
2019 Inspection Hancock Askew & Co., LLP

(Headquartered in Savannah, Georgia)

January 21, 2021



THIS IS A PUBLIC VERSION OF A PCAOB INSPECTION REPORT

PORTIONS OF THE COMPLETE REPORT ARE OMITTED FROM THIS DOCUMENT IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH SECTIONS 104(g)(2) AND 105(b)(5)(A) OF THE SARBANES-OXLEY ACT OF 2002

PCAOB RELEASE NO. 104-2021-037

Table of Contents

2019 Inspection	2
Overview of the 2019 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year	3
Part I: Inspection Observations	5
Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions	5
Part I.B: Other Instances of Non-Compliance with PCAOB Standards or Rules	5
Part II: Observations Related To Quality Control	6
Appendix A: Firm's Response to the Draft Inspection Report	A-1

2019 Inspection

During the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (“PCAOB”)’s 2019 inspection of Hancock Askew & Co., LLP, we assessed the firm’s compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of public companies.

We selected for review two audits of issuers, one with a fiscal year ending in 2018 and one with a fiscal year 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.

2019 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. In certain situations we may select all of the firm’s issuer audits for review.

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 2019 Inspection and Historical Data by Inspection Year

The following information provides an overview of our inspection in 2019 of the firm's issuer audits as well as data from the previous inspection. We use a risk-based method to select audits for review and to identify areas on which we focus our review. Because our inspection process evolves over time, it can, and often does, focus on a different mix of audits and audit areas from inspection to inspection and firm to firm. Further, a firm's business, the applicable auditing standards, or other factors can change from the time of one inspection to the next. As a result of these variations, we caution that our inspection results are not necessarily comparable over time or among firms.

Firm Data and Audits Reviewed

	2019	2016
Firm Data		
Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures	11	10
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	3	2
Audits Reviewed		
Total audits reviewed²	2	3
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	2	3
Audits with Part I.A deficiencies	0	0

¹ The number of engagement 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) during the twelve-month period preceding the outset of the inspection.

² The population of issuer audits from which audits are selected for review may differ from the issuer audits at the outset of the inspection procedures due to variations such as new issuer audit clients for which the firm has not yet issued an opinion or issuer audit clients lost prior to the outset of the inspection.

Audit Areas Most Frequently Reviewed

This table reflects the audit areas we have selected most frequently for review in the 2019 inspection and the previous inspection. 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.

2019		2016	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Investment securities	2	Investment securities	2
Participant and employer contributions	1	Participant and employer contributions	2
Revenue and related accounts	1	Revenue and related accounts	1
Financial reporting	1	Long-lived assets	1

Part I: Inspection Observations

Part I.A of our report discusses 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 ICFR. Part I.B 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. Consistent with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act ("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. Section 104(g)(2) of 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.

Part I.A: Audits with Unsupported Opinions

In the 2019 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 and/or ICFR.

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

In the 2019 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.



HANCOCK ASKEW & CO LLP
ACCOUNTANTS & ADVISORS

November 20, 2020

Via Electronic Mail: ResponsestoDraftReport@pcaobus.org

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

Firm ID: 0079410010
Response on 2019 Inspection of Hancock Askew & Co., LLP

Dear Mr. Botic:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PCAOB's Draft Report on the 2019 inspection of Hancock Askew & Co., LLP dated November 18, 2020. We believe the PCAOB's inspection process is a valuable means of evaluating audit performance and quality controls. Our firm is committed to the highest quality and we attempt to conduct our audit practice in strict conformity with professional standards, your inspection helps us meet that goal.

We appreciate the professionalism of the PCAOB staff and thank them for their efforts in our shared goals of improving audit quality. Thank you for the opportunity to respond, we are pleased that our report did not reveal significant deficiencies in the engagements reviewed.

Sincerely,

Hancock Askew & Co., LLP

Hancock Askew & Co., LLP

Atlanta | 770-246-0793 | 3740 Davinci Court | Suite 400 | Peachtree Corners, GA 30092
Offices in Georgia and Florida

www.HancockAskew.com

