



1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 207-9100
Facsimile: (202) 862-8430
www.pcaobus.org

**Inspection of
Tedder, James, Worden & Associates, P.A.**

**Issued by the
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board**

July 16, 2007

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. 104-2007-104



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 U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP") or Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC" or "Commission") disclosure requirements in its audits of financial statements. This report's descriptions of any such auditing failures necessarily involve descriptions of the related GAAP or disclosure 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 or Commission disclosure requirements, rests with the Commission. Any description, in this report, of perceived departures from GAAP or Commission disclosure requirements should not be understood as an indication that the Commission has considered or made any determination regarding these issues unless otherwise expressly stated.



INSPECTION OF TEDDER, JAMES, WORDEN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") has conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Tedder, James, Worden & Associates, P.A. ("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 unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. 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.

^{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 August 28, 2006 to September 1, 2006. 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 (Orlando, Florida)
Ownership structure	Corporation
Number of partners	11
Number of professional staff ^{3/}	56
Number of issuer audit clients ^{4/}	17

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audits.^{5/} To achieve that goal, Board

^{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. In some circumstances, a Board inspection may include a review of a firm's audit of financial statements of an issuer that ceased to be an audit client before the inspection, and any such former clients are not included in the number shown here.

^{5/} This focus 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.

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 conformity with GAAP.^{6/} 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 inspection procedures included a review of aspects of the Firm's auditing of financial statements of six issuers. The scope of this review was determined according to the Board's criteria, and the Firm was not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the scope.

The inspection team identified what it considered to be audit deficiencies.^{7/} 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

^{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 GAAP, the Board's practice is to report that information to the SEC, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

^{7/} 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.

competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements.^{8/} That deficiency was the failure to perform an analysis to evaluate the materiality of uncorrected misstatements.

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

^{8/} In some cases, an inspection team's observation that a firm failed to perform a procedure may be based on the absence of documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence, even if a firm claims to have performed the procedure. PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 3, *Audit Documentation* ("AS No. 3"), 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. See AS No. 3, paragraph 9; Appendix A to AS No. 3, paragraph A28. For purposes of the inspection, an observation that the Firm did not perform a procedure, obtain evidence, or reach an appropriate conclusion may be based on the absence of such documentation and the absence of persuasive other evidence.



PCAOB Release No. 104-2007-104
Inspection of Tedder, James, Worden
& Associates, P.A.
July 16, 2007
Page 5

PARTS II AND III OF THIS REPORT ARE NONPUBLIC
AND ARE OMITTED FROM THIS PUBLIC DOCUMENT

PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the Firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the Firm's response, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.^{9/}

^{9/} 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 unless a firm specifically requests otherwise. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.

TEDDER, JAMES, WORDEN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS & BUSINESS ADVISORS

April 5, 2007

VIA UPS OVERNIGHT AND FACSIMILE TO 202-862-8433

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

Re: Public Response to Part I of the Draft Report dated March 6, 2007 of the 2006 Inspection of Tedder, James, Worden & Associates, P.A.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's (Board) Draft Report of the 2006 inspection of Tedder, James, Worden & Associates, P.A. We recognize the importance of the inspection process and support the efforts of the Board.

With respect to the Board's comment in Part I of the Draft Report, we respectfully disagree. The Board's assertion that the deficiency was a failure to perform an analysis to evaluate the materiality of uncorrected misstatements is factually inaccurate. We believe we performed all of the required procedures relating to the analysis and evaluation of uncorrected misstatements. However, we acknowledge that certain of our documentation could have been further enhanced.

Our working papers included a quantitative analysis of the uncorrected misstatements including measurement of the cumulative misstatement errors or the uncorrected misstatements against net income, stockholder's equity and our calculated materiality for planning purposes. Our working papers also included conclusions indicating that the "Individual adjustments passed and the aggregate of adjustments passed have been evaluated and determined to be qualitatively immaterial" and "The aggregate of misstatements (total in income column, total in equity column) leaves an adequate allowance for possible undetected misstatements" (quantitative analysis). The work paper documenting this assessment was prepared and signed off by the Manager assigned to the audit engagement and was reviewed and signed off by the Engagement Partner. In addition, our work papers also included documentation that the Concurring Review Partner agreed with the engagement team's assessment as to the immateriality of the passed adjustments, both quantitatively and qualitatively. However, as indicated above, we believe that the documentation could have been expanded to reference the specific qualitative factors that were considered by the engagement team and the specific reasons that the uncorrected misstatements were considered quantitatively immaterial.

Adding value... Building trust... Securing your future...

800 NORTH MAGNOLIA AVENUE, SUITE 1700 \ ORLANDO, FLORIDA 32803-3247
WWW.TJWCpa.com \ 800.820.0621 \ 407.898.2727 \ FAX: 407.895.1335 \ EMAIL: INFO@TJWCpa.COM

NATIONAL & INTERNATIONAL SERVICES THROUGH RSM INTERNATIONAL • AN INDEPENDENTLY OWNED MEMBER OF THE MCGLADREY NETWORK

Mr. George H. Diacont
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
Page 2

Our work papers also included a copy of our report to the audit committee. That report clearly identified the uncorrected misstatements. The uncorrected misstatements were reviewed with management and the audit committee prior to the issuance of our report. We believe this further supports our conclusion that an analysis of the materiality of the uncorrected misstatements was made prior to the issuance of our report.

Based on the foregoing, in our opinion, the deficiency asserted that we failed to perform an analysis to evaluate the materiality of uncorrected misstatements is inaccurate and is not supported by the inspection finding, our work paper content or the relevant professional auditing standards. While we agree that we could have enhanced our documentation of the qualitative factors considered in our assessment of the uncorrected misstatements, we certainly analyzed the materiality of the uncorrected misstatements and continue to believe that the financial statements were not materially misstated.

As for the impact of the Board's finding on our audit regarding Issuer A, we are of the opinion that based on our knowledge of Issuer A and our analysis of the uncorrected misstatements, including those originating from the prior year, the judgment of a reasonable person relying on the information would not have been changed or influenced had the uncorrected misstatements been recorded. Pursuant to your Draft Report, we have considered the possible impacts of AU390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date* and AU560, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Financial Statements* and believe that neither of these applies in this situation. We have however, enhanced our documentation of our previously performed analysis of the uncorrected misstatements to support the above conclusions.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our response to the Draft Report and look forward to providing our response to Part II.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Tedder, James, Worden & Associates, P.A.

Adding *value*... Building *trust*... Securing your *future*...

TEDDER, JAMES, WORDEN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS & BUSINESS ADVISORS

NATIONAL & INTERNATIONAL SERVICES THROUGH RSM INTERNATIONAL • AN INDEPENDENTLY OWNED MEMBER OF THE MCGILADREY NETWORK