



1666 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 207-9100
Facsimile: (202) 862-8433
www.pcaobus.org

Report on

2013 Inspection of Gregory, Sharer & Stuart, P.A.
(Headquartered in St. Petersburg, Florida)

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

August 1, 2013

PCAOB RELEASE NO. 104-2013-172

2013 INSPECTION OF GREGORY, SHARER & STUART, P.A.

In 2013, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Gregory, Sharer & Stuart, P.A. ("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 inspection process is designed, and inspections are performed, to provide a basis for assessing the degree of compliance by a firm with applicable requirements related to auditing issuers. The issuer audits and aspects of those audits inspected were selected based on a number of risk-related and other factors. The inspection process included reviews of aspects of selected issuer audits completed by the inspected firm. The reviews were intended to identify whether deficiencies existed in those aspects of the audits, and whether such deficiencies indicated weaknesses or defects in the firm's system of quality control over audits. In addition, the inspection included reviews of policies and procedures related to certain quality control processes of the firm that could be expected to affect audit quality.

The Act restricts the Board from publicly disclosing portions of an inspection report that discuss certain types of deficiencies or certain other nonpublic information. Because the inspection did not identify instances of such deficiencies, and because the report does not otherwise disclose protected information, the Board is making the entire report available to the public.^{1/}

^{1/} In its *Statement Concerning the Issuance of Inspection Reports*, PCAOB Release No. 104-2004-001 (August 26, 2004), the Board described its approach to making inspection-related information publicly available consistent with legal restrictions.

PART I

INSPECTION PROCEDURES AND CERTAIN OBSERVATIONS

Members of the Board's inspection staff ("the inspection team") conducted primary procedures for the inspection from March 18, 2013 to March 22, 2013. 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 (St. Petersburg, Florida)
Ownership structure	Corporation
Number of partners	13
Number of professional staff ^{2/}	25
Number of issuer audit clients ^{3/}	2

^{2/} "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.

^{3/} 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. For information about audit reports issued by the Firm, see Item 4.1 of the Firm's annual reports on PCAOB Form 2, available at www.pcaobus.org.

A. Review of Audit Engagement

The inspection procedures included a review of aspects of the Firm's auditing of financial statements of one issuer. This review did not identify any audit performance issues that, in the inspection team's view, resulted in the Firm failing to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements.

B. Review of Quality Control System

In addition to evaluating the quality of the audit work performed on a specific audit, 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. The inspection team did not identify anything that it considered to be a quality control defect that warrants discussion in a Board inspection report.

C. General Information Concerning PCAOB Inspections

Board inspections are designed to identify whether weaknesses and deficiencies exist related to how a firm conducts audits and address any such weaknesses and deficiencies. 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. The scope of the inspection procedures is determined according to the Board's criteria, and the firm is not allowed an opportunity to limit or influence the scope. The 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. Further, the inclusion in an inspection report of certain deficiencies and potential deficiencies should not be construed as an indication that the Board has made any determination about other aspects of the firm's systems, policies, procedures, practices, or conduct not included within the report.

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 Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP").^{4/} 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.

END OF PART I

^{4/} 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 Securities and Exchange Commission, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

PART II

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.



Gregory, Sharer & Stuart, P.A.

Richard H. Caton, CPA
M. Timothy Farrell, CPA
Thomas H. Gregory, CPA
Daniel J. Hevia, CPA
Robert L. Ingham, CPA
Troy Kimbrough, CPA
James G. Newman, CPA
Paula D. Popovich, CPA
Larry W. Sharer, CPA
Byron C. Smith, CPA
Charles L. Stuart, CPA
Richard G. Ulrich, CPA
Carlos R. Vila, CPA

May 9, 2013

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

Re: Gregory, Sharer & Stuart, P.A.
Response to 2013 Draft Inspection Report

Dear Ms. Munter:

We have received the draft report related to the 2013 inspection of Gregory, Sharer & Stuart, P.A. (Firm) and are pleased to submit our response.

Our Firm is committed to the highest standards of audit quality and we continually monitor our systems and methodologies for compliance and improvements that could further enhance our audit practice. We believe the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's inspection program is of great value to that process.

We support the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board's mission and appreciate the professionalism of the inspection team.

Very truly yours,

Gregory, Sharer & Stuart, P.A.