PCAOB
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 207-9100
Facsimile: (202) 862-8433
www.pcaobus.org

Report on

2018 Inspection of AJ Robbins CPA LLC
(Headquartered in Denver, Colorado)

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

April 30, 2019

THIS IS A PUBLIC VERSION OF A PCAOB INSPECTION REPORT

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

PCAOB RELEASE NO. 104-2019-098A
(Includes portions of Part II of the full report that
were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2019-098)

2018 INSPECTION OF AJ ROBBINS CPA LLC

Preface

In 2018, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm AJ Robbins CPA LLC ("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.

PROFILE OF THE FIRM[1]

Offices	1 (Denver, Colorado)
Ownership structure	Limited liability company
Partners / professional staff[2]	1 / 3
Issuer audit clients	5
Lead partners on issuer audit work[3]	1

[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 August 6, 2018 to August 10, 2018.[4]

A. Review of Audit Engagement

The inspection procedures included a 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 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 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.

---

[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.

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.[5]

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, .11, and .13; AS 2501.04; AS 2810.30);

(2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test accounts receivable and a related agreement (AS 2301.08; AS 2310.31; AS 2501.04; AS 2810.30 and .31);

(3) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test a significant purchase (AS 2502.03 and .15; AS 2810.30);

(4) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to evaluate whether goodwill was impaired (AS 2502.26 and .28); and

[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.

(5) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to identify related parties and test related party transactions (AS 2410.03, .11, and .14).

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 2301, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*	A
AS 2310, *The Confirmation Process*	A
AS 2410, *Related Parties*	A
AS 2501, *Auditing Accounting Estimates*	A
AS 2502, *Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures*	A
AS 2810, *Evaluating Audit Results*	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 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

---

[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 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.

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]

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

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

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 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

---

[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.

[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.

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[10] –

* * * *

Technical Training and Proficiency

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide reasonable assurance that the Firm will assign personnel with the training and proficiency required to perform audit work in accordance with PCAOB standards. With respect to the audit deficiencies described in Part I.A, it appeared to the inspection team that the engagement personnel who performed and supervised the work did not possess 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 did not have an appropriate understanding of the relevant PCAOB standards. [Issuer A]

Fraud Procedures

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide reasonable assurance that the Firm will perform all of the procedures necessary to identify, assess, and respond to the risk of material misstatement due to fraud. Specifically, in the audit reviewed, while the Firm's fraud procedures included consideration of whether journal

---

[10] 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.

entries and adjustments possessed certain defined characteristics of potentially fraudulent transactions, the Firm failed to apply such procedures as the Firm stated that it "randomly" selected entries for testing. Based on review of the work papers and discussions with the engagement personnel, it appeared to the inspection team that the engagement personnel may not have had an adequate understanding of the requirements of PCAOB standards related to fraud procedures. This information provides cause for concern regarding the Firm's understanding and application of PCAOB requirements pertaining to fraud procedures. [Issuer A]

Communications with Audit Committees Related to the Conduct of the Audit

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide reasonable assurance that all of the required auditor communications to the audit committee, or equivalent, occur and are appropriately documented in accordance with AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees.* Specifically, in the audit reviewed, except for establishing an understanding of the terms of the audit, the Firm failed to make any of the required communications to the audit committee. Based on review of the work papers and discussions with the engagement personnel, it appeared to the inspection team that the engagement personnel may not have had an adequate understanding of what AS 1301 required. This information provides cause for concern regarding the Firm's understanding and application of PCAOB requirements pertaining to communications with audit committees. [Issuer A]

Risk Assessment

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide reasonable assurance that the Firm will perform risk assessment in accordance with the provisions of AS 2110, *Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement*, and AS 2301. Specifically, in the audit reviewed, the Firm failed to (1) identify and assess the risks of material misstatement at the assertion level and (2) perform procedures to support its assessment of control risk for all areas at below maximum. Based on a review of the work papers and discussions with the engagement personnel, it appeared to the inspection team that the deficiencies were attributable, at least in part, to the engagement personnel lacking an appropriate understanding of PCAOB standards related to risk assessment. This information provides cause for concern regarding the Firm's proficiency with respect to performing risk assessment procedures. [Issuer A]

Engagement Quality Review

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 II.A related to revenue and related parties, which were in areas in which the engagement team had identified a significant risk. * * * * [Issuer A]

Reporting of Audit Participants

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide reasonable assurance that the Firm will comply with PCAOB Rule 3211, *Auditor Reporting of Certain Audit Participants*. Rule 3211 requires that with respect to each audit report that a registered public accounting firm issues for an issuer and that is included in a document filed with the Commission, the firm that issued the audit report must file a PCAOB Form AP to report certain information by the relevant deadline prescribed in Rule 3211(b), unless an exception applies. * * * * [F]or two of the issuer audits performed by the Firm, the Firm incorrectly identified the issuers' CIK numbers in the Forms AP filed with the Board. [Issuers B and C]

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.[11]

PCAOB Standards / Rules
AS 1010, *Training and Proficiency of the Independent Auditor*
AS 1015, *Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work*
* * * *
AS 1220, *Engagement Quality Review*
AS 1301, *Communications with Audit Committees*

[11] 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.

PCAOB Standards / Rules
AS 2110, *Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement*
AS 2301, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*
AS 2401, *Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit*
QC 20, *System of Quality Control for a CPA Firm's Accounting and Auditing Practice*
Rule 3211, *Auditor Reporting of Certain Audit Participants*

* * * *

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 Board provided the Firm an opportunity to review and comment on a draft of this report. The Firm did not provide a written response.

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.[12]

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 Significant Risks		
AS 2301.11	For significant risks, the auditor should perform substantive procedures, including tests of details, that are specifically responsive to the assessed risks. Note: AS 2110 discusses identification of significant risks[10] and states that fraud risks are significant risks.	Issuer A
<u>Footnote to AS 2301.11</u> 10 *See* AS 2110.71 for factors that the auditor should evaluate in determining which risks are significant risks.		

12 The text presented in this appendix represents the standards as in effect during the applicable audit period.

AS 2301, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*		
Responses to Fraud Risks		
AS 2301.13	*Addressing Fraud Risks in the Audit of Financial Statements*. 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 2310, *The Confirmation Process*		
ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURES		
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 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.	Issuer A

AS 2410, *Related Parties*		
PERFORMING RISK ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES TO OBTAIN AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE COMPANY'S RELATIONSHIPS AND TRANSACTIONS WITH ITS RELATED PARTIES		
AS 2410.03	The auditor should perform procedures to obtain an understanding of the company's relationships and	Issuer A

AS 2410, *Related Parties*		
	transactions with its related parties that might reasonably be expected to affect the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements in conjunction with performing risk assessment procedures in accordance with AS 2110, *Identifying and Assessing Risks of Material Misstatement*. The procedures performed to obtain an understanding of the company's relationships and transactions with its related parties include: a. Obtaining an understanding of the company's process (paragraph .04); b. Performing inquiries (paragraphs .05-.07); and c. Communicating with the audit engagement team and other auditors (paragraphs .08-.09). Note: Obtaining an understanding of the company's relationships and transactions with its related parties includes obtaining an understanding of the nature of the relationships between the company and its related parties and of the terms and business purposes (or the lack thereof) of the transactions involving related parties. Note: Performing the risk assessment procedures described in paragraphs .04-.09 of this standard in conjunction with the risk assessment procedures required by AS 2110 is intended to provide the auditor with a reasonable basis for identifying and assessing risks of material misstatement associated with related parties and relationships and transactions with related parties.	
RESPONDING TO THE RISKS OF MATERIAL MISSTATEMENT		
AS 2410.11	The auditor must design and implement audit responses that address the identified and assessed risks of material misstatement.[11] This includes designing and performing audit procedures in a manner that addresses the risks of material misstatement associated with related parties and relationships and transactions with related parties.[12] Note: The auditor also should look to the requirements in paragraphs .66-.67A of AS 2401, Consideration of Fraud in a Financial Statement Audit, for related party transactions that are also significant unusual transactions (for example, significant related party	Issuer A

AS 2410, *Related Parties*		
	transactions outside the normal course of business). For such related party transactions, AS 2401.67 requires that the auditor evaluate whether the business purpose (or the lack thereof) of the transactions indicates that the transactions may have been entered into to engage in fraudulent financial reporting or conceal misappropriation of assets.	

Footnotes to AS 2410.11

[11] *See* paragraph .03 of AS 2301, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement.*

[12] *See* generally, AS 2301 and paragraph .17 of AS 1105, *Audit Evidence*, which provides that inquiry of company personnel, by itself, does not provide sufficient audit evidence to reduce audit risk to an appropriately low level for a relevant assertion or to support a conclusion about the effectiveness of a control.

AS 2410, *Related Parties*		
EVALUATING WHETHER THE COMPANY HAS PROPERLY IDENTIFIED ITS RELATED PARTIES AND RELATIONSHIPS AND TRANSACTIONS WITH RELATED PARTIES		
AS 2410.14	The auditor should evaluate whether the company has properly identified its related parties and relationships and transactions with related parties. Evaluating whether a company has properly identified its related parties and relationships and transactions with related parties involves more than assessing the process used by the company. This evaluation requires the auditor to perform procedures to test the accuracy and completeness of the related parties and relationships and transactions with related parties identified by the company, taking into account the information gathered during the audit.[15] As part of this evaluation, the auditor should read minutes of the meetings of stockholders, directors, and committees of directors, or summaries of actions of recent meetings for which minutes have not yet been prepared. Note: Appendix A contains examples of information and sources of information that may be gathered during the audit that could indicate that related parties or relationships or transactions with related parties previously undisclosed to the auditor might exist.	Issuer A
Footnote to AS 2410.14 [15] Information obtained from identifying and evaluating a company's significant unusual transactions and obtaining an understanding of a company's financial relationships and transactions with its executive officers could indicate that related parties or relationships or transactions with related parties previously undisclosed to the auditor might exist.		

AS 2501, *Auditing Accounting Estimates*		
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	Issuer A

AS 2501, *Auditing Accounting Estimates*		
	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.	

AS 2502, *Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures*		
INTRODUCTION		
AS 2502.03	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, *Using Cash Flow Information and Present Value in Accounting Measurements*, 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.	Issuer A
Footnote to AS 2502.03 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, *Using Cash Flow Information and Present Value in Accounting Measurements*. For example, Governmental Accounting Standards Board Statement of Governmental Accounting Standards No. 31, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Certain Investments and for External Investment Pools*, 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."		
EVALUATING CONFORMITY OF FAIR VALUE MEASUREMENTS AND DISCLOSURES WITH GAAP		
AS 2502.15	The auditor should evaluate whether the fair value measurements and disclosures in the financial	Issuer A

AS 2502, *Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures*		
	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.	
TESTING THE ENTITY'S FAIR VALUE MEASUREMENTS AND DISCLOSURES		
Testing Management's Significant Assumptions, the Valuation Model, and the Underlying Data		
AS 2502.26	The auditor's understanding of the reliability of the process used by management to determine fair value is an important element in support of the resulting amounts and therefore affects the nature, timing, and extent of audit procedures. When testing the entity's fair value measurements and disclosures, the auditor evaluates whether: a. Management's assumptions are reasonable and reflect, or are not inconsistent with, market information (*see* paragraph .06). b. The fair value measurement was determined using an appropriate model, if applicable. c. Management used relevant information that was reasonably available at the time.	Issuer A
AS 2502.28	Where applicable, the auditor should evaluate whether the significant assumptions used by management in measuring fair value, taken individually and as a whole, provide a reasonable basis for the fair value measurements and disclosures in the entity's financial statements.	Issuer A

AS 2810, *Evaluating Audit Results*		
EVALUATING THE RESULTS OF THE AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS		
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. 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.	Issuer A
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. 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	Issuer A

AS 2810, *Evaluating Audit Results*		
	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]	
Footnote to AS 2810.31 18 AS 3101.41-.44.		