraphs .02, .05, and .06 of AS 1015, *Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work*, require the independent auditor to plan and perform his or her work with due professional care and set forth aspects of that requirement. AS 1015.07-.09 and paragraph .07 of AS 2301, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*, 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 2301.03, .05, and .08 require the auditor to design and implement audit responses that address the risks of material misstatement. Paragraph .04 of AS 1105, *Audit Evidence*, 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) or the risk associated with the control (in the audit of ICFR) 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.

PCAOB Auditing Standards	Issuers
<i>AS 2201, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>	A, B, and C
<i>AS 2301, The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	A, B, C, and D
<i>AS 2315, Audit Sampling</i>	A and B
<i>AS 2501, Auditing Accounting Estimates</i>	C
<i>AS 2605, Consideration of the Internal Audit Function</i>	B

C. Information Concerning PCAOB Inspections that is Generally Applicable to Triennially Inspected Firms

A Board inspection includes a review of certain portions of selected audit work performed by the inspected firm and a review 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.

C.1. Reviews of Audit Work

Inspections include reviews of portions of selected audits of financial statements and, where applicable, audits of 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,⁷ as well as a firm's failure to perform, or to perform sufficiently, certain necessary audit procedures. An inspection may 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 1215, *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 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 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

⁷ 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.

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.⁸

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.

C.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 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,

⁸ 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.

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 may indicate a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system.⁹ 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;¹⁰ 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. This review addresses practices, policies, and procedures concerning audit performance, training, compliance with independence standards, client acceptance and retention, and the establishment of policies and procedures.

END OF PART I

⁹ Not every audit deficiency suggests a defect or potential defect in a firm's quality control system, and this report may not discuss every audit deficiency the inspection team identified.

¹⁰ 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.

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

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 Firm provided a written response to a draft of this report and that response has received careful consideration. 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.¹¹

¹¹ 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.



4350 Congress Street
Suite 900
Charlotte, NC 28209
P 704.367.7020
F 704.367.7760
dhg.com

August 15, 2019

Mr. George Botic, Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Re: Response to Part I of the Draft Report on the 2018 Inspection of Dixon Hughes
Goodman LLP

Dear Mr. Botic:

We are pleased to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's (the "PCAOB") Draft Report on the 2018 Inspection of Dixon Hughes Goodman LLP.

Our firm is committed to the highest standards of audit quality. We continually monitor our audit processes, and adjust our methodologies, policies, procedures, and guidance when we identify improvements that could enhance audit quality. We value the benefits of the PCAOB inspection process, as it serves to assist us in identifying areas where we can continue to improve our audit performance and strengthen our system of quality control.

We have evaluated the matters described in Part I of the Draft Report, and have taken appropriate actions to comply with AS 2901, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and where applicable, AS 2905, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report*.

We continue to support the PCAOB and its mission, and remain committed to improving our audit performance. We look forward to continuing to work with the PCAOB to achieve our shared objective of continual improvement in audit quality.

Respectfully submitted,

Dixon Hughes Goodman LLP



APPENDIX A

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>.¹²

<i>AS 2201, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements</i>		
PLANNING THE AUDIT		
Using the Work of Others		
AS 2201.18	<p>The auditor should assess the competence and objectivity of the persons whose work the auditor plans to use to determine the extent to which the auditor may use their work. The higher the degree of competence and objectivity, the greater use the auditor may make of the work. The auditor should apply AS 2605.09 through .11 to assess the competence and objectivity of internal auditors. The auditor should apply the principles underlying those paragraphs to assess the competence and objectivity of persons other than internal auditors whose work the auditor plans to use.</p> <p>Note: For purposes of using the work of others, competence means the attainment and maintenance of a level of understanding and knowledge that enables that person to perform ably the tasks assigned to them, and objectivity means the ability to perform those tasks impartially and with intellectual honesty. To assess competence, the auditor should evaluate factors about the person's qualifications and ability to perform the work the auditor plans to use. To assess objectivity, the auditor should evaluate whether factors are present that either inhibit or promote a person's ability to perform with the</p>	Issuer B

¹² The text presented in this appendix represents the standards as in effect during the applicable audit period.

AS 2201, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements		
	<p>necessary degree of objectivity the work the auditor plans to use.</p> <p>Note: The auditor should not use the work of persons who have a low degree of objectivity, regardless of their level of competence. Likewise, the auditor should not use the work of persons who have a low level of competence regardless of their degree of objectivity. Personnel whose core function is to serve as a testing or compliance authority at the company, such as internal auditors, normally are expected to have greater competence and objectivity in performing the type of work that will be useful to the auditor.</p>	
AS 2201.19	The extent to which the auditor may use the work of others in an audit of internal control also depends on the risk associated with the control being tested. As the risk associated with a control increases, the need for the auditor to perform his or her own work on the control increases.	Issuer B
USING A TOP-DOWN APPROACH		
Understanding Likely Sources of Misstatement		
AS 2201.34	<p>To further understand the likely sources of potential misstatements, and as a part of selecting the controls to test, the auditor should achieve the following objectives –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understand the flow of transactions related to the relevant assertions, including how these transactions are initiated, authorized, processed, and recorded; ▪ Verify that the auditor has identified the points within the company's processes at which a misstatement - including a misstatement due to fraud - could arise that, individually or in combination with other misstatements, would be material; ▪ Identify the controls that management has implemented to address these potential misstatements; and ▪ Identify the controls that management has implemented over the prevention or timely detection of unauthorized acquisition, use, or disposition of the company's assets that could result in a material misstatement of the financial statements. 	Issuer B

AS 2201, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements		
Selecting Controls to Test		
AS 2201.39	The auditor should test those controls that are important to the auditor's conclusion about whether the company's controls sufficiently address the assessed risk of misstatement to each relevant assertion.	Issuers A, B, and C
TESTING CONTROLS		
Testing Design Effectiveness		
AS 2201.42	<p>The auditor should test the design effectiveness of controls by determining whether the company's controls, if they are operated as prescribed by persons possessing the necessary authority and competence to perform the control effectively, satisfy the company's control objectives and can effectively prevent or detect errors or fraud that could result in material misstatements in the financial statements.</p> <p>Note: A smaller, less complex company might achieve its control objectives in a different manner from a larger, more complex organization. For example, a smaller, less complex company might have fewer employees in the accounting function, limiting opportunities to segregate duties and leading the company to implement alternative controls to achieve its control objectives. In such circumstances, the auditor should evaluate whether those alternative controls are effective.</p>	Issuers A, B, and C
Testing Operating Effectiveness		
AS 2201.44	<p>The auditor should test the operating effectiveness of a control by determining whether the control is operating as designed and whether the person performing the control possesses the necessary authority and competence to perform the control effectively.</p> <p>Note: In some situations, particularly in smaller companies, a company might use a third party to provide assistance with certain financial reporting functions. When assessing the competence of personnel responsible for a company's financial reporting and associated controls, the auditor may take into account the combined competence of</p>	Issuers A, B, and C

AS 2201, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements		
	company personnel and other parties that assist with functions related to financial reporting.	
AS 2201.55	<i>Roll-Forward Procedures.</i> When the auditor reports on the effectiveness of controls as of a specific date and obtains evidence about the operating effectiveness of controls at an interim date, he or she should determine what additional evidence concerning the operation of the controls for the remaining period is necessary.	Issuer B
AS 2201.56	<p>The additional evidence that is necessary to update the results of testing from an interim date to the company's year-end depends on the following factors –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The specific control tested prior to the as-of date, including the risks associated with the control and the nature of the control, and the results of those tests; ▪ The sufficiency of the evidence of effectiveness obtained at an interim date; ▪ The length of the remaining period; and ▪ The possibility that there have been any significant changes in internal control over financial reporting subsequent to the interim date. <p>Note: In some circumstances, such as when evaluation of the foregoing factors indicates a low risk that the controls are no longer effective during the roll-forward period, inquiry alone might be sufficient as a roll-forward procedure.</p>	Issuer B
APPENDIX B - Special Topics		
USE OF SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS		
AS 2201.B18	AS 2601.03 describes the situation in which a service organization's services are part of a company's information system. If the service organization's services are part of a company's information system, as described therein, then they are part of the information and communication component of the company's internal control over financial reporting. When the service organization's services are part of the company's internal control over	Issuer B

AS 2201, An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements		
	financial reporting, the auditor should include the activities of the service organization when determining the evidence required to support his or her opinion	
AS 2201.B19	<p>AS 2601.07 through .16 describe the procedures that the auditor should perform with respect to the activities performed by the service organization. The procedures include -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Obtaining an understanding of the controls at the service organization that are relevant to the entity's internal control and the controls at the user organization over the activities of the service organization, and b. Obtaining evidence that the controls that are relevant to the auditor's opinion are operating effectively. 	Issuer B
AS 2201.B22	If the service auditor's report on controls placed in operation and tests of operating effectiveness contains a qualification that the stated control objectives might be achieved only if the company applies controls contemplated in the design of the system by the service organization, the auditor should evaluate whether the company is applying the necessary procedures.	Issuer A

AS 2301, The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement		
RESPONSES INVOLVING THE NATURE, TIMING, AND EXTENT OF AUDIT PROCEDURES		
AS 2301.08	The auditor should design and perform audit procedures in a manner that addresses the assessed risks of material misstatement for each relevant assertion of each significant account and disclosure.	Issuer D
Responses to Significant Risks		
AS 2301.11	For significant risks, the auditor should perform substantive procedures, including tests of details, that are specifically responsive to the assessed risks.	Issuer C

AS 2301, The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement		
	Note: AS 2110 discusses identification of significant risks ¹⁰ and states that fraud risks are significant risks.	
<p><u>Footnote to AS 2301.11</u></p> <p>¹⁰ See AS 2110.71 for factors that the auditor should evaluate in determining which risks are significant risks.</p>		
TESTING CONTROLS		
Testing Controls in an Audit of Financial Statements		
AS 2301.16	<p><i>Controls to be Tested.</i> If the auditor plans to assess control risk at less than the maximum by relying on controls,¹² and the nature, timing, and extent of planned substantive procedures are based on that lower assessment, the auditor must obtain evidence that the controls selected for testing are designed effectively and operated effectively during the entire period of reliance.¹³ However, the auditor is not required to assess control risk at less than the maximum for <i>all</i> relevant assertions and, for a variety of reasons, the auditor may choose not to do so.</p>	Issuers A and B
<p><u>Footnotes to AS 2301.16</u></p> <p>¹² Reliance on controls that is supported by sufficient and appropriate audit evidence allows the auditor to assess control risk at less than the maximum, which results in a lower assessed risk of material misstatement. In turn, this allows the auditor to modify the nature, timing, and extent of planned substantive procedures.</p> <p>¹³ Terms defined in Appendix A, <i>Definitions</i>, are set in boldface type the first time they appear.</p>		
AS 2301.18	<p><i>Evidence about the Effectiveness of Controls in the Audit of Financial Statements.</i> In designing and performing tests of controls for the audit of financial statements, the evidence necessary to support the auditor's control risk assessment depends on the degree of reliance the auditor plans to place on the effectiveness of a control. The auditor should obtain more persuasive audit evidence from tests of controls the greater the reliance the auditor places on the effectiveness of a control. The auditor also should obtain more persuasive evidence about the effectiveness of controls for each relevant assertion for which the audit approach consists primarily of tests of controls, including</p>	Issuers A and B

AS 2301, The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement		
	situations in which substantive procedures alone cannot provide sufficient appropriate audit evidence.	
SUBSTANTIVE PROCEDURES		
AS 2301.37	As the assessed risk of material misstatement increases, the evidence from substantive procedures that the auditor should obtain also increases. The evidence provided by the auditor's substantive procedures depends upon the mix of the nature, timing, and extent of those procedures. Further, for an individual assertion, different combinations of the nature, timing, and extent of testing might provide sufficient appropriate evidence to respond to the assessed risk of material misstatement.	Issuers A and B

AS 2315, Audit Sampling		
SAMPLING IN SUBSTANTIVE TESTS OF DETAILS		
Planning Samples		
AS 2315.19	After assessing and considering the levels of inherent and control risks, the auditor performs substantive tests to restrict detection risk to an acceptable level. As the assessed levels of inherent risk, control risk, and detection risk for other substantive procedures directed toward the same specific audit objective decreases, the auditor's allowable risk of incorrect acceptance for the substantive tests of details increases and, thus, the smaller the required sample size for the substantive tests of details. For example, if inherent and control risks are assessed at the maximum, and no other substantive tests directed toward the same specific audit objectives are performed, the auditor should allow for a low risk of incorrect acceptance for the substantive tests of details. ³ Thus, the auditor would select a larger sample size for the tests of details than if he allowed a higher risk of incorrect acceptance.	Issuers A and B
<p><u>Footnote to AS 2315.19</u></p> <p>³ Some auditors prefer to think of risk levels in quantitative terms. For example, in the circumstances described, an auditor might think in terms of a 5 percent risk of incorrect acceptance for the substantive test of details. Risk levels used in sampling applications in other fields are not necessarily relevant in determining appropriate levels for applications in auditing because an audit includes many interrelated tests and sources of evidence.</p>		

AS 2315, Audit Sampling		
AS 2315.23	To determine the number of items to be selected in a sample for a particular substantive test of details, the auditor should take into account tolerable misstatement for the population; the allowable risk of incorrect acceptance (based on the assessments of inherent risk, control risk, and the detection risk related to the substantive analytical procedures or other relevant substantive tests); and the characteristics of the population, including the expected size and frequency of misstatements.	Issuers A and B
AS 2315.23A	Table 1 of the Appendix describes the effects of the factors discussed in the preceding paragraph on sample sizes in a statistical or nonstatistical sampling approach. When circumstances are similar, the effect on sample size of those factors should be similar regardless of whether a statistical or nonstatistical approach is used. Thus, when a nonstatistical sampling approach is applied properly, the resulting sample size ordinarily will be comparable to, or larger than, the sample size resulting from an efficient and effectively designed statistical sample.	Issuers A and B

AS 2501, Auditing Accounting Estimates		
EVALUATING ACCOUNTING ESTIMATES		
Evaluating Reasonableness		
AS 2501.11	<p>Review and test management's process. In many situations, the auditor assesses the reasonableness of an accounting estimate by performing procedures to test the process used by management to make the estimate. The following are procedures the auditor may consider performing when using this approach:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify whether there are controls over the preparation of accounting estimates and supporting data that may be useful in the evaluation. b. Identify the sources of data and factors that management used in forming the assumptions, and consider whether such data and factors are relevant, reliable, and sufficient for the purpose based on information gathered in other audit tests. c. Consider whether there are additional key factors or alternative assumptions about the factors. 	Issuer C

AS 2501, Auditing Accounting Estimates		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Evaluate whether the assumptions are consistent with each other, the supporting data, relevant historical data, and industry data. e. Analyze historical data used in developing the assumptions to assess whether the data is comparable and consistent with data of the period under audit, and consider whether such data is sufficiently reliable for the purpose. f. Consider whether changes in the business or industry may cause other factors to become significant to the assumptions. g. Review available documentation of the assumptions used in developing the accounting estimates and inquire about any other plans, goals, and objectives of the entity, as well as consider their relationship to the assumptions. h. Consider using the work of a specialist regarding certain assumptions (AS 1210, <i>Using the Work of a Specialist</i>). i. Test the calculations used by management to translate the assumptions and key factors into the accounting estimate. 	

AS 2605, Consideration of the Internal Audit Function		
ASSESSING THE COMPETENCE AND OBJECTIVITY OF THE INTERNAL AUDITORS		
Objectivity of the Internal Auditors		
AS 2605.10	<p>When assessing the internal auditors' objectivity, the auditor should obtain or update information from prior years about such factors as—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The organizational status of the internal auditor responsible for the internal audit function, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Whether the internal auditor reports to an officer of sufficient status to ensure broad audit coverage and adequate consideration of, and action on, the findings and recommendations of the internal auditors. 	Issuer B

AS 2605, Consideration of the Internal Audit Function		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Whether the internal auditor has direct access and reports regularly to the board of directors, the audit committee, or the owner-manager. ○ Whether the board of directors, the audit committee, or the owner-manager oversees employment decisions related to the internal auditor. ▪ Policies to maintain internal auditors' objectivity about the areas audited, including— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Policies prohibiting internal auditors from auditing areas where relatives are employed in important or audit-sensitive positions. ○ Policies prohibiting internal auditors from auditing areas where they were recently assigned or are scheduled to be assigned on completion of responsibilities in the internal audit function. 	
Assessing Competence and Objectivity		
AS 2605.11	<p>In assessing competence and objectivity, the auditor usually considers information obtained from previous experience with the internal audit function, from discussions with management personnel, and from a recent external quality review, if performed, of the internal audit function's activities. The auditor may also use professional internal auditing standards⁴ as criteria in making the assessment. The auditor also considers the need to test the effectiveness of the factors described in paragraphs .09 and .10. The extent of such testing will vary in light of the intended effect of the internal auditors' work on the audit. If the auditor determines that the internal auditors are sufficiently competent and objective, the auditor should then consider how the internal auditors' work may affect the audit.</p>	Issuer B
<p><u>Footnote to AS 2605.11</u></p> <p>⁴ Standards have been developed for the professional practice of internal auditing by The Institute of Internal Auditors and the General Accounting Office. These standards are meant to (a) impart an understanding of the role and responsibilities of internal auditing to all levels of management, boards of directors, public bodies, external auditors, and related professional organizations; (b) permit measurement of internal auditing performance; and (c) improve the practice of internal auditing.</p>		

AS 2605, Consideration of the Internal Audit Function		
EXTENT OF THE EFFECT OF THE INTERNAL AUDITORS' WORK		
AS 2605.20	<p>In making judgments about the extent of the effect of the internal auditors' work on the auditor's procedures, the auditor considers—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The materiality of financial statement amounts— that is, account balances or classes of transactions. b. The risk (consisting of inherent risk and control risk) of material misstatement of the assertions related to these financial statement amounts. c. The degree of subjectivity involved in the evaluation of the audit evidence gathered in support of the assertions.⁷ <p>As the materiality of the financial statement amounts increases and either the risk of material misstatement or the degree of subjectivity increases, the need for the auditor to perform his or her own tests of the assertions increases. As these factors decrease, the need for the auditor to perform his or her own tests of the assertions decreases.</p>	Issuer B
<p><u>Footnote to AS 2605.20</u></p> <p>⁷ For some assertions, such as existence and occurrence, the evaluation of audit evidence is generally objective. More subjective evaluation of the audit evidence is often required for other assertions, such as the valuation and disclosure assertions.</p>		

AS 2605, Consideration of the Internal Audit Function		
AS 2605.21	<p>For assertions related to material financial statement amounts where the risk of material misstatement or the degree of subjectivity involved in the evaluation of the audit evidence is high, the auditor should perform sufficient procedures to fulfill the responsibilities described in paragraphs .18 and .19. In determining these procedures, the auditor gives consideration to the results of work (either tests of controls or substantive tests) performed by internal auditors on those particular assertions. However, for such assertions, the consideration of internal auditors' work cannot alone reduce audit risk to an acceptable level to eliminate the necessity to perform tests of those assertions directly by the auditor. Assertions about the valuation of assets and liabilities involving significant accounting estimates, and about the existence and disclosure of related-party transactions, contingencies, uncertainties, and subsequent events, are examples of assertions that might have a high risk of material misstatement or involve a high degree of subjectivity in the evaluation of audit evidence.</p>	Issuer B