

Report on

**2015 Inspection of KLJ & Associates LLP
(Headquartered in West Chicago, Illinois)**

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

September 29, 2016

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**



2015 INSPECTION OF KLJ & ASSOCIATES LLP

Preface

In 2015, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm KLJ & Associates LLP ("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.

PROFILE OF THE FIRM¹

Offices	2 (West Chicago, Illinois and Edina, Minnesota)
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Partners / professional staff ²	2 / 6
Issuer audit clients	80
Lead partners on issuer audit work ³	2

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.

³ The number of lead partners on issuer audit work represents the total number of Firm personnel who had primary responsibility for an issuer audit (as defined in AS No. 10, *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 September 14, 2015 through September 24, 2015 and on September 30, 2015.⁴

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included a review of portions of eight 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 standards that primarily relate to the deficiencies; they do not present a comprehensive list of every auditing standard that applies 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

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.

were presented fairly, in all material respects, in accordance with the applicable financial reporting framework. In other words, in these audits, the auditor issued an opinion 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.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 a related party transaction (AU 334, paragraph .09); 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.

(2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the completeness and valuation of share-based compensation (AS No. 13, paragraphs 8 and 39; AU 328, paragraphs .26, .28 and .39).

A.2. Issuer B

(1) the failure to perform procedures to test the valuation and disclosure of an investment (AS No. 13, paragraph 36); and

(2) the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the existence and valuation of mineral properties (AS No. 13, paragraphs 8 and 36).

A.3. Issuer C

the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the occurrence and valuation of revenue (AS No. 14, paragraphs 30 and 31; AU 342, paragraph .11).

A.4. Issuer D

the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the occurrence of revenue, the valuation of related costs, and the presentation of revenue and related costs (AS No. 13, paragraph 8; AS No. 14, paragraphs 30 and 31; AS No. 15, paragraph 10).

A.5. Issuer E

the failure to perform sufficient procedures to test the valuation of an investment (AU 328 paragraphs .26 and .28).

A.6. Issuer F

the failure to evaluate the accounting for an acquisition (AS No. 14, paragraphs 30 and 31).

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. AU 230, *Due Professional Care in the Performance of Work*, paragraphs .02, .05, and .06, requires the independent auditor to plan and perform his or her work with due professional care and sets forth aspects of that requirement. AU 230, paragraphs .07 through .09, and AS No. 13, *The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement*, paragraph 7, 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 No. 13, paragraphs 3, 5, and 8, requires the auditor to design and implement audit responses that address the risks of material misstatement, and AS No. 15, *Audit Evidence*, paragraph 4, 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 No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>	A, B, and D

PCAOB Auditing Standards	Issuers
AS No. 14, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i>	C, D, and F
AS No. 15, <i>Audit Evidence</i>	D
AU 328, <i>Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures</i>	A and E
AU 334, <i>Related Parties</i>	A
AU 342, <i>Auditing Accounting Estimates</i>	C

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 No. 3, *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

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.

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.



PCAOB Release No. 104-2016-196A
Inspection of KLJ & Associates LLP
September 29, 2016
Page 11

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

PART II

* * * *

B. Issues Related to Quality Controls

The inspection of the Firm included consideration of aspects of the Firm's system of quality control.¹⁰

B.1. Audit Performance

A firm's system of quality control should provide reasonable assurance that the work performed on an audit engagement will meet applicable professional standards and regulatory requirements. 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 –

B.1.a. Due Professional Care, Including Professional Skepticism

As discussed above, the inspection team reported identifying several audit deficiencies of such significance that they appeared to the inspection team to result in insufficiently supported audit opinions. With respect to each deficiency, based on review of the work papers and discussions with the engagement personnel, it appeared to the inspection team that the deficiency was attributable, at least in part, to the engagement personnel having approached that aspect of the audit without due professional care, including not having exercised professional skepticism. This information provides cause for concern about whether the Firm's engagement personnel will perform all aspects of their work on issuer audits with due professional care, including exercising professional skepticism, which is an attitude that includes a questioning mind and a critical assessment of audit evidence. [Issuers A, B, C, D, E, and F]

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 will be 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.

B.1.b. Communications with Audit Committees Related to the Conduct of the Audit

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide sufficient assurance that the required auditor communications to the audit committee, or equivalent, occur and are appropriately documented in accordance with AS No. 16, *Communications with Audit Committees*. Specifically, in three of the audits reviewed, the Firm failed to make any of the required communications. [Issuers A, B, and D]

B.1.c. Client Acceptance and Continuance

The Firm's system of quality control may not provide sufficient assurance that Firm undertakes only those engagements that it can reasonably expect to complete with professional competence, taking into account the circumstances of competing time demands on the Firm's engagement personnel assigned to lead the audits. During the inspection period, one of the Firm's partners served as lead partner on audits for 54 issuers (including 23 with calendar year ends). The inspection results provide cause for concern about whether, given that partner's current capability, the competing time demands of those audits contribute to failures to meet PCAOB standards in the performance of the audit work.

B.1.d. Engagement Quality Review

In light of the 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 No. 7, *Engagement Quality Review*. An engagement quality review performed with due professional care in compliance with AS No. 7 should have detected, and resulted in the Firm addressing, each of the deficiencies described in Part II.A. [Issuers A, B, C, D, E, and F]

* * * *

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>.

AS No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>		
Responses Involving the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Audit Procedures		
AS No. 13.8	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, B, and D
Substantive Procedures		
AS No. 13.36	The auditor should perform substantive procedures for each relevant assertion of each significant account and disclosure, regardless of the assessed level of control risk.	Issuer B
Nature of Substantive Procedures		
AS No. 13.39	Substantive procedures generally provide persuasive evidence when they are designed and performed to obtain evidence that is relevant and reliable. Also, some types of substantive procedures, by their nature, produce more persuasive evidence than others. Inquiry alone does not provide sufficient appropriate evidence to support a conclusion about a relevant assertion. Note: Auditing Standard No. 15 discusses	Issuer A

AS No. 13, <i>The Auditor's Responses to the Risks of Material Misstatement</i>		
	certain types of substantive procedures and the relevance and reliability of audit evidence.	

AS No. 14, <i>Evaluating Audit Results</i>		
EVALUATING THE PRESENTATION OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, INCLUDING THE DISCLOSURES		
AS No. 14.30	<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: AU sec. 411, <i>The Meaning of Present Fairly in Conformity With Generally Accepted Accounting Principles</i>, establishes requirements for evaluating the presentation of the financial statements. Auditing Standard No. 6, <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>	Issuers C, D, and F
AS No. 14.31	<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</p>	Issuers C, D, and F

AS No. 14, Evaluating Audit Results		
	<p>amount of detail given, the classification of items in the statements, and the bases of amounts set forth.</p> <p>Note: According to AU sec. 508, 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.^{18/}</p>	
<p>Footnote to AS No. 14.31</p> <p>^{18/} AU secs. 508.41-.44.</p>		

AS No. 15, Audit Evidence		
USING INFORMATION PRODUCED BY THE COMPANY		
AS No. 15.10	<p>When using information produced by the company as audit evidence, the auditor should evaluate whether the information is sufficient and appropriate for purposes of the audit by performing procedures to:^{3/}</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test the accuracy and completeness of the information, or test the controls over the accuracy and completeness of that information; and • Evaluate whether the information is sufficiently precise and detailed for purposes of the audit. 	Issuer D
<p>Footnote to AS No. 15.10</p> <p>^{3/} When using the work of a specialist engaged or employed by management, <u>see</u> AU sec. 336, <i>Using the Work of a Specialist</i>. When using information produced by a service organization or a service auditor's report as audit evidence, <u>see</u> AU sec. 324, <i>Service Organizations</i>, and for integrated audits, <u>see</u></p>		

Auditing Standard No. 5, *An Audit of Internal Control Over Financial Reporting That Is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements*.

AU 328, Auditing Fair Value Measurements and Disclosures

Testing Management's Significant Assumptions, the Valuation Model, and the Underlying Data		
AU 328.26	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	Issuers A and E
AU 328.28	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.	Issuers A and E
AU 328.39	The auditor should test the data used to develop the fair value measurements and disclosures and evaluate whether the fair value measurements have been properly determined from such data and management's assumptions. Specifically, the auditor evaluates whether the data on which the fair value measurements are based, including the data used in the work of a specialist, is accurate, complete, and relevant;	Issuer A

	<p>and whether fair value measurements have been properly determined using such data and management's assumptions. The auditor's tests also may include, for example, procedures such as verifying the source of the data, mathematical recomputation of inputs, and reviewing of information for internal consistency, including whether such information is consistent with management's intent and ability to carry out specific courses of action discussed in paragraph .17.</p>	
--	---	--

AU 334, Related Parties		
Examining Identified Related Party Transactions		
<p>AU 334.09</p>	<p>After identifying related party transactions, the auditor should apply the procedures he considers necessary to obtain satisfaction concerning the purpose, nature, and extent of these transactions and their effect on the financial statements. The procedures should be directed toward obtaining and evaluating sufficient appropriate evidential matter and should extend beyond inquiry of management. Procedures that should be considered include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Obtain an understanding of the business purpose of the transaction.^{fn 6} b. Examine invoices, executed copies of agreements, contracts, and other pertinent documents, such as receiving reports and shipping documents. c. Determine whether the transaction has been approved by the board of directors or other appropriate officials. d. Test for reasonableness the compilation of amounts to be disclosed, or considered for disclosure, in the financial statements. 	<p>Issuer A</p>

	<p>e. Arrange for the audits of intercompany account balances to be performed as of concurrent dates, even if the fiscal years differ, and for the examination of specified, important, and representative related party transactions by the auditors for each of the parties, with appropriate exchange of relevant information.</p> <p>f. Inspect or confirm and obtain satisfaction concerning the transferability and value of collateral.</p>	
--	--	--

Footnote to AU 334.09

^{fn 6} Until the auditor understands the business sense of material transactions, he cannot complete his audit. If he lacks sufficient specialized knowledge to understand a particular transaction, he should consult with persons who do have the requisite knowledge.

AU 342, Auditing Accounting Estimates

<p>AU 342.11</p>	<p>Review and test management's process. In many situations, the auditor assesses the reasonableness of an accounting estimate by performing procedures to test the process used by management to make the estimate. The following are procedures the auditor may consider performing when using this approach:</p> <p>a. Identify whether there are controls over the preparation of accounting estimates and supporting data that may be useful in the evaluation.</p> <p>b. Identify the sources of data and factors that management used in forming the assumptions, and consider whether such data and factors are relevant, reliable, and sufficient for the purpose based on information gathered in other audit tests.</p>	<p>Issuer C</p>
------------------	--	-----------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">c. Consider whether there are additional key factors or alternative assumptions about the factors.d. Evaluate whether the assumptions are consistent with each other, the supporting data, relevant historical data, and industry data.e. Analyze historical data used in developing the assumptions to assess whether the data is comparable and consistent with data of the period under audit, and consider whether such data is sufficiently reliable for the purpose.f. Consider whether changes in the business or industry may cause other factors to become significant to the assumptions.g. Review available documentation of the assumptions used in developing the accounting estimates and inquire about any other plans, goals, and objectives of the entity, as well as consider their relationship to the assumptions.h. Consider using the work of a specialist regarding certain assumptions (section 336, Using the Work of a Specialist).i. Test the calculations used by management to translate the assumptions and key factors into the accounting estimate.	
--	---	--