

Report on

**2013 Inspection of CohnReznick LLP
(Headquartered in Roseland, New Jersey)**

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

February 27, 2014

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**

2013 INSPECTION OF COHNREZNICK LLP

In 2013, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm CohnReznick LLP^{1/} ("the Firm"). The Board is issuing this report of that inspection in accordance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

The inspection process is designed, and inspections are performed, to provide a basis for assessing the degree of compliance by a firm with applicable requirements related to auditing issuers. The issuer audits and aspects of those audits inspected were selected based on a number of risk-related and other factors. The inspection process included reviews of aspects of selected issuer audits completed by the inspected firm. The reviews were intended to identify whether deficiencies existed in those aspects of the audits, and whether such deficiencies indicated weaknesses or defects in the firm's system of quality control over audits. In addition, the inspection included 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 making portions of the report publicly available. Specifically, the Board is releasing to the public Part I of the report and portions of Part IV of the report. Part IV of the report consists of the Firm's comments, if any, on a draft of the report.^{2/}

^{1/} The Firm has issued audit reports under the names of J.H. Cohn LLP and CohnReznick, LLC.

^{2/} In its *Statement Concerning the Issuance of Inspection Reports*, PCAOB Release No. 104-2004-001 (August 26, 2004), the Board described its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions. As described there, if the nonpublic portions of any inspection report discuss criticisms of or potential defects in a firm's system of quality control, those discussions also could eventually be made public, but only to the extent a firm fails to address the criticisms to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the issuance of the report.

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from June 3, 2013 to June 7, 2013 and from June 17, 2013 to June 21, 2013. These procedures were tailored to the nature of the Firm, certain aspects of which the inspection team understood at the outset of the inspection to be as follows:

Number of offices	27 ^{3/}
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Number of partners	287
Number of professional staff ^{4/}	1,584
Number of issuer audit clients ^{5/}	83

^{3/} The Firm's offices are located in Los Angeles, Sacramento, San Diego, and Woodland Hills, California; Farmington, Glastonbury, New London, and Stamford, Connecticut; Atlanta, Georgia; Chicago, Illinois; Baltimore and Bethesda, Maryland; Boston and Springfield, Massachusetts; Eatontown, Edison, Princeton, and Roseland, New Jersey; Jericho and White Plains, New York; Charlotte, North Carolina; Austin, Texas; Vienna, Virginia; George Town, Grand Cayman, Cayman Islands, B.W.I.; and Chennai, Republic of India.

^{4/} "Professional staff" includes all personnel of the Firm, except partners or shareholders and administrative support personnel. The number of partners and professional staff is provided here as an indication of the size of the Firm, and does not necessarily represent the number of the Firm's professionals who participate in audits of issuers or are "associated persons" (as defined in the Act) of the Firm.

^{5/} The number of issuer audit clients shown here is based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information for inspection planning purposes. It does not reflect any Board determination concerning which, or how many, of the Firm's audit clients are "issuers" as defined in the Act. For information about

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included a review of aspects of the Firm's auditing of financial statements of 11 issuers. This review did not identify any audit performance issues that, in the inspection team's view, resulted in the Firm failing to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements or internal control over financial reporting ("ICFR").

B. Review of Quality Control System

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

C. General Information Concerning PCAOB Inspections

Board inspections are designed to identify whether weaknesses and deficiencies exist related to how a firm conducts audits and address any such weaknesses and deficiencies. To achieve that goal, Board inspections include reviews of certain aspects of selected audits performed by the firm and reviews of other matters related to the firm's quality control system. The scope of the inspection procedures is determined according to the Board's criteria, and the firm is not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the scope. The focus on weaknesses and deficiencies 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 and potential deficiencies should not be construed as an indication that the Board has made any determination about other

audit reports issued by the Firm, see Item 4.1 of the Firm's annual reports on PCAOB Form 2, available at www.pcaobus.org.

aspects of the firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct not included within the report.

In the course of reviewing aspects of selected audits, an inspection may identify ways in which a particular audit is deficient, including failures by the firm to identify, or to address appropriately, respects in which an issuer's financial statements do not present fairly the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP").^{6/} It is not the purpose of an inspection, however, to review all of a firm's audits or to identify every respect in which a reviewed audit is deficient. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that the firm's audits, or its issuer clients' financial statements or reporting on internal control, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

Inclusion of a deficiency in an inspection report does not mean that the deficiency remained unaddressed after the inspection team brought it to the firm's attention. Under PCAOB standards, when audit deficiencies are discovered after the date of the audit report, a firm must take appropriate action to assess the importance of the deficiencies to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed audit opinions.^{7/} Depending upon the circumstances, compliance with these standards may require the firm to perform additional 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 previously expressed audit opinions. A Board inspection does not typically include review of a firm's actions to address deficiencies identified in that inspection, but the Board expects that firms are attempting to take appropriate action, and firms frequently

^{6/} When it comes to the Board's attention that an issuer's financial statements appear not to present fairly, in a material respect, the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in conformity with GAAP, the Board's practice is to report that information to the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission"), which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

^{7/} See AU 390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and AU 561, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report* (both included among the PCAOB's interim auditing standards, pursuant to PCAOB Rule 3200T).

represent that they have taken, are taking, or will take, action. If, through subsequent inspections or other processes, the Board determines that the firm failed to take appropriate action, that failure may be grounds for a Board disciplinary sanction.

END OF PART I



PCAOB Release No. 104-2014-050
Inspection of CohnReznick LLP
February 27, 2014
Page 6

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. 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.^{8/}

^{8/} 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.

January 7, 2014

Ms. Helen Munter, 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 Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
Draft Report on 2013 Inspection of CohnReznick LLP

Dear Ms. Munter:

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (the "PCAOB" or the "Board") draft report on the 2013 inspection of CohnReznick LLP ("CohnReznick"). The inspection process is a fundamental component of the PCAOB's mission. We believe that the PCAOB and CohnReznick mutually share the objective to continually improve audit quality as well as serving investors and the public interest both domestically and internationally.

CohnReznick is committed to achieving the highest level of audit quality. Our systems have been designed to not only accomplish this goal but to also be adaptable to changes in methodologies, policies, procedures and practices when our monitoring systems identify opportunities for improvements in our system of quality control.

We would like to take this opportunity to voice our support of the PCAOB inspection process and thank the PCAOB and its inspection team for the professionalism, objectivity, dialogue and perspective demonstrated during the review of the Firm. We look forward to working with the PCAOB in the future.

Sincerely,



CohnReznick LLP