



August 18, 2022

Via Electronic Mail

Mr. Darin Jenkins
Kerber, Eck & Braeckel LLP
3200 Robbins Road
Suite 200A
Springfield, Illinois 62704

Re: Final Report of Inspection

Dear Mr. Jenkins:

Attached please find a copy of the final inspection report issued on August 18, 2022 by the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) concerning the inspection of Kerber, Eck & Braeckel LLP. Please confirm receipt of the final inspection report upon receipt.

The PCAOB is issuing this report in accordance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. The PCAOB is releasing to the public Part I, the first four paragraphs of Part II, and portions of Appendix A that consists of your firm's comments, if any, related to public portions of the report.

If you make a submission or wish to submit a draft submission to facilitate dialogue with the staff, please do so by following the link to the [Registered Firm Portal](https://pcaobus.appiancloud.com/suite/?signin=firm) (<https://pcaobus.appiancloud.com/suite/?signin=firm>) by sending your submission to the "Remediation Mailbox." Please include in the subject line your firm's Firm ID number and inspection report name in the following format: Firm ID number, Remediation Response (or Draft Response) for Report on 20XX Inspection of FIRM NAME.

If you have questions concerning the process for seeking Securities and Exchange Commission ("Commission") review of the final inspection report, please see Rule 140 of the Commission's Rules on Informal and Other Procedures, 17 C.F.R. § 202.140, and direct any questions to staff in the Commission's Office of the Chief Accountant. Please note that if your firm makes a request to the Commission for review, the Commission's rule requires that your firm "provide a copy of its review request to the PCAOB simultaneously with its submission to the Commission." Any such copy should be sent to the attention of Phoebe W. Brown, Secretary, either by e-mail by following the link to Rule140@pcaobus.org, by fax to (866) 210-1148, or by delivery to the mailing address shown on the letterhead above.



Mr. Darin Jenkins
Kerber, Eck & Braeckel LLP
August 18, 2022
Page 2

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Richard Wei at (202) 207-9152 or weir@pcaobus.org or me at (202) 207-9175 or boticg@pcaobus.org.

Sincerely,

George Botic
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections

2021 Inspection Kerber, Eck & Braeckel LLP

(Headquartered in Springfield, Illinois)

August 18, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2021 Inspection.....	2
Overview of the 2021 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

2021 INSPECTION

In the 2021 inspection of Kerber, Eck & Braeckel LLP, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB) assessed the firm's compliance with laws, rules, and professional standards applicable to the audits of public companies.

We selected for review one audit of an issuer with a fiscal year ending in 2020. For the issuer audit selected, we reviewed a portion of the audit. We also evaluated elements of the firm's system of quality control.

2021 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 necessarily 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 2021 INSPECTION AND HISTORICAL DATA BY INSPECTION YEAR

The following information provides an overview of our 2021 inspection 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 Selected for Review

	2021	2018
Firm data		
Total issuer audit clients for which the firm was the principal auditor at the outset of the inspection procedures	3	3
Total engagement partners on issuer audit work¹	3	2
Audits reviewed		
Total audits reviewed²	1	1
Audits in which the firm was the principal auditor	1	1
Integrated audits of financial statements and internal control over financial reporting (ICFR)	0	0
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, *Supervision of the Audit Engagement*) 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 audit report 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 2021 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.

2021		2018	
Audit area	Audits reviewed	Audit area	Audits reviewed
Revenue and related accounts	1	Insurance-related assets and liabilities, including insurance reserves	1
Investment securities	1	Investment securities	1
Loans and related accounts	1	Significant estimate	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 ("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. We discuss any such criticisms or potential defects in Part II. Further, you should not infer from any Part I deficiency, or combination of deficiencies, that we identified a quality control finding 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 2021 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, 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

This section of our report discusses any deficiencies we identified that do not relate directly to the sufficiency or appropriateness of evidence the firm obtained to support its opinion but nevertheless relate to instances of non-compliance with PCAOB standards or rules.

When we review an audit, we do not review every aspect of the audit. In some cases, we assess the firm's compliance with specific PCAOB standards or rules on other audits that were not reviewed and include any instances of non-compliance below.

We identified the following deficiency:

In the audit reviewed, the firm did not make a required communication to the issuer's audit committee related to the significant risks identified through its risk assessment procedures. In this instance, the firm was non-compliant with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*.

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.

We include deficiencies 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.

This report does not reflect changes or improvements to the firm's system of quality control that the firm may have made subsequent to the period covered by our inspection. The Board does consider such changes or improvements in assessing whether the firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects no later than 12 months after the issuance of this report.

When we issue our reports, we do not make public criticisms of, and potential defects in, the firm's system of quality control, to the extent any are identified. 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, we will make public any such deficiency.

In the 2021 inspection, we did not identify any deficiencies that we considered to be a criticism of, or potential defect in, the firm's system of quality control.

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.



Kerber, Eck & Braeckel LLP P 217.789.0960
3200 Robbins Road F 217.789.2822
Suite 200A
Springfield, IL 62704

June 14, 2022

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

Re: Response to Report on 2021 Inspection of Kerber, Eck & Braeckel LLP

Dear Mr. Botic:

We are pleased to provide our response to Part 1 of the Draft Report on the 2021 inspection of Kerber, Eck & Braeckel LLP.

Upon learning of our oversight in our communication of required items to the Audit Committee of our client, we were able to communicate the significant risks identified through our risk assessment procedures in the next Audit Committee meeting held one month after the inspection.

In addition, we have taken steps to correct this deficiency within our firm's policies as we moved forward into our year end 2021 audit cycle.

We look forward to working with the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board in future inspections, and benefit from the process as we continually improve our audit quality.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Kerber Eck + Braeckel LLP".

Kerber, Eck & Braeckel LLP

kebcpa.com

