

Report on

2012 Inspection of
Padgett, Stratemann & Co., L.L.P.
(Headquartered in San Antonio, Texas)

Issued by the

Public Company Accounting Oversight Board

February 25, 2013

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 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 financial statement misstatements, including failures to comply with 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 apparent misstatements 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 whether an issuer's financial statements are misstated or fail to comply with Commission disclosure requirements, rests with the Commission. Any description, in this report, of financial statement misstatements or failures to comply with 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.

2012 INSPECTION OF PADGETT, STRATEMANN & CO., L.L.P.

In 2012, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board ("PCAOB" or "the Board") conducted an inspection of the registered public accounting firm Padgett, Stratemann & Co., L.L.P. ("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 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.

^{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 primary procedures for the inspection from June 4, 2012 to June 11, 2012. 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	2 (Austin and San Antonio, Texas)
Ownership structure	Limited liability partnership
Number of partners	16
Number of professional staff ^{3/}	107
Number of issuer audit clients ^{4/}	6

^{3/} "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.

^{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. 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.^{5/} 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 Generally Accepted Accounting Principles ("GAAP").^{6/} 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.^{7/} Depending upon the circumstances, compliance with these standards may

^{5/} 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.

^{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 GAAP, the Board's practice is to report that information to the SEC, which has jurisdiction to determine proper accounting in issuers' financial statements.

^{7/} 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 two 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 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 appropriate audit evidence to support its opinion on the issuer's financial statements. That deficiency was –

the failure to perform sufficient procedures related to revenue recognition.

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. 104-2013-083A
Inspection of Padgett, Stratemann & Co., L.L.P.
February 25, 2013
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.^{8/} 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.

* * * *

Monitoring and Addressing Identified Weaknesses

The Firm's system of quality control appears to lack a monitoring element sufficient to provide the Firm with reasonable assurance that the Firm's policies and procedures for engagement performance are suitably designed and effectively applied. The Firm's monitoring appears to have been deficient with respect to at least one type of previously identified weaknesses. In a report dated July 2, 2010, which related to an inspection of the Firm conducted in 2009, the Board noted that the Firm's procedures appear not to provide sufficient assurance that the Firm performed procedures related to revenue recognition, and specifically to the allocation and reasonableness of the amounts used by the issuer to recognize revenue. An appropriate approach to monitoring would have resulted in the Firm avoiding these deficiencies in audits performed after they were brought to the Firm's attention, yet a similar deficiency was noted in this inspection.

* * * *

^{8/} 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.

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.^{9/}

^{9/} 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.



January 3, 2012

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

Re: Padgett Stratemann & Co., L.L.P. – Response to Part 1 of Draft Report on 2012 Inspection

Dear Ms. Munter:

Padgett, Stratemann & Co., L.L.P. (“PS&Co”) is pleased to submit its response to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board’s (“PCAOB”) December 4, 2012 draft of its Report on the 2012 Inspection of Padgett, Stratemann & Co., L.L.P. (the “Draft Report”). We are supportive of the inspection process and believe the Board’s comments and observations assist in the achievement of our shared objective of improving audit quality.

PS&Co is committed to the highest standards of audit quality. We continually monitor the systems and processes for our audit practice, including quality control, and, among other things, make changes to methodologies, policies, and procedures when we identify improvements that could enhance audit quality. As we have done with respect to the Board’s previous inspection reports, we will thoroughly consider the Board’s comments and concerns addressed in the Draft Report, assess whether we have already initiated actions that address those concerns, and consider whether additional actions are necessary.

We believe that the observations included in the Draft Report reflect the fact that professional judgments are involved in both auditing and issuer’s financial statements and internal control over financial reporting as well as in subsequently inspecting any such audits. Professional judgments of reasonable and highly competent professionals may differ as to the sufficiency of auditing procedures performed and evidence obtained, conclusions reached and documentation required in specific circumstances. We believe that the PCAOB’s comments relate to situations in which the engagement team made and documented well reasoned and supported judgments during the audit.

We view the PCAOB’s observations as constructive, and, accordingly, give each comment careful and thoughtful consideration. Although we may not always agree with the characterizations by the PCAOB in the Draft Report of our audit work and related documentation, we have evaluated the matters identified by the Board’s inspection team of the Issuer audit described in Part 1 of the Draft Report.

SAN ANTONIO
100 N.E. LOOP 410, SUITE 1100
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78216
210 828 6281

AUSTIN
811 BARTON SPRINGS ROAD, SUITE 550
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78704
512 476 0717

TOLL FREE: 800 879 4966
WEB: Padgett-CPA.com

Ms. Helen A. Munter, Director
Division of Registration and Inspections
Public Company Accounting Oversight Board
Washington, DC

January 3, 2012 – page 2

With respect to comment A cited in Part 1 of the Draft Report, we supplemented our documentation to add clarity and we performed additional procedures in response to the inspection findings. In this regard we have fulfilled our professional responsibilities under AU 390, *Consideration of Omitted Procedures After the Report Date*, and none of our conclusions or our reports on the Issuer financial statements were affected.

REDACTED. Comments on Non-public Aspects of Report

With respect to comment B.2 cited in Part 1 of the Draft Report, we believe that our system of quality control has a monitoring element sufficient to provide our firm reasonable assurance that our firm's policies and procedures for engagement performance are suitably designed and effectively applied. Our firm performed and documented additional procedures on subsequent Issuer audits in response to the observations noted in the Board's report dated July 2, 2010. We believe such observations should not be included in the final report.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our responses to Part 1 of the Draft Report and look forward to continuing to work with the PCAOB in support of efforts to improve audit quality. We are available to the Board and its staff to discuss our responses in further detail.

Sincerely,

Padgett, Stratemann & Co., L.L.P.

Padgett, Stratemann & Co., L.L.P.