

**Inspection of
Ary, Roepcke & Mulchaey, P.C.**

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

February 2, 2006

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**

Notes Concerning this Report

1. Portions of this report may describe deficiencies or potential deficiencies in the systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct of the firm that is the subject of this report. The express inclusion of certain deficiencies and potential deficiencies, however, should not be construed to support any negative inference that any other aspect of the firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct is approved or condoned by the Board or judged by the Board to comply with laws, rules, and professional standards.
2. Any references in this report to violations or potential violations of law, rules, or professional standards should be understood in the supervisory context in which this report was prepared. Any such references are not a result of an adversarial adjudicative process and do not constitute conclusive findings of fact or of violations for purposes of imposing legal liability. Similarly, any description herein of a firm's cooperation in addressing issues constructively should not be construed, and is not construed by the Board, as an admission, for purposes of potential legal liability, of any violation.
3. Board inspections encompass, among other things, whether the firm has failed to identify departures from Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") in its audits of financial statements. This report's descriptions of any such auditing failures necessarily involve descriptions of the related GAAP departures. The Board, however, has no authority to prescribe the form or content of an issuer's financial statements. That authority, and the authority to make binding determinations concerning an issuer's compliance with GAAP, rests with the Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission"). Any description, in this report, of perceived departures from GAAP should not be understood as an indication that the Commission has considered or made any determination regarding these GAAP issues unless otherwise expressly stated.

INSPECTION OF ARY, ROEPCKE & MULCHAEY, P.C.

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") has conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Ary, Roepcke & Mulchaey, P.C. ("the Firm"). The Board is issuing this report of that inspection in accordance with the requirements of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 ("the Act").

The Board is making portions of the report publicly available. Specifically, 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.^{1/}

The Board has elsewhere described in detail its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions.^{2/} A substantial portion of the Board's criticisms of a firm (specifically criticisms of the firm's quality control system), and the Board's dialogue with the firm about those criticisms, occurs out of public view, unless the firm fails to make progress to the Board's satisfaction in addressing those criticisms. In addition, the Board generally does not disclose otherwise nonpublic information, learned through inspections, about the firm or its clients. Accordingly, information in those categories generally does not appear in the publicly available portion of an inspection report.

^{1/} The Board does not make public any of a firm's comments that address a nonpublic portion of the report. 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 notes that it routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any of a firm's comments that identify factually inaccurate statements in the draft that the Board corrects in the final report.

^{2/} See Statement Concerning the Issuance of Inspection Reports, PCAOB Release No. 104-2004-001 (August 26, 2004).

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted fieldwork for the inspection from July 25, 2005 to July 28, 2005. The fieldwork included procedures tailored to the nature of the Firm, certain aspects of which the inspection team understood at the outset of the inspection to be as follows:

Number of offices	1 (Columbus, Ohio)
Ownership structure	Professional corporation
Number of partners	3
Number of professional staff ^{3/}	4
Number of issuer audit clients ^{4/}	3

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audits. To achieve that goal, Board inspections include reviews of certain aspects of selected audits performed by the firm and reviews of other matters related to the firm's quality control system.

In the course of reviewing aspects of selected audits, an inspection may identify ways in which a particular audit is deficient, including failures by the firm to identify, or to address appropriately, respects in which an issuer's financial statements do not present fairly the financial position, results of operations, or cash flows of the issuer in

^{3/} "Professional staff" includes all personnel of the Firm, except partners or shareholders and administrative support personnel. 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 or are "associated persons" (as defined in the Act) of the Firm.

^{4/} The number of issuer audit clients shown here is based on the Firm's self-reporting and the inspection team's review of certain information for inspection planning purposes. It does not reflect any Board determination concerning which, or how many, of the Firm's audit clients are "issuers" as defined in the Act.

conformity with GAAP.^{5/} It is not the purpose of an inspection, however, to review all of a firm's audits or to identify every respect in which a reviewed audit is deficient. Accordingly, a Board inspection report should not be understood to provide any assurance that the firm's audits, or its issuer clients' financial statements, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The scope of the inspection procedures performed included reviews of aspects of the performance of all three of the Firm's audits of the financial statements of issuers. Those aspects were selected according to the Board's criteria, and the Firm was not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the selection process.

The inspection team identified matters that it considered to be audit deficiencies.^{6/} The deficiencies identified in one of the audits reviewed included a deficiency of such significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm did not obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements. That deficiency was the failure to perform and document an assessment of the interaction between a service organization's controls and the issuer's controls when relying on the service auditor's report to reduce the Firm's assessment of control risk.

^{5/} 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 GAAP, the Board reports that information to the SEC, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

^{6/} PCAOB standards require a firm to take appropriate actions to assess the importance of audit deficiencies identified after the date of the audit report to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed opinions. *See* AU 390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and AU 561, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report* (both included among the PCAOB's interim auditing standards, pursuant to PCAOB Rule 3200T). Failure to comply with these PCAOB standards could be a basis for Board disciplinary sanctions.

B. Review of Quality Control System

In addition to evaluating the quality of the audit work performed on specific audits, the inspection included review of certain of the Firm's practices, policies and procedures related to audit quality. This review addressed practices, policies and procedures concerning audit performance, training, compliance with independence standards, client acceptance and retention, and the establishment of policies and procedures. As described above, any defects in, or criticisms of, the Firm's quality control system are discussed in the nonpublic portion of this report and will remain nonpublic unless the Firm fails to address them to the Board's satisfaction within 12 months of the date of this report.

END OF PART I

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 Board provided the Firm an opportunity to review and comment on a draft of this report. The Firm provided a written response.

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), if a firm requests, and the Board grants, confidential treatment for any of the firm's comments on a draft report, the Board does not include those comments in the final report. The Board routinely grants confidential treatment, if requested, for any of a firm's comments that identify factually inaccurate statements in the draft that the Board corrects in the final 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. In any version of this report that the Board makes publicly available, any portions of the Firm's response that address nonpublic portions of the report are omitted.

ARY, ROEPCKE & MULCHAEY, P.C.

Certified Public Accountants

November 1, 2005

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

RE: Response to Part I of Draft Report of Inspection

Dear Mr. Diacont:

We are pleased to submit our response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's (the "Board") draft report (the "Report") dated October 27, 2005 on its inspection of Ary, Roepcke & Mulchaey, P.C. (the "Firm"). We are supportive of the Board's mission, including its inspection process, and believe that the Board has an important role in restoring the public's trust in the independent audit process.

Our Firm is committed to providing audits of the highest quality. While we have confidence in our auditing and quality control processes, we welcome the Board's observations and comments.

With regard to the Board's comment: *"That deficiency was the failure to perform and document an assessment of the interaction between a service organization's controls and the issuer's controls when relying on the service auditor's report to reduce the Firm's assessment of control risk."* – we respectfully disagree. As clearly evidenced in our work papers, our Firm obtained a comprehensive understanding of both the service organization's and issuer's controls and in so doing, inherently assessed the interaction between these entities.

Evidence of our understanding of the controls at each entity is located in the audit work papers via completion of several planning and control related programs, various program steps and by comments written directly on the SAS No. 70 reports of the service organizations. Also, our Firm performed an in-depth examination of the issuer's own internal control documentation and testing as prescribed by Section 404 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 and included the internal control and testing matrices as part of the audit work papers. Further, our staff utilized its cumulative audit knowledge and experience from prior engagements with the issuer and service organization to reach conclusions regarding the assessment of the interaction between the service organization and the issuer. Additionally, areas of audit significance pertaining to the interaction of the service organization's controls and the issuer's controls were assessed via basis and scope determinations and substantively tested through multiple procedures documented in the audit work papers.

While we acknowledge that our *documentation* of the *interaction* of the service organization's controls and the issuer's controls could be improved, we firmly believe that our audit work papers clearly demonstrate that we performed an assessment of the interaction between the service organization's controls and the issuer's controls when we relied on the service auditor's report to reduce the Firm's assessment of control risk.


In this case, where we agree that the documentation clarity could be improved, we have undertaken steps to incorporate additional documentation into our work papers in accordance with AU 390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After Report Date*. In this case, however, the subsequent additional documentation did not lead to any changes in this issuer's audited financial statements or our report thereon and that our present ability to support our previously expressed opinion has not been impaired.

As we do place a high value on the Board's inspection process and continue to refine our auditing process to produce audits of superior quality and excellence, we have implemented an additional procedure within our Firm that ensures that the consideration of the interaction of a service organization's controls with an issuer's controls is documented in a more evident fashion on future audit engagements.

* * * * *

We appreciate the opportunity to respond to the Report and are available to the Board to discuss our comments in further detail. Please contact John M. Roepcke at 614.486.3600, with any questions.

Sincerely,



Ary, Roepcke & Mulchaey, P.C.