



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

**Inspection of
Ehrhardt, Keefe, Steiner & Hottman, P.C.**

**Issued by the
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
May 21, 2008**

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. 104-2008-079



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 EHRHARDT, KEEFE, STEINER & HOTTMAN, P.C.

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") has conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Ehrhardt, Keefe, Steiner & Hottman, 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 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 July 24, 2006 to July 28, 2006 and from August 7, 2006 to August 11, 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	2 (Denver and Fort Collins, Colorado)
Ownership structure	Corporation
Number of partners	30
Number of professional staff ^{3/}	191
Number of issuer audit clients ^{4/}	40

^{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.

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audits.^{5/} 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 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 two of the audits reviewed included deficiencies of such

^{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.

^{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*

significance that it appeared to the inspection team that the Firm did not obtain sufficient competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuers' financial statements.^{8/} Those deficiencies were –

- (1) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test deferred revenue; and
- (2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test revenue recognition.

One of the deficiencies described above related to auditing an aspect of an issuer's financial statements that the issuer revised in a restatement subsequent to inspection fieldwork.^{9/}

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.

^{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.

^{9/} The restatement followed the issuer's discussions with the staff of the SEC who raised the issue. These discussions began prior to the commencement of the Board's inspection. The Board inspection process did not include any review of any additional audit work or the restated financial statements.

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



PCAOB Release No. 104-2008-079
Inspection of Ehrhardt, Keefe,
Steiner & Hottman, P.C.
May 21, 2008
Page 6

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

PART IV

RESPONSE OF THE FIRM TO DRAFT INSPECTION REPORT

Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act, 15 U.S.C. § 7214(f), and PCAOB Rule 4007(a), the Firm provided a written response to a draft of this report. Pursuant to section 104(f) of the Act and PCAOB Rule 4007(b), the Firm's response, minus any portion granted confidential treatment, is attached hereto and made part of this final inspection report.^{10/}

^{10/} 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.



7979 E. Tufts Avenue, Suite 400
Denver, Colorado 80237-2843
P: 303-740-9400 F: 303-740-9009

April 1, 2008

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

Re: EKS&H Response to Part I of 2006 Draft Report of Inspection

Dear Mr. Diacont:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or the "Board") draft report dated March 4, 2008 (the "Report"), of the inspection of Ehrhardt Keefe Steiner & Hottman PC ("EKS&H").

As the 2nd largest Firm in Colorado, with approximately 370 people, our ultimate objective is to continuously ensure our audits are of the highest quality. We believe the 2006 inspection, although conducted nineteen months ago, assisted us in identifying areas where we can improve our performance and, beginning immediately after the 2006 inspection, we have taken appropriate action to address the matters described in the Report.

We recognize that the comments in the Report reflect differences of opinion about judgments we made over two years ago during the performance of 2005 audits and judgments subsequently made by the Board's inspection staff. The two matters identified in the "Review of Audit Engagements" section of your Report involve materiality assessments or deal with the nature and extent of audit documentation we obtained during the conduct of the audits inspected. We view the comments in the Report as helpful and have given each careful consideration.

We do not agree, however, with overly broad comments such as "failed to perform," which implies that there were departures from generally accepted accounting principles or that our auditing procedures were not sufficient. We believe the conclusions reached by our engagement teams were appropriate in the circumstances.

Regarding the engagement review comment about revenue recognition, this matter involves a highly judgmental accounting question. As explained to your inspection staff on the first day of their inspection, when we brought it to their attention, the difficulty is a matter that is not adequately addressed by authoritative accounting literature. In fact, even the SEC had difficulty in agreeing to an appropriate accounting policy. The degree of difficulty is reflected in the fact that the comment resolution process took an extended period of time. We suspect that the matter was addressed by your inspection staff by reference to an amended Form 10-K filed on November 13, 2006, AFTER the inspection. In fact, this matter had already been addressed in Form 8-K filings on May 19 and June 2, 2006 which occurred BEFORE the inspection.

April 1, 2008
Mr. George H. Diacont
Re: EKS&H Response to Part I of 2006 Draft Report of Inspection
Page 2 of 2

To say that audit procedures were responsible for a restatement concerning resolution of an appropriate accounting policy misses the point: certain matters are simply not covered by accounting standards. Furthermore, the process to address such difficult matters was appropriately followed by both the client and our Firm in consultation with the SEC. To subsequently read that the inspection staff "identified" this "audit deficiency" is not only disingenuous but misleading. We continue to disagree with any characterization implying a substandard audit was conducted and believe that it should be deleted from your final report.

We support the Board's inspection process and believe that it will improve audit quality. The process could be substantially improved if: 1) the inspection reports were provided more timely, and 2) we were given an opportunity to discuss the Board's preliminary conclusions prior to the issuance of its final report. This would facilitate sharing of information and allow us to implement quality improvements on a more timely basis.

Respectfully submitted,

Eberhardt Keefe Steiner & Nottman PC