

Report on

2017 Inspection of Dave Banerjee CPA
an Accountancy Corporation
(Headquartered in Woodland Hills, California)

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

December 14, 2017

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**



2017 INSPECTION OF DAVE BANERJEE CPA AN ACCOUNTANCY CORPORATION

Preface

In 2017, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Dave Banerjee CPA an Accountancy Corporation ("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 a review of portions of an issuer audit. This review was 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.

Note on this report's citations to auditing standards: On March 31, 2015, the PCAOB adopted a reorganization of its auditing standards using a topical structure and a single, integrated numbering system. *See Reorganization of PCAOB Auditing Standards and Related Amendments to PCAOB Standards and Rules*, PCAOB Release No. 2015-002 (Mar. 31, 2015). The reorganization became effective as of December 31, 2016. Citations in this report reference the reorganized PCAOB auditing standards.

PROFILE OF THE FIRM¹

Offices	1 (Woodland Hills, California)
Ownership structure	Professional corporation
Partners / professional staff ²	1 / 4
Issuer audit clients	5
Lead partners on issuer audit work ³	1
Other names used in audit reports	Dave Banerjee, CPA

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 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.

³ 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 March 27, 2017 to March 31, 2017.⁴

A. Review of Audit Engagement

The inspection procedures included review of portions of one issuer audit 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 standards that primarily relate to the deficiencies; they do not present a comprehensive list of every auditing standard that applies 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 accordance with the applicable

⁴ 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.

financial reporting framework. In other words, in this audit, the auditor issued an opinion without satisfying its fundamental obligation to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements were free of material misstatement.

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. 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. As indicated below, however, in one instance, the inspection team identified a failure by the Firm to identify and address appropriately a departure from Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") that appeared to the inspection team to be material.

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.⁵

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

A.1. Issuer A

- (1) the Firm's failure to identify, or to address appropriately, a departure from GAAP that appeared to the inspection team to be material,

⁵ 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.

which related to the omission from the financial statements of disclosures concerning certain assets (AS 2502.43; AS 2810.31);

(2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the existence, valuation, and presentation and disclosure of certain assets, including the failure to perform sufficient risk assessment procedures (AS 2110.59; AS 2301.08 and .13; AS 2502.03, .15, and .43; AS 2810.03 and .30);

(3) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test revenue, including the failure to perform sufficient risk assessment procedures (AS 2110.59 and .68; AS 2502.03 and .15; AS 2810.03 and .30);

(4) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test income, including the use of sampling with an inadequate sample size developed without consideration of relevant factors (AS 2315.19, .23, .23A, .24, and .26; AS 2810.17); and

(5) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test certain liabilities, including the inadequate performance of substantive analytical procedures (AS 2301.08 and .13; AS 2305.17 and .20; AS 2810.31).

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) 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 audit for which each standard is cited.

PCAOB Auditing Standards	Issuer
AS 2110, <i>Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	A
AS 2301, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	A
AS 2305, <i>Substantive Analytical Procedures</i>	A
AS 2315, <i>Audit Sampling</i>	A
AS 2502, <i>Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</i>	A
AS 2810, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i>	A

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 internal control over financial reporting ("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,⁶ as well as a

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 the applicable financial reporting framework, the Board's practice is to report that information to the

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 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.⁷

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.

⁷ 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

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, 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.⁸ 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

professional standards are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings for purposes of imposing legal liability.

⁸ 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.

nature, significance, and frequency of deficiencies;⁹ 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 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.



PCAOB Release No. 104-2018-035
Inspection of Dave Banerjee CPA
an Accountancy Corporation
December 14, 2017
Page 11

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.¹⁰

¹⁰ 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.



DAVE BANERJEE, CPA

An Accountancy Corporation – Member AICPA and PCAOB

21860 Burbank Blvd., Suite 150, Woodland Hills, CA 91367 • (818) 657-0288 • FAX (818) 657-0299 • (818) 312-3283

November 1, 2017

Ms. Helen A. 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 Draft Report on the 2017 Inspection of Dave Banerjee CPA an Accountancy Corporation

Dear Ms. Munter,

We are pleased to respond to the Part I of the PCAOB's draft report on the 2017 inspection of the Dave Banerjee, CPA an Accountancy Corporation. We continue to support the Board's goal of improving audit quality and the reliability of financial reporting for the public markets.

Our objective is to make certain that all aspects of our auditing and quality control processes are of high quality. To that end, we continuously monitor and assess our methodologies, policies, and procedures to improve audit quality. The Board's inspection process assists us in identifying areas where we can continue to improve our performance. We wish to acknowledge the professionalism of the PCAOB inspection staff.

We have evaluated the matters described in Part I of the draft report, and have taken actions as appropriate in accordance with PCAOB standards to comply with our professional responsibilities under AS 2901, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and AS 2905, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report*. We concluded that the matters identified by the PCAOB did not have an impact on our previously issued audit report.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our response to the Board and we look forward to continuing to work with the PCAOB on the most effective ways to improve our audit performance and system of quality control.

Sincerely,

Dave Banerjee CPA, an Accountancy Corporation

Dave Banerjee CPA, an Accountancy Corporation

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>.

AS 2110, <i>Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement</i>		
IDENTIFYING AND ASSESSING THE RISKS OF MATERIAL MISSTATEMENT		
AS 2110.59	<p>The auditor should identify and assess the risks of material misstatement at the financial statement level and the assertion level. In identifying and assessing risks of material misstatement, the auditor should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Identify risks of misstatement using information obtained from performing risk assessment procedures (as discussed in paragraphs .04–.58) and considering the characteristics of the accounts and disclosures in the financial statements. <p>Note: Factors relevant to identifying fraud risks are discussed in paragraphs .65–.69 of this standard.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate whether the identified risks relate pervasively to the financial statements as a whole and potentially affect many assertions. Evaluate the types of potential misstatements that could result from the identified risks and the accounts, disclosures, and assertions that could be affected. <p>Note: In identifying and assessing risks at the assertion level, the auditor should evaluate how risks at the financial statement level could affect risks of misstatement at the assertion level.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the likelihood of misstatement, including the 	Issuer A

AS 2110, Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement

	<p>possibility of multiple misstatements, and the magnitude of potential misstatement to assess the possibility that the risk could result in material misstatement of the financial statements.</p> <p>Note: In assessing the likelihood and magnitude of potential misstatement, the auditor may take into account the planned degree of reliance on controls selected to test.³²</p> <p>e. Identify significant accounts and disclosures³³ and their relevant assertions³⁴ (paragraphs .60–.64 of this standard).</p> <p>Note: The determination of whether an account or disclosure is significant or whether an assertion is a relevant assertion is based on inherent risk, without regard to the effect of controls.</p> <p>f. Determine whether any of the identified and assessed risks of material misstatement are significant risks (paragraphs .70–.71 of this standard).</p>	
<p>Footnotes to AS 2110.59</p> <p>³² AS 2301.16–.35.</p> <p>³³ AS 2201.A10 states:</p> <p>An account or disclosure is a significant account or disclosure if there is a reasonable possibility that the account or disclosure could contain a misstatement that, individually or when aggregated with others, has a material effect on the financial statements, considering the risks of both overstatement and understatement. The determination of whether an account or disclosure is significant is based on inherent risk, without regard to the effect of controls.</p> <p>³⁴ AS 2201.A9 states:</p> <p>A relevant assertion is a financial statement assertion that has a reasonable possibility of containing a misstatement or misstatements that would cause the financial statements to be materially misstated. The determination of whether an assertion is a relevant assertion is based on inherent risk, without regard to the effect of controls.</p>		
Factors Relevant to Identifying Fraud Risks		
AS 2110.68	<p><i>Presumption of Fraud Risk Involving Improper Revenue Recognition.</i> The auditor should presume that there is a fraud risk involving improper revenue recognition and</p>	Issuer A

AS 2110, *Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement*

	evaluate which types of revenue, revenue transactions, or assertions may give rise to such risks.	
--	---	--

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 A
Responses to Fraud Risks		
AS 2301.13	<i>Addressing Fraud Risks in the Audit of Financial Statements.</i> In the audit of financial statements, the auditor should perform substantive procedures, including tests of details, that are specifically responsive to the assessed fraud risks. If the auditor selects certain controls intended to address the assessed fraud risks for testing in accordance with paragraphs .16-.17 of this standard, the auditor should perform tests of those controls.	Issuer A

AS 2305, *Substantive Analytical Procedures*

ANALYTICAL PROCEDURES USED AS SUBSTANTIVE TESTS		
Precision of the Expectation		
AS 2305.17	The expectation should be precise enough to provide the desired level of assurance that differences that may be potential material misstatements, individually or when aggregated with other misstatements, would be identified for the auditor to investigate (<u>see</u> paragraph .20). As expectations become more precise, the range of expected differences becomes narrower and, accordingly, the likelihood increases that significant differences from the	Issuer A

AS 2305, Substantive Analytical Procedures		
	expectations are due to misstatements. The precision of the expectation depends on, among other things, the auditor's identification and consideration of factors that significantly affect the amount being audited and the level of detail of data used to develop the expectation.	
Investigation and Evaluation of Significant Differences		
AS 2305.20	In planning the analytical procedures as a substantive test, the auditor should consider the amount of difference from the expectation that can be accepted without further investigation. This consideration is influenced primarily by materiality and should be consistent with the level of assurance desired from the procedures. Determination of this amount involves considering the possibility that a combination of misstatements in the specific account balances, or class of transactions, or other balances or classes could aggregate to an unacceptable amount.	Issuer A

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.	Issuer A

AS 2315, Audit Sampling

Footnote to AS 2315.19

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.

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.	Issuer A
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.	Issuer A
Sample Selection		
AS 2315.24	Sample items should be selected in such a way that the sample can be expected to be representative of the population. Therefore, all items in the population should have an opportunity to be selected. For example, haphazard and random-based selection of items represents two means of obtaining such samples. ⁴	Issuer A

Footnote to AS 2315.24

⁴ Random-based selection includes, for example, random sampling, stratified random sampling, sampling with probability proportional to size, and systematic sampling (for example, every hundredth item) with one or more random starts.

AS 2315, Audit Sampling		
Performance and Evaluation		
AS 2315.26	<p>The auditor should project the misstatement results of the sample to the items from which the sample was selected.^{5,6} There are several acceptable ways to project misstatements from a sample. For example, an auditor may have selected a sample of every twentieth item (50 items) from a population containing one thousand items. If he discovered overstatements of \$3,000 in that sample, the auditor could project a \$60,000 overstatement by dividing the amount of misstatement in the sample by the fraction of total items from the population included in the sample. The auditor should add that projection to the misstatements discovered in any items examined 100 percent. This total projected misstatement should be compared with the tolerable misstatement for the account balance or class of transactions, and appropriate consideration should be given to sampling risk. If the total projected misstatement is less than tolerable misstatement for the account balance or class of transactions, the auditor should consider the risk that such a result might be obtained even though the true monetary misstatement for the population exceeds tolerable misstatement. For example, if the tolerable misstatement in an account balance of \$1 million is \$50,000 and the total projected misstatement based on an appropriate sample (see paragraph .23) is \$10,000, he may be reasonably assured that there is an acceptably low sampling risk that the true monetary misstatement for the population exceeds tolerable misstatement. On the other hand, if the total projected misstatement is close to the tolerable misstatement, the auditor may conclude that there is an unacceptably high risk that the actual misstatements in the population exceed the tolerable misstatement. An auditor uses professional judgment in making such evaluations.</p>	Issuer A
<p><u>Footnotes to AS 2315.26</u></p> <p>⁵ If the auditor has separated the items subject to sampling into relatively homogeneous groups (see paragraph .22), he separately projects the misstatement results of each group and sums them.</p> <p>⁶ AS 2810.10 through .23 discuss the auditor's consideration of differences between the accounting records and the underlying facts and circumstances.</p>		

AS 2502, Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures		
INTRODUCTION		
AS 2502.03	<p>The auditor should obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to provide reasonable assurance that fair value measurements and disclosures are in conformity with GAAP. GAAP requires that certain items be measured at fair value. Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts No. 7, <i>Using Cash Flow Information and Present Value in Accounting Measurements</i>, defines the fair value of an asset (liability) as "the amount at which that asset (or liability) could be bought (or incurred) or sold (or settled) in a current transaction between willing parties, that is, other than in a forced or liquidation sale."¹ Although GAAP may not prescribe the method for measuring the fair value of an item, it expresses a preference for the use of observable market prices to make that determination. In the absence of observable market prices, GAAP requires fair value to be based on the best information available in the circumstances.</p>	Issuer A
<p><u>Footnote to AS 2502.03</u></p> <p>¹ Generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) contain various definitions of fair value. However, all of the definitions reflect the concepts in the definition that appears in Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) Statement of Financial Accounting Concepts No. 7, <i>Using Cash Flow Information and Present Value in Accounting Measurements</i>. For example, Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement of Governmental Accounting Standards No. 31, <i>Accounting and Financial Reporting for Certain Investments and for External Investment Pools</i>, defines fair value as "the amount at which an investment could be exchanged in a current transaction between willing parties, other than in a forced or liquidation sale."</p>		
EVALUATING CONFORMITY OF FAIR VALUE MEASUREMENTS AND DISCLOSURES WITH GAAP		
AS 2502.15	<p>The auditor should evaluate whether the fair value measurements and disclosures in the financial statements are in conformity with GAAP. The auditor's understanding of the requirements of GAAP and knowledge of the business and industry, together with the results of other audit procedures, are used to evaluate the accounting for assets or liabilities requiring fair value measurements, and the disclosures about the basis for the fair value measurements and significant uncertainties related thereto.</p>	Issuer A

AS 2502, Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures

**DISCLOSURES ABOUT
FAIR VALUES**

AS 2502.43

The auditor should evaluate whether the disclosures about fair values made by the entity are in conformity with GAAP.⁸ Disclosure of fair value information is an important aspect of financial statements. Often, fair value disclosure is required because of the relevance to users in the evaluation of an entity's performance and financial position. In addition to the fair value information required under GAAP, some entities disclose voluntary additional fair value information in the notes to the financial statements.

Issuer A

Footnote to AS 2502.43

⁸ See also paragraph .31 of AS 2810, *Evaluating Audit Results*.

AS 2810, Evaluating Audit Results

**EVALUATING THE
RESULTS OF THE AUDIT
OF FINANCIAL
STATEMENTS**

AS 2810.03

In forming an opinion on whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework, the auditor should take into account all relevant audit evidence, regardless of whether it appears to corroborate or to contradict the assertions in the financial statements.

Issuer A

**Accumulating and
Evaluating Identified
Misstatements**

AS 2810.17

Evaluation of the Effect of Uncorrected Misstatements. The auditor should evaluate whether uncorrected misstatements are material, individually or in combination with other misstatements. In making this evaluation, the auditor should evaluate the misstatements in relation to the specific accounts and disclosures involved and to the financial statements as a whole, taking into account relevant quantitative and qualitative factors.⁷ (See Appendix B.)

Issuer A

AS 2810, Evaluating Audit Results

Note: In interpreting the federal securities laws, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that a fact is material if there is "a substantial likelihood that the ...fact would have been viewed by the reasonable investor as having significantly altered the 'total mix' of information made available."⁸ As the Supreme Court has noted, determinations of materiality require "delicate assessments of the inferences a 'reasonable shareholder' would draw from a given set of facts and the significance of those inferences to him"⁹

Note: As a result of the interaction of quantitative and qualitative considerations in materiality judgments, uncorrected misstatements of relatively small amounts could have a material effect on the financial statements. For example, an illegal payment of an otherwise immaterial amount could be material if there is a reasonable possibility¹⁰ that it could lead to a material contingent liability or a material loss of revenue.¹¹ Also, a misstatement made intentionally could be material for qualitative reasons, even if relatively small in amount.

Note: If the reevaluation of the established materiality level or levels, as set forth in AS 2105,¹² results in a lower amount for the materiality level or levels, the auditor should take into account that lower materiality level or levels in the evaluation of uncorrected misstatements.

Footnotes to AS 2810.17

⁷ If the financial statements contain material misstatements, AS 3101, *Reports on Audited Financial Statements*, indicates that the auditor should issue a qualified or an adverse opinion on the financial statements. AS 3101.35 discusses situations in which the financial statements are materially affected by a departure from the applicable financial reporting framework.

⁸ *TSC Industries v. Northway, Inc.*, 426 U.S. 438, 449 (1976). See also *Basic, Inc. v. Levinson*, 485 U.S. 224 (1988).

⁹ *TSC Industries*, 426 U.S. at 450.

AS 2810, *Evaluating Audit Results*

¹⁰ There is a reasonable possibility of an event, as used in this standard, when the likelihood of the event is either "reasonably possible" or "probable," as those terms are used in the FASB Accounting Standards Codification, Contingencies Topic, paragraph 450-20-25-1.

¹¹ AS 2405, *Illegal Acts by Clients*.

¹² AS 2105.11-.12.

**Evaluating the
Presentation of the
Financial Statements,
Including the Disclosures**

AS 2810.30

The auditor must evaluate whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework.

Issuer A

Note: AS 2815, *The Meaning of "Present Fairly in Conformity With Generally Accepted Accounting Principles,"* establishes requirements for evaluating the presentation of the financial statements. AS 2820, *Evaluating Consistency of Financial Statements*, establishes requirements regarding evaluating the consistency of the accounting principles used in financial statements.

Note: The auditor should look to the requirements of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the company under audit with respect to the accounting principles applicable to that company.

AS 2810.31

As part of the evaluation of the presentation of the financial statements, the auditor should evaluate whether the financial statements contain the information essential for a fair presentation of the financial statements in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework. Evaluation of the information disclosed in the financial statements includes consideration of the form, arrangement, and content of the financial statements (including the accompanying notes), encompassing matters such as the terminology used, the amount of detail given, the classification of items in the statements, and the bases of amounts set forth.

Issuer A

AS 2810, *Evaluating Audit Results*

	<p>Note: According to AS 3101, if the financial statements, including the accompanying notes, fail to disclose information that is required by the applicable financial reporting framework, the auditor should express a qualified or adverse opinion and should provide the information in the report, if practicable, unless its omission from the report is recognized as appropriate by a specific auditing standard.¹⁸</p>	
<p><u>Footnote to AS 2810.31</u></p> <p>¹⁸ AS 3101.41-.44.</p>		