

Report on
2010 Inspection of Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C.
(Headquartered in Leawood, Kansas)

Issued by the
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

September 23, 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 MAYER HOFFMAN MCCANN P.C.

In 2010, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C.^{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 MHM Mahoney Cohen CPAs (The New York Practice of Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C.).

^{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 May 17, 2010 to May 28, 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	32 ^{4/}
Ownership structure	Professional corporation; Alternative practice structure affiliation with CBIZ, Inc.
Number of partners	279
Number of professional staff ^{5/}	1,053
Number of issuer audit clients ^{6/}	52

^{4/} The Firm's offices are located in Phoenix, Arizona; Bakersfield, Irvine, Los Angeles, Orange County, Oxnard, San Diego, and San Jose, California; Boulder and Denver, Colorado; Boca Raton and Miami, Florida; Atlanta, Georgia; Chicago, Illinois; Leawood, Topeka, and Wichita, Kansas; Bethesda, Columbia, Cumberland, Denton, and Easton, Maryland; Cambridge and New Bedford, Massachusetts; Minneapolis, Minnesota; St. Louis, Missouri; New York, New York; Akron and Cleveland, Ohio; Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania; Chattanooga, Tennessee; and Salt Lake City, Utah.

^{5/} The number of "professional staff" shown here excludes partners and represents the number of staff, other than administrative staff, leased by the firm through the alternative practice structure. The information on partners and professional staff described here is provided as an indication of the size of the Firm, and does not necessarily represent the number of those professionals who participate in audits of issuers or are "associated persons" (as defined in the Act) of the Firm.

^{6/} 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,

Board inspections are designed to identify and address weaknesses and deficiencies related to how a firm conducts audits.^{7/} 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.^{8/} 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

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.

^{7/} 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.

^{8/} 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.

opinions.^{9/} Depending upon the circumstances, compliance with these 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 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 seven 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. Those deficiencies included failures by the Firm to identify or appropriately address errors in the issuer's application of GAAP, including, in some cases, errors that appeared likely to be material to the issuer's financial statements. In addition, 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

^{9/} 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 Financial Reporting That is Integrated with An Audit of Financial Statements* ("AS No. 5"), ¶ 98.

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 one of the audits reviewed included a deficiency 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. That deficiency was –

the Firm's failure to identify, or to address appropriately, a departure from GAAP that related to a potentially material misstatement in the audited financial statements concerning the issuer's accounting for a settlement of a royalty refund applicable to sales that occurred in years prior to the year under audit.

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 alternative practice structure, 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. 104-2011-278
Inspection of Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C.
September 23, 2011
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 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.



Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C.
An Independent CPA Firm

11440 Tomahawk Creek Parkway
Leawood, Kansas 66211
913-234-1900 ph
913-234-1100 fx
www.mhm-pc.com

June 30, 2011

Ms. Helen A. Munter
Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Standards Board
1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Re: Response to the Draft Report on the 2010 Inspection of Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C.

Part I (Public Portion)

Dear Ms. Munter:

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our response to Part I of the draft report of the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB or the Board) on the 2010 inspection of Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C. (MHM or the Firm). MHM is committed to the highest quality throughout our practice and we consider the Board's inspection process an integral component of improvement to our practice.

We appreciate the professionalism and courtesy of the PCAOB inspection team in carrying out their procedures. In light of the value and importance we place on the inspection process, we cooperated with the inspection team to our fullest ability. We provided complete and accurate responses to all of their questions and we are pleased to receive the draft report that contains only one comment considered significant enough to be included as an audit deficiency.

The draft report identified a deficiency related to the identification, or the appropriate addressing of a very specific accounting issue. The accounting for a Mutual Release and Settlement Agreement (characterized in the draft report as a "royalty refund") involved substantial professional judgment in the interpretation of contracts as well as accounting standards. While we do not agree that the Firm failed to identify the issue, we do agree that the issue could have been more adequately addressed. Also, while we agree that the impact of the issue could potentially have been material to the audited financial statements, our subsequent analysis led us to the judgment that any resulting revisions would be neither quantitatively nor qualitatively material to the financial statements for any period.

We understand the concern by the inspection team that the Firm may not have obtained sufficient competent evidential matter to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements at the time it issued its audit report. We have carefully considered the finding and performed additional steps in response to the PCAOB's observation and have concluded that there were no additional actions by the Firm necessary under AU 390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures after the Report Date* or AU 561, *Subsequent Discovery of Facts Existing at the Date of the Auditor's Report*.

Ms. Helen A. Munter
Public Company Accounting Standards Board
Page 2
June 30, 2011

As previously noted, MHM considers the inspection process an integral component of our continuous improvement. We have communicated the concerns raised by the inspection team to all of our personnel. We also have and will use these results as we update our policies, and develop additional guidance for the Firm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C.

Mayer Hoffman McCann P.C.