Executive Summary

Our 2018 inspection report on Cohen & Company, Ltd. provides information on our inspection to assess the firm’s compliance with Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (“PCAOB”) standards and rules and other applicable regulatory and professional requirements. This executive summary offers a high-level overview of: (1) Part I.A of the report, which discusses deficiencies (“Part I.A deficiencies”), if any, that were of such significance that we believe the firm, at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer’s financial statements and/or internal control over financial reporting (“ICFR”), and (2) Part I.B of the report, which discusses deficiencies, if any, that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion(s) but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules.

Overview of the 2018 Deficiencies Included in Part I

In the 2018 inspection, we did not identify any Part I.A or Part I.B deficiencies.
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2018 Inspection

During the PCAOB’s 2018 inspection of Cohen & Company, Ltd., we assessed the firm’s compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of public companies.

We selected for review eight audits of issuers with fiscal years generally ending in 2017. For each issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm’s system of quality control.

What’s Included in this Inspection Report

This report includes the following sections:

- **Overview of the 2018 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year**: Information on our inspection, historical data, and common deficiencies.

- **Part I – Inspection Observations**:
  - **Part I.A**: Deficiencies that were of such significance that we believe the firm, at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer’s financial statements and/or ICFR.
  - **Part I.B**: Deficiencies that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion(s) but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules.

- **Part II – Observations Related to Quality Control**: Criticisms of, or potential defects in, the firm’s system of quality control. Section 104(g)(2) of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (“the Act”) restricts us from publicly disclosing Part II deficiencies unless the firm does not address the criticisms or potential defects to the Board’s satisfaction no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

- **Appendix A – Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report**: The firm’s response to a draft of this report, excluding any portion granted confidential treatment.

2018 Inspection Approach

In selecting issuer audits for review, we use a risk-based method of selection. We make selections based on (1) our internal evaluation of audits we believe have a heightened risk of material misstatement, including those with challenging audit areas, and (2) other risk-based characteristics, including issuer and firm considerations.

When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. Rather, we generally focus our attention on audit areas we believe to be of greater complexity, areas of greater significance or with a heightened risk of material misstatement to the issuer’s financial statements, and areas of recurring deficiencies. We may also select some audit areas for review in a manner designed to incorporate unpredictability.

Our selection of audits for review does not constitute a representative sample of the firm’s total population of issuer audits. Additionally, our inspection findings are specific to the particular portions of the issuer audits reviewed. They are not an assessment of all of the firm’s audit work nor of all of the audit procedures performed for the audits reviewed.

View the details on the scope of our inspections and our inspections procedures.
Overview of the 2018 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year

The following information provides an overview of our inspections in 2018 of the firm’s issuer audits as well as data from the previous two inspections. We use a risk-based method to select audits for review and to identify areas on which we focus our inspection. Because our inspection process evolves over time, it can, and often does, focus on a different mix of audits and focus areas from year to year and firm to firm. As a result of this variation, we caution that our inspection results are not necessarily comparable over time or among firms.

### Audits Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total audits reviewed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated audits of financial statements and ICFR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-based selections</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part I.A Deficiencies in Audits Reviewed

If a deficiency is included in Part I.A of our report, it does not necessarily mean that the firm has not addressed the deficiency. In many cases, the firm has performed remedial actions after the issue was identified. Depending on the circumstances, remedial actions may include performing additional audit procedures, informing management of the issuer of the need for changes to the financial statements or reporting on ICFR, or taking steps to prevent reliance on prior audit reports. Our inspection normally includes a review, on a sample basis, of the adequacy of a firm's remedial actions, either with respect to previously identified deficiencies or deficiencies identified during that inspection. If a firm does not take appropriate actions to address deficiencies, we may criticize its system of quality control or pursue a disciplinary action.
The fact that we have included a deficiency in our report — other than those deficiencies for audits with incorrect opinions on the financial statements and/or ICFR — does not necessarily mean that the issuer’s financial statements are materially misstated or that undisclosed material weaknesses in ICFR exist. It is often not possible for us to reach a conclusion on those points based on our inspection procedures and related findings because, for example, we have only the information that the auditor retained and the issuer’s public disclosures. We do not have direct access to the issuer’s management, underlying books and records, and other information.

The following tables and graphs summarize inspection-related information, by inspection year, for 2018 and the previous two inspections. We caution any comparison of the data provided without reading the descriptions of the underlying deficiencies in each respective inspection report.

**Most Frequently Identified Part I.A Deficiencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deficiencies in audits of financial statements</th>
<th>Audits with Part I.A deficiencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not sufficiently evaluate significant assumptions or data that the issuer used in developing an estimate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed and Related Part I.A Deficiencies

This table reflects the three focus areas we have selected most frequently for review in each inspection year (and the related Part I.A deficiencies). For the issuer audits selected for review, we selected these areas because they were generally significant to the issuer’s financial statements, may have included complex issues for auditors, and/or involved complex judgments in (1) estimating and auditing the reported value of related accounts and disclosures and (2) implementing and auditing the related controls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment securities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital share transactions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investment Securities:** The deficiencies in 2017 related to substantive testing of the valuation of hard-to-value investment securities.

Auditing Standards Associated with Identified Part I.A Deficiencies

The following lists the auditing standards referenced in Part I.A of the 2018 and the previous two inspection reports and the number of times that the standard is cited in Part I.A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCAOB Auditing Standards</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AS 1210, <em>Using the Work of a Specialist</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2301, <em>The Auditor’s Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2502, <em>Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS 2810, <em>Evaluating Audit Results</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issuer Industry Information

All of the issuers whose audits were inspected in 2018, 2017, and 2016 were registered management investment companies in the financials industry sector.

Inspection Results by Issuer Net Asset Range

The charts below categorize, based upon net assets, the inspection results for the issuers whose audits were reviewed in 2018, 2017, and 2016. Because all of the issuers inspected are registered management investment companies, net asset data is used to provide information about the size of the issuers whose audits were reviewed.

The industry sector is based on Global Industry Classification Standard ("GICS") data obtained from Standard & Poor’s ("S&P").
Classification of Audits with Part I.A Deficiencies

We classify each issuer audit in one of the categories discussed below based on the Part I.A deficiency or deficiencies identified in our review.

The sole purpose of this classification system is to group and present issuer audits by the number of Part I.A deficiencies we identified within the audit as well as to highlight audits with an incorrect opinion on the financial statements and/or ICFR.

Audits with an Incorrect Opinion on the Financial Statements and/or ICFR

This classification includes instances where an audit deficiency was identified in connection with our inspection and, as a result, an issuer’s financial statements were determined to be materially misstated, and the issuer restated its financial statements. It also includes instances where an audit deficiency was identified in connection with our inspection and, as a result, an issuer’s ICFR was determined to be ineffective, or there were additional material weaknesses that the firm did not identify, and the firm withdrew its opinion, or modified its report, on ICFR.

Audits with Multiple Deficiencies

This classification includes instances where multiple deficiencies were identified that related to a combination of one or more financial statement accounts, disclosures, and/or important controls in an ICFR audit.

Audits with a Single Deficiency

This classification includes instances where a single deficiency was identified that related to a financial statement account or disclosure or to an important control in an ICFR audit.

Number of Audits in Each Category
Part I: Inspection Observations

Part I.A of our report discusses deficiencies that were of such significance that we believe the firm, at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer’s financial statements and/or ICFR. Part I.B discusses deficiencies that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion(s) but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules. Consistent with the Act, it is the Board’s assessment that nothing in Part I of this report deals with a criticism of or potential defect in the firm’s quality control system. Any such criticisms or potential defects are discussed in Part II. Further, you should not infer from any Part I deficiency or combination of deficiencies that a quality control finding is identified in Part II.

Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions

In the 2018 inspection, we did not identify any deficiencies that were of such significance that we believe the firm, at the time it issued its audit report(s), had not obtained sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer’s financial statements.

Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules

In the 2018 inspection, we did not identify any deficiencies related to other instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules.
Part II: Observations Related To Quality Control

Part II of our report discusses criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm’s system of quality control.

Deficiencies are included in Part II if an analysis of the inspection results, including the results of the reviews of individual audits, indicates that the firm’s system of quality control does not provide reasonable assurance that firm personnel will comply with applicable professional standards and requirements. Generally, the report’s description of quality control criticisms is based on observations from our inspection procedures.

Any changes or improvements to its system of quality control that the firm may have brought to the Board’s attention may not be reflected in this report, but are taken into account during the Board’s assessment of whether the firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

Criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm’s system of quality control, to the extent any are identified, are nonpublic when the reports are issued. If a firm does not address to the Board’s satisfaction any criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm’s system of quality control within 12 months after the issuance of our report, any such deficiency will be made public.
Appendix A: Firm’s Response to the Draft Inspection Report

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the firm’s response, excluding any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.

The Board does not make public any of a firm’s comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm’s response is made publicly available.

In addition, pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm’s comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any portion of a firm’s response that addresses any point in the draft that the Board omits from, or any inaccurate statement in the draft that the Board corrects in, the final report.
July 7, 2020

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


Dear Mr. Botic:

We are pleased to provide our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board’s (PCAOB) Draft Report on the 2018 Inspection of Cohen & Company, Ltd. (Cohen). The inspection process is critical to the PCAOB’s role in the oversight of a public accounting firm’s compliance with rules and professional standards specifically related to the performance of audits and the issuance of accurate and independent audit reports. Cohen fully supports the mission of the PCAOB and its inspection process.

We are committed to consistently performing the highest quality audits and embrace our responsibility to investors and the public interest. We appreciate the ongoing dialogue and professionalism exhibited by the PCAOB and their inspection team, and we look forward to continuously improving our audit process, methodologies and quality control system.

Very truly yours,

COHEN & COMPANY, LTD.