



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

Inspection of George Brenner, CPA, A Professional Corporation

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

November 30, 2005

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. 104-2005-127A
(Includes portions of Parts II and IV of the full report that
were not included in PCAOB Release No. 104-2005-127)



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 GEORGE BRENNER, CPA,
A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION**

The Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") has conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm George Brenner, CPA, A Professional Corporation ("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 December 6, 2004 to December 8, 2004 and on January 14, 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 (Los Angeles, California)
Ownership structure	Professional corporation
Number of partners	1
Number of professional staff ^{3/}	None
Number of issuer audit clients ^{4/}	10

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.

^{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 three of the Firm's audits of the financial statements of issuers. Those audits and 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 deficiencies 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. Those deficiencies included –

- (1) the failure to perform and document sufficient substantive testing of accrued environmental liabilities and related contingencies;
- (2) the failure to perform and document sufficient substantive testing of a significant sales transaction; and

^{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.

- (3) the failure to perform and document appropriate consideration of the effect of certain fraud risk factors and the lack of certain management representations on the Firm's audit scope and report.

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. 104-2005-127A
Inspection of George Brenner, CPA,
A Professional Corporation
November 30, 2005
Page 5

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. Assessment of a firm's quality control system rests both on a review of a firm's stated quality control policies and procedures and on inferences that can be drawn from respects in which a firm's system has failed to assure quality in the actual performance of engagements.^{7/} On the basis of the information reported by the inspection team, the Board has the following concerns about aspects of the Firm's system of quality control.

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 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 –

a. Technical Competence, Due Care, and Professional Skepticism

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to do enough to ensure technical competence and the exercise of due care or professional skepticism.

b. Concurring Partner Review

Questions exist about the effectiveness of the Firm's existing arrangement for concurring partner reviews. Having procedures for concurring partner review by a competent reviewer is an important element of quality control. Such reviews should involve the performance of appropriate procedures using due care and professional

^{7/} A firm's failure to comply with the requirements of PCAOB standards when performing an audit may be an indication of a potentially significant defect in a firm's quality control system even if that failure did not result in an insufficiently supported audit opinion.

skepticism, with the Firm appropriately addressing the reviewer's findings and documenting the process. The Firm used the services of an accountant not affiliated with the Firm to perform the concurring partner review of all three issuer audits included in the inspection. The information reported by the inspection team suggests that there is no evidence that the concurring partner review procedure used by the Firm resulted in the identification of any of the deficiencies noted by the inspection team. This may result from a lack of competency, due care or professional skepticism on the part of the concurring partner; deficiencies in the scope of the concurring partner's procedures; and/or the Firm's failure to properly address the concurring partner findings. Apparent deficiencies in documentation of the scope and results of the concurring partner's reviews preclude the Board from determining the relative contribution of each of these potential causes to the failure of the concurring partner process to prevent the deficiencies reported by the inspection team.

2. Independence

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide reasonable assurance that the Firm will comply with independence requirements. As described in Part II.C below, the inspection team reported information indicating that the Firm may not have been independent of two of its issuer clients within the meaning of the Commission's independence requirements. [Issuers B and C]

In addition, in two of the issuer audits reviewed, the Firm did not make independence confirmations required by Independence Standards Board Standard No. 1, *Independence Discussions with Audit Committees*. [Issuers A and B]

3. Monitoring and Addressing Identified Weaknesses

A firm should monitor the adequacy of its policies and procedures and meaningfully address weaknesses in its audit practice. The Firm's policies and procedures appear to be deficient in this regard. In the Firm's March 31, 2003 peer review report and supplemental inspection required by the AICPA, deficiencies were identified related to independence, appropriate audit procedures, and concurring partner reviews, as well as several other areas. While the Firm addressed some of the comments in the March 31, 2003 peer review report, the nature of the deficiencies reported by the inspection team suggest that the Firm has not responded meaningfully to all weaknesses that had been reported to the Firm in the past.

* * * *

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.

George Brenner, CPA
A Professional Corporation
10680 W. PICO BOULEVARD, SUITE 260
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90064
310/202-6445 – Fax 310/202-6494

October 10, 2005

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

Dear Mr. Diacont:

This letter is being written in response to the Draft Report of Inspection dated September 22, 2005. I would like to first address PART I, "Review of Audit Engagements." The inspection team identified one audit, issuer A and enumerated three deficiencies in that issuer's audit.

PART I

Per the attached, I have answered each of the above three matters separately. My approach was what procedures were followed during the 9/30/03 audit and a recent follow-up (9/23 – 10/05/05). In my follow-up I revisited the predecessor auditors on 9/28/05 who performed the 9/30/00, 9/30/01 and 9/30/02 audits. In addition I went to Issuer A's offices on October 5, 2005 (who, because of financial hardship have "gone dark" effective September 30, 2005) and met with my concurring reviewer on September 30, 2005.

Overall I believed my audit approach was acceptable but in Item A (1) and A (3) the documentation was weak. Item A (2) I thought was properly documented and audited but there was, as explained in the attached detail, an oversight which resulted in a GAAP violation. Issuer A does not want to amend and I was told by the Board's representative if Issuer A, their counsel and myself agreed not to amend, it would not be necessary to do so. I believe I can even quantify the understatement of income less an overstatement of income due to past practices which could be rationalized to a net understatement of approximately \$150,000 below the net loss from operations line. See the attached. Issuer A, their general counsel and I do not wish to amend.

PART II

Concurring Partner Review

My concurring reviewer spent 13.5 hours on Issuer A's review. Approximately 10 hours were spent at A's offices. Part I, matters A (1) and A (3) were discussed with him. The A (2) matter completely got by the two of us. We followed incorrectly the practice set

forth by the predecessor accountants who discussed it among three of their four partners. I subsequently changed this practice. See Issuer A's first quarter (12/31/04) 10Q. However without a doubt the concurring review process must be strengthened and documented.

Independence

The firm now has all its issuers' audits done by: a registered accountant, a CPA or in-house personnel capable of doing the entire 10K's and 10Q's. Updated independence letters are being sent to all SEC clients.

REDACTED

Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report

Very truly yours,



George Brenner, CPA