

Report on

**2010 Inspection of George Stewart, CPA
(Headquartered in Seattle, Washington)**

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

December 5, 2011

**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 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.

2010 INSPECTION OF GEORGE STEWART, CPA

In 2010, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm George Stewart, CPA^{1/} ("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.^{2/}

The Board has elsewhere described in detail its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions.^{3/} 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 Firm has issued audit reports under the name of George Stewart.

^{2/} 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.

^{3/} 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 primary procedures for the inspection from September 27, 2010 to October 4, 2010 and October 7, 2010. These procedures were 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 (Seattle, Washington)
Ownership structure	Sole proprietorship
Number of partners	1
Number of professional staff ^{4/}	1
Number of issuer audit clients ^{5/}	17

^{4/} "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.

^{5/} 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 and internal control over financial reporting ("ICFR") 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.^{6/} 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.^{7/} 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 or reporting on internal control, are free of any deficiencies not specifically described in an inspection report.

In addition, inclusion of a deficiency in an inspection report does not mean that the deficiency remained unaddressed after the inspection team brought it to the firm's attention. Under PCAOB standards, when audit deficiencies are discovered after the date of the audit report, a firm must take appropriate action to assess the importance of the deficiencies to the firm's present ability to support its previously expressed audit opinions.^{8/} Depending upon the circumstances, compliance with these standards may

^{6/} This focus on weaknesses and deficiencies 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.

^{7/} 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.

^{8/} 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), and PCAOB Auditing Standard No. 5, *An Audit of Internal Control Over*

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 previously expressed audit opinions. A Board inspection does not typically include review of a firm's actions to address deficiencies identified in that inspection, but the Board expects that firms are attempting to take appropriate action, and firms frequently represent that they have taken, are taking, or will take, action. If, through subsequent inspections or other processes, the Board determines that the firm failed to take appropriate action, that failure may be grounds for a Board disciplinary sanction.

A. Review of Audit Engagements

The inspection procedures included a review of aspects of the Firm's auditing of financial statements of three 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. The deficiencies included failures by the Firm to perform, or to perform sufficiently, certain necessary audit procedures.

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 and 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.

The deficiencies identified in all three of the audits reviewed included deficiencies 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 competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements. Those deficiencies were –

- (1) the failure, in two audits, to perform sufficient audit procedures related to a business combination;
- (2) the failure to perform sufficient audit procedures related to an intangible asset;
- (3) the failure to perform sufficient audit procedures related to revenue; and
- (4) the failure to perform audit procedures to test loans from related parties and the related financial statement disclosures.

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. 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. 104-2012-011A
Inspection of George Stewart, CPA
December 5, 2011
Page 6

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 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.^{9/} 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. Design of Quality Control System

Audit Documentation

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide sufficient assurance that the Firm will comply with the audit documentation and retention rules set forth in AS No. 3, in that all of the audit work papers reviewed by the concurring review partner were signed and dated by the partner more than 45 days after the report release date. [Issuers A and C]

2. 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

^{9/} 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.

concerns that the Firm's system of quality control fails to provide such reasonable assurance in at least the following respects –

Testing Appropriate to the Audit

The Firm's system of quality control appears not to provide sufficient assurance that the Firm will conduct all testing appropriate to a particular audit, specifically with respect to the following issues:

* * * *

Intangible Asset

As discussed above, the inspection team identified a significant deficiency related to the Firm's testing of the valuation of an intangible asset. This information provides cause for concern regarding the Firm's quality control policies and procedures related to the Firm's testing of intangible assets. [Issuer A]

* * * *

Related Party Transactions

As discussed above, the inspection team identified a significant deficiency related to the Firm's testing of loans from related parties. This information provides cause for concern regarding the Firm's quality control policies and procedures related to the Firm's testing of loans from related parties. [Issuer C]

* * * *

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 an inspection report that the Board makes publicly available, any portions of a firm's response that address nonpublic portions of the report are omitted. In some cases, the result may be that none of a firm's response is made publicly available.

George Stewart, CPA
316 – 17th Avenue South
Seattle, Washington 98144
(206) 328-8554, (206) 328-0383 FAX
stewcpasea@aol.com

October 24, 2011

Ms. Helen Munter, Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006

Re: George Stewart, CPA – Response to Part I of Draft Report on the 2011 Inspection

Dear Ms. Munter:

George Stewart, CPA is pleased to submit its response to the September 22, 2011 draft of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (the PCAOB or the Board) Report on the 2011 Inspection of George Stewart, CPA (the Draft Report). We are committed to the highest standards of audit quality and believe that the PCAOB's inspection process is an important factor in the achievement of our shared objectives of improving audit quality and serving investors and the public interest. We continually monitor the systems and processes of our practice, including quality control, and, among other things, make changes to methodologies, policies, and procedures when we identify improvements that could enhance audit quality.

We have evaluated the matters identified by the Board's inspection team for each of the Issuer audits described in Part I of the Draft Report and have taken actions as appropriate in accordance with George Stewart, CPA's policies and PCAOB standards. In this regard, we have fulfilled our professional responsibilities under AU 390, Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date, and AU561, Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of The Auditor's Report; none of our reports on the Issues' financial statements was affected.

We are supportive of, and committed to working with the PCAOB to continue to strengthen trust in the integrity of the independent audit. We are available to the Board and its staff to discuss our response in further detail

Sincerely,



George Stewart

George Stewart, CPA
316 – 17th Avenue South
Seattle, Washington 98144
(206) 328-8554, (206) 328-0383 FAX
stewcpasea@aol.com

October 24, 2011

Ms. Helen Munter, Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
1666 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006

Re: George Stewart, CPA – Response to Part I of Draft Report on the 2011 Inspection-
NonPublic

Dear Ms. Munter:

George Stewart, CPA is pleased to submit its response to the September 22, 2011 draft of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (the PCAOB or the Board) Report on the 2011 Inspection of George Stewart, CPA (the Draft Report). We are committed to the highest standards of audit quality and believe that the PCAOB's inspection process is an important factor in the achievement of our shared objectives of improving audit quality and serving investors and the public interest. We continually monitor the systems and processes of our practice, including quality control, and, among other things, make changes to methodologies, policies, and procedures when we identify improvements that could enhance audit quality.

We have evaluated the matters identified by the Board's inspection team for each of the Issuer audits described in Part I of the Draft Report and have taken actions as appropriate in accordance with George Stewart, CPA's policies and PCAOB standards. In this regard, we have fulfilled our professional responsibilities under AU 390, Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date, and AU561, Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of The Auditor's Report; none of our reports on the Issues' financial statements was affected.

The firm will schedule additional training including but not limited to:

*
Intangible assets
*
Related Party Transactions

Revised Procedures will include but not be limited to:

* REDACTED. Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report

Deliver audit workpapers to the Concurring reviewer no later than three days after field work completion.
Obtain qualified per Diem staff and have them prepare portions of workpapers.

We are supportive of, and committed to working with the PCAOB to continue to strengthen trust in the integrity of the independent audit. We are available to the Board and its staff to discuss our response in further detail

Sincerely,

George Stewart