

**Report on**  
  
**2017 Inspection of WWC, P.C.**  
**(Headquartered in San Mateo, 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 WWC, P.C.**

### Preface

In 2017, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm WWC, P.C. ("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 reviews of portions of selected issuer audits. These reviews were 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 December 31, 2016. Citations in this report reference the reorganized PCAOB auditing standards.

**PROFILE OF THE FIRM<sup>1</sup>**

Offices	1 (San Mateo, California)
Ownership structure	Professional corporation
Partners / professional staff <sup>2</sup>	4 / 3
Issuer audit clients	14
Lead partners on issuer audit work <sup>3</sup>	2

---

<sup>1</sup> 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](http://pcaobus.org/Registration/rasr/Pages/RASR_Search.aspx).

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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 June 5, 2017 to June 9, 2017.<sup>4</sup>

#### **A. Review of Audit Engagements**

The inspection procedures included review of portions of two issuer audits 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 the standards that most directly relate to the deficiencies and do not include all standards that apply 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 conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework. In other words, in these audits, the auditor issued an opinion

---

<sup>4</sup> 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.

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.

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.<sup>5</sup>

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

A.1. Issuer A

- (1) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test revenue (AS 2301.08 and .13; AS 2810.30);
- (2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the existence and valuation of accounts receivable (AS 2310.31-.32; AS 2501.04); and

---

<sup>5</sup> 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.

(3) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test certain other assets (AS 2310.27; AS 2810.31).

**A.2. Issuer B**

(1) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test revenue (AS 1105.27; AS 2301.08 and .13); and

(2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation of accounts receivable (AS 2501.04).

**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 paragraphs 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 audits for which each standard is cited.

PCAOB Auditing Standards	Issuers
AS 1105, <i>Audit Evidence</i>	B
AS 2301, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	A and B
AS 2310, <i>The Confirmation Process</i>	A
AS 2501, <i>Auditing Accounting Estimates</i>	A and B
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,<sup>6</sup> as well as a 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.

---

<sup>6</sup> 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 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.



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.<sup>7</sup>

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.

---

<sup>7</sup> 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 professional standards are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings for purposes of imposing legal liability.

## 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.<sup>8</sup> 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 nature, significance, and frequency of deficiencies;<sup>9</sup> 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

---

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> 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.

performance, training, compliance with independence standards, client acceptance and retention, and the establishment of policies and procedures.

END OF PART I

PORTIONS OF THE REST OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC AND ARE OMITTED  
FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

## PART II

\* \* \* \*

### **B. Issues Related to Quality Controls**

A firm's system of quality control should provide reasonable assurance of compliance with applicable professional standards and regulatory requirements with respect to its audit practice (QC 20.04 and .17). On the basis of the information reported by the inspection team, including the audit performance deficiencies described in Part II.A (and summarized in Part I.A) and any other deficiencies identified below, the Board has concerns that the Firm's system of quality control fails to provide such reasonable assurance in at least the following respects<sup>10</sup> –

\* \* \* \*

#### Engagement Performance

##### Technical Training and Proficiency

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide sufficient assurance that the Firm will assign personnel with the training and proficiency required to perform audit work in accordance with PCAOB standards. Regarding the findings related to the valuation of accounts receivable for Issuers A and B, a similar significant deficiency was also identified in the Firm's audit that was reviewed in the previous inspection of the Firm (in 2015). With respect to each of the audit deficiencies identified in the 2017 inspection and described in Part II.A, it appeared to the inspection team that the engagement personnel who performed and supervised the work did not have sufficient technical knowledge, experience, or training necessary to enable them to fulfill the responsibilities of the work assigned. Specifically, with respect to these deficiencies, it appeared to the inspection team that the engagement personnel assigned to the audit

---

<sup>10</sup> This report's description of quality control issues is based on the inspection team's observations during the primary inspection procedures. Any changes or improvements that the Firm may have made in its system of quality control since that time may not be reflected in this report, but \* \* \* \* [have been] taken into account by the Board during its assessment of whether the Firm has satisfactorily addressed the quality control criticisms or defects within the twelve months after the issuance of this report.

did not have an appropriate understanding of relevant PCAOB standards. This information provides cause for concern with respect to the proficiency of Firm personnel with respect to the application of PCAOB standards. [Issuers A and B]

### Engagement Quality Review

In light of certain audit performance deficiencies described in Part II.A (and summarized in Part I.A), questions exist about the effectiveness of the Firm's system of quality control with respect to the execution of engagement quality reviews in compliance with AS 1220, *Engagement Quality Review*. An engagement quality review performed with due professional care in compliance with AS 1220 should have detected, and resulted in the Firm addressing, the deficiencies described in Part II.A related to the auditing of revenue. [Issuers A and B]

### Independence

A firm should have policies and procedures that provide the firm with reasonable assurance that the firm and its personnel will maintain independence from issuer audit clients (QC 20.04, .09 and .10). The inspection results indicate that the Firm's system of quality control may not provide the necessary assurance with respect to maintaining independence. The inspection team reported that, in one engagement reviewed, the Firm appeared not to have satisfied certain applicable independence criteria. [Issuer A]

### PCAOB Standards and Rules

The table below lists the specific PCAOB standards and rules that are primarily related to the descriptions of defects in, or criticisms of, the Firm's system of quality control included in this Part of the report.<sup>11</sup>

PCAOB Standards / Rules
AS 1010, <i>Training and Proficiency of the Independent Auditor</i>
AS 1220, <i>Engagement Quality Review</i>

---

<sup>11</sup> This table does not necessarily include reference to every standard or rule that may have been related to the criticisms or potential defects that are included in Part II.

QC 20, <i>System of Quality Control for a CPA Firm's Accounting and Auditing Practice</i>
---

* * * *
---------

Rule 3520, <i>Auditor Independence</i>
--

\* \* \* \*



## **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.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> 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.



**WWC, P.C.** CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

---

November 6, 2017

**BY EMAIL AND FEDEX**

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board  
Division of Registration and Inspections  
1666 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
Attn: Ms. Helen A. Munter, Director

Re: WWC, P.C. (Firm ID No.: 1171)  
Response to Part I of the Draft Inspection  
Report on the 2017 Inspection

Dear Ms. Munter:

We are writing in response to Part I of the draft Report of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB") on our 2017 inspection. We appreciate the Board for providing a draft inspection report to us so that we may assess and remediate deficiencies on our firm's audit quality.

We have assessed the matters discussed in Part I of the draft inspection report have taken and are currently implementing appropriate actions under both PCAOB standards and our firm's policies in order to address and rectify deficiencies identified by the inspection team, specifically: AS 1105 *Audit Evidence*, AS 2301 *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*, AS 2310 *The Confirmation Process*, AS 2501 *Auditing Accounting Estimates*, and AS 2810 *Evaluating Audit Results*. In certain instances, we have either determined that there has been no material misstatement based on additional procedures performed by us, or we are taking further action to determine if there has been material misstatement. In one circumstance, our Firm has worked with the issuer to amend previously issued financial statements to rectify an error.

Our Firm thanks the PCAOB for providing us the opportunity to respond to the draft inspection report and show that we are committed to improving our audit process and our underlying systems of audit quality control.

Sincerely,

*WWC, P.C.*

WWC, P.C.  
Certified Public Accountants



**WWC, P.C.** CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

---

November 6, 2017

**BY EMAIL AND FEDEX**

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board  
Division of Registration and Inspections  
1666 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
Attn: Ms. Helen A. Munter, Director

Re: WWC, P.C. (Firm ID No.: 1171)  
Response to Part II of the Draft Inspection  
Report on the 2017 Inspection

Dear Ms. Munter,

We are writing in response to Part II of the draft Report of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB") on our 2017 inspection. We appreciate the Board for providing a draft inspection report to us so that we may assess and remediate deficiencies on our firm's audit quality.

We have assessed the matters discussed in Part II of the draft inspection report and have either executed or are the midst of taking appropriate actions under both PCAOB standards and our Firm's policies in order to rectify the deficiencies observed during the review of the audit engagement workpapers and the effectiveness of our system of quality control cited in your draft report.

Since the inspection, we have taken remediating measures with the engagement teams and issuers to address the deficiencies identified.

**\* \* \* \* REDACTED. Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report**

*WWC*

\* \* \* \* REDACTED. Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report

In order to comprehensively address: AS 1010 *Training and Proficiency of the Independent Auditor*, and AS 1220 *Engagement Quality Review*, QC 20, *System of Quality Control for a CPA Firm's Accounting and Auditing Practice*, \* \* \* \* REDACTED. Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report \* \* \* \*, and Rule 3520 *Auditor Independence*, the Firm will hold a meeting amongst all its Partners, Senior Staff, and those charged overseeing the Firm's system of quality control and will discuss the issues identified by the PCAOB and how to thoroughly address them. Any comprehensive plan will require additional training, continuing professional education, revisiting the Firm's current quality control manual, systems and tools, and overall emphasis and re-emphasis on a constructive attitude towards improvement, diligence, skepticism, independence, and ethics. From a practical standpoint, the improvement of such systems will require the Firm to set aside time, financial, and human resources to implement these remedial actions.

We plan to submit evidence of our Firm's efforts in carrying the measures outlined above to the PCAOB as evidence become available in due course and we do recognize the importance of submitting such evidence in a timely manner.

Our Firm thanks the PCAOB for providing us the opportunity to respond to the draft inspection report and show that we are committed to improving our audit process and our underlying systems of audit quality control.

Sincerely,

*WWC, P.C.*

WWC, P.C.  
Certified Public Accountants

## 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>.

<b>AS 1105, <i>Audit Evidence</i></b>		
<b>SELECTING ITEMS FOR TESTING TO OBTAIN AUDIT EVIDENCE</b>		
<b>Selecting Specific Items</b>		
AS 1105.27	The application of audit procedures to items that are selected as described in paragraphs .25-.26 of this standard does not constitute audit sampling, and the results of those audit procedures cannot be projected to the entire population. <sup>12</sup>	Issuer B
<u>Footnote to AS 1105.27</u>  <sup>12</sup> If misstatements are identified in the selected items, <u>see</u> AS 2810.12 - .13 and AS 2810.17 - .19.		

<b>AS 2301, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i></b>		
<b>RESPONSES INVOLVING THE NATURE, TIMING, AND EXTENT OF AUDIT PROCEDURES</b>		
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.	Issuers A and B
<b>Responses to Fraud Risks</b>		
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	Issuers A and B

<b>AS 2301, The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</b>		
	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.	

<b>AS 2310, The Confirmation Process</b>		
<b>THE CONFIRMATION PROCESS</b>		
<b>Designing the Confirmation Request</b>		
<b>Respondent</b>		
AS 2310.27	If information about the respondent's competence, knowledge, motivation, ability, or willingness to respond, or about the respondent's objectivity and freedom from bias with respect to the audited entity <sup>2</sup> comes to the auditor's attention, the auditor should consider the effects of such information on designing the confirmation request and evaluating the results, including determining whether other procedures are necessary. In addition, there may be circumstances (such as for significant, unusual year-end transactions that have a material effect on the financial statements or where the respondent is the custodian of a material amount of the audited entity's assets) in which the auditor should exercise a heightened degree of professional skepticism relative to these factors about the respondent. In these circumstances, the auditor should consider whether there is sufficient basis for concluding that the confirmation request is being sent to a respondent from whom the auditor can expect the response will provide meaningful and appropriate evidence.	Issuer A
<b>Footnote to AS 2310.27</b>  <sup>2</sup> AS 2410, Related Parties, establishes requirements regarding the auditor's evaluation of relationships and transactions between the company and its related parties.		
<b>ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES</b>		
AS 2310.31	When the auditor has not received replies to positive confirmation requests, he or she should apply alternative procedures to the nonresponses to obtain the evidence necessary to reduce audit risk to an acceptably low level. However, the omission of alternative procedures may be acceptable (a) when the auditor has not identified unusual qualitative factors or systematic characteristics	Issuer A

<b>AS 2310, <i>The Confirmation Process</i></b>		
	related to the nonresponses, such as that all nonresponses pertain to year-end transactions, and (b) when testing for overstatement of amounts, the nonresponses in the aggregate, when projected as 100 percent misstatements to the population and added to the sum of all other unadjusted differences, would not affect the auditor's decision about whether the financial statements are materially misstated.	
AS 2310.32	The nature of alternative procedures varies according to the account and assertion in question. In the examination of accounts receivable, for example, alternative procedures may include examination of subsequent cash receipts (including matching such receipts with the actual items being paid), shipping documents, or other client documentation to provide evidence for the existence assertion. In the examination of accounts payable, for example, alternative procedures may include examination of subsequent cash disbursements, correspondence from third parties, or other records to provide evidence for the completeness assertion.	Issuer A

<b>AS 2501, <i>Auditing Accounting Estimates</i></b>		
AS 2501.04	The auditor is responsible for evaluating the reasonableness of accounting estimates made by management in the context of the financial statements taken as a whole. As estimates are based on subjective as well as objective factors, it may be difficult for management to establish controls over them. Even when management's estimation process involves competent personnel using relevant and reliable data, there is potential for bias in the subjective factors. Accordingly, when planning and performing procedures to evaluate accounting estimates, the auditor should consider, with an attitude of professional skepticism, both the subjective and objective factors.	Issuers A and B



<b>AS 2810, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i></b>		
<b>EVALUATING THE RESULTS OF THE AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS</b>		
<b>Evaluating the Presentation of the Financial Statements, Including the Disclosures</b>		
AS 2810.30	<p>The auditor must evaluate whether the financial statements are presented fairly, in all material respects, in conformity with the applicable financial reporting framework.</p> <p>Note: AS 2815, <i>The Meaning of "Present Fairly in Conformity With Generally Accepted Accounting Principles,"</i> establishes requirements for evaluating the presentation of the financial statements. AS 2820, <i>Evaluating Consistency of Financial Statements</i>, establishes requirements regarding evaluating the consistency of the accounting principles used in financial statements.</p> <p>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.</p>	Issuer A
AS 2810.31	<p>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.</p> <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.<sup>18</sup></p>	Issuer A

**AS 2810, *Evaluating Audit Results***

Footnote to AS 2810.31

<sup>18</sup> AS 3101.41-.44.