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We have completed the March 2009 report of the results of our Computer-Assisted Audit Techniques (CAAT). The final report is attached for your information. Recoveries to date from duplicate vendor payments are $754,036.

Each month I submit an Audit Status Report to the Board of Supervisors (BOS) where I detail any material and significant audit issues released in reports during the prior month and the implementation status of audit recommendations as disclosed by our Follow-Up Audits. Accordingly, the results of this audit will be included in a future status report to the BOS.

As always, the Internal Audit Department is available to partner with your staff so that they can successfully implement or mitigate difficult audit recommendations. Please feel free to call me should you wish to discuss any aspect of our audit report.

We appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to us by the personnel of the Auditor-Controller’s Office and the Human Resources Department. If we can be of further assistance, please contact me or Eli Littner, Deputy Director at (714) 834-5899, or Autumn McKinney, Senior Audit Manager at (714) 834-6106.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Peter Hughes, CPA
County Internal Auditor

Attachment
Distribution Pursuant to Audit Oversight Committee Procedure No. 1:

Members, Board of Supervisors
Members, Audit Oversight Committee
Thomas G. Mauk, County Executive Officer
Jan Grimes, Director, Auditor-Controller/Central Accounting Operations
Robert Leblow, Senior Manager, Auditor-Controller/Claims & Disbursing Section
Bill Malohn, A-C/Information Technology/CAPS G/L System Support
Shelley Carlucci, Assistant Director, Human Resources/Administration
Bob Leys, Assistant Director, Human Resources/Services and Support
Rosie Santiesteban, Admin. Manager, Human Resources/Administration
Joan Villanueva, Admin. Manager, Human Resources/Administration
Laurence McCabe, Admin. Manager II, Human Resources
Foreperson, Grand Jury
Darlene J. Bloom, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
Table of Contents

Monthly Performance Report of CAATS:  
Auditor-Controller, Human Resources, & CEO/Purchasing  
Duplicate Vendor Payments and Other Periodic Routines  
Audit No. 2844-I  

For the Month:  
March 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transmittal Letter</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACKGROUND</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DETAILED RESULTS:

1. Duplicate Payments (Objective #1) 4
2. Employee Vendor Match (Objective #2) 5
3. Retiree/Extra Help Hours (Objective #3) 5
4. Deleted Vendors (Objective #4) 6
5. Direct Deposits (Objective #5) 6
6. Data Validation (Objective #6) 6
7. High Dollar Payments (Objective #7) 7
TO: David Sundstrom, Auditor-Controller  
Carl Crown, Director, Human Resources Department  
Ronald C. Vienna, County Purchasing Agent, County Procurement Office

FROM: Dr. Peter Hughes, CPA  
County Internal Auditor

SUBJECT: Monthly Performance Report of CAATS: Auditor-Controller, Human Resources, & CEO/Purchasing - Duplicate Vendor Payments and Other Periodic Routines

OBJECTIVES
Each month, the Internal Audit Department conducts a variety of performance reviews of vendor payment and payroll activity utilizing Computer-Assisted Audit Techniques (known by the acronym CAAT). Our objectives are to analyze the selected vendor payment and payroll data to identify:

1. **Duplicate Payments:** Duplicate payments made to vendors. This CAAT is performed monthly.

2. **Employee Vendor Match:** Employees that bought goods or issued contracts to themselves or a related vendor. This CAAT is performed periodically as needed.

3. **Retiree/Extra Help Hours:** Retirees working as extra help in excess of mandated hour limits. This CAAT is performed annually.

4. **Deleted Vendors:** Active vendors deleted from the Vendor Master Table which could be an indicator of inappropriate payments. This CAAT is performed monthly.

5. **Direct Deposits:** Multiple employee paychecks directly deposited to the same bank account which could be an indicator of inappropriate payments. This CAAT is performed monthly.

6. **Data Validation:** Invalid or missing data in the data file such as bank account numbers, check numbers, transaction dates, input ID, vendor tax ID, negative check amounts, etc. Incomplete or inaccurate data could be an indicator of control weakness. This CAAT is performed periodically as needed.

7. **High Dollar Payments:** Produce statistics and stratify the payment (invoice) file to identify large and unusual payments when compared to the population. This CAAT is performed periodically as needed.

Audit Highlight
We analyzed 12,106 vendor invoices paid in February 2009 amounting to about $74 million and found 99.94% of the invoices were only paid once.

Of the $74 million vendor invoices, we identified 8 potential duplicate payments made to vendors totaling $33,844.

To date we have identified $806,183 in duplicate vendor payments, of which $754,036 has been recovered.
BACKGROUND
CAATs are automated queries applied to large amounts of electronic data searching for specified characteristics. We use a proprietary, best practices and industry recognized software product to help us in this process.

CAATs differ from our traditional audits in that CAATs can query 100% of a data universe whereas the traditional audits typically test but a sample of transactions from the population.

Resulting exceptions or findings are forwarded to the appropriate department for validation and/or resolution. Depending on the department’s review, the exceptions may or may not be a finding.

Often there is additional data needed to validate the exception that is only known at the department level. We also partner with the departments to identify internal control enhancements with the purpose of preventing future occurrences of the type of findings identified by the CAATs.

We are keeping the details of our process and the vulnerabilities identified to a general discussion because of the risks associated with disclosing specific details of our financial and accounting processes.

SCOPE
This report details the CAAT work we performed in March 2009. Our analysis included a review of the following data:

1. **Duplicate Payments:** 12,106 vendor invoices totaling $73,509,922 for potential duplicate payments.
2. **Employee Vendor Match:** Employee and vendor addresses from 1/1/05 to 6/30/08 for potential conflicts of interest.
3. **Retiree/Extra Help Hours:** Retiree/extra help hours worked as of 3/18/09 for individuals exceeding annual limits.
4. **Deleted Vendors:** 104,248 vendors as of 3/4/09 in the Vendor Master Table for suspicious vendor payment activity.
5. **Direct Deposits:** 39,062 payroll direct deposit transactions processed for pay periods 3 (1/16/09 - 1/29/09) and 4 (1/30/09 - 2/12/09) for suspicious direct deposit activity.
6. **Data Validation:** 2,248,786 invoices totaling $14,449,716,819 for the period 1/1/05 – 6/30/08 and 100,752 vendor codes as of 7/02/08 for missing or invalid data.
7. **High Dollar Payments:** 2,248,786 invoices totaling $14,449,716,819 for the period 1/1/05 – 6/30/08 for large and unusual high dollar payments (exceeding $20 million).
RESULTS
For the month of March 2009, we found the following:

- **Objective #1 - Duplicate Payments:**
  We identified 8 duplicate payments made to vendors, totaling $33,844 or .046% of the $74 million of vendor invoices processed during February 2009.

**Value-added Information**
Based on the to-date recoveries of $754,036 from the duplicate vendor payment routine, these computer assisted routines have paid for themselves and are returning monies to the County that may otherwise be lost. To date, we have issued 82 monthly performance reports for the CAATs.

- **Objective #2 – Employee Vendor Match:**
  We identified 26 potential employee/vendor matches and have submitted them to Human Resources for further evaluation.

- **Objective #3 – Retiree/Extra Help Hours:**
  As of 3/18/09, no working retirees have exceeded the annual limits.

- **Objective #4 - Deleted Vendors:**
  Analysis performed with no findings noted.

- **Objective #5 – Direct Deposits:**
  Analysis performed with no findings noted.

- **Objective #6 – Data Validation:**
  Analysis performed with no findings noted.

- **Objective #7 – High Dollar Payments:**
  Analysis performed with no findings noted.

See the Detailed Results section for further information.
Detailed Results

1. Duplicate Payments (Objective #1)
   We used a CAAT routine to identify potential duplicate payments made to vendors during February 2009.

A. Results
   We identified eight (8) duplicate payments totaling $33,844 or .046% of the $74 million of vendor invoices processed during February 2009. We have communicated the duplicate payments to the Auditor-Controller. The Auditor-Controller continues to investigate all duplicate payments and is pursuing collection. Currently, the Auditor-Controller has a recovery rate of about 98% on these duplicate payments that we have brought to their attention since the inception of the CAAT routines.

The table below summarizes the duplicate payment activity to date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAAT Report</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not Duplicates</th>
<th>Recovered</th>
<th>In Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#'s</td>
<td>$'s</td>
<td>#'s</td>
<td>$'s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$99,980</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$10,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$33,306</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$10,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$105,779</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$80,162</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$347,008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$33,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$99,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$8,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,410</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,594</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,812</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$24,188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$788</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$21,448</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,691</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,492</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$10,386</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,053</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,293</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,991</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2009</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$33,844</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>$883,074</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$76,891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Background
This CAAT routine concentrates on a sub-set of vendor invoices paid by the County that possesses certain common attributes. The sub-set excludes one-time payments (such as election worker pay, jury duty pay, etc.) as well as recurring payments (periodic payments to the same payee for the same amount such as welfare, family support, etc.).

During the month of March 2009, 12,106 invoices for $73,509,922 were added to this data sub-set representing February 2009 transactions. Currently, the data sub-set includes 847,297 invoices totaling $8,508,929,049.

The total data file from which the sub-set is derived includes 2,544,586 records totaling $16,694,787,458.

Our prior research has indicated that the duplicate payments are typically caused by a compounded human clerical error.

2. Employee Vendor Match (Objective #2)
We used a CAAT routine to identify employees that share a similar address as a vendor. This may identify employees buying goods or issuing contracts to themselves or a related vendor.

Status:
This routine is performed periodically, as needed. We performed an analysis of employee and vendor addresses for the period 1/1/05 to 6/30/08. We identified 26 potential employee-vendor matches. Our results have been provided to the Human Resources Department (HR) for their evaluation as to whether any employee vendor conflicts exist in the matches identified. The table below tracks the status of the potential employee-vendor matches submitted to HR for their review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAAT Report Month</th>
<th>Matches Submitted to HR</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>No Conflict – Potential HR Policy Issue Resolved to HR’s Satisfaction</th>
<th>Conflict – Issue Resolved to HR’s Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 2009</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Retiree/Extra Help Hours (Objective #3)
We performed an analysis of working retiree hours to identify retirees working as extra help in excess of mandated limits. Our criteria are 960 hours (maximum allowed for regular retirees) or 720 hours (maximum for early retirees) during the fiscal year (FY).
Detailed Results

4. Deleted Vendors (Objective #4)
We used a CAAT to identify vendors that have been deleted or removed from the Vendor Master List. For deleted vendors, we verify that there has been no recent activity for that vendor.

Results:
This CAAT was applied in March 2009 with no significant findings.

5. Direct Deposits (Objective #5)
We used a CAAT to identify multiple employee paychecks directly deposited to the same bank account in the same pay period. We review results to determine there has been no irregular direct deposit activity.

Results:
This CAAT was applied in March 2009 with no significant findings.

6. Data Validation (Objective #6)
We used multiple CAATs to identify missing or invalid data in certain payment and vendor files used in other various CAAT routines. We analyzed specific data fields including bank account, check number, check amount, voucher date, check date, report date, preparer ID, and vendor tax ID.

Results:
Our analysis included 2,248,786 invoices totaling $14,449,716,819 for the period 1/1/05 - 6/30/08 and 100,752 vendor codes per the vendor master table as of 7/02/08.

We initially identified 1,568 vendors without a tax ID (some miscellaneous vendors may not be required to provide a tax ID such as foster parents). The Auditor-Controller Claims Unit informed us that it has been working on the vendor master table and has implemented procedures to ensure vendor codes for current contracts have a tax ID. We reviewed the vendor master table as of 1/02/09 for current active vendors (excluding miscellaneous vendors) and found only 6 current active vendors without tax IDs. The 6 vendors were governmental entities which appears appropriate. It appears the Auditor-Controller has taken appropriate steps to ensure the vendor tax ID is recorded in the vendor master table for current active vendors. No findings result from this CAAT.
Detailed Results

7. High Dollar Payments (Objective #7)
   We used a CAAT to produce statistics and stratify the payment (invoice) file to identify large and unusual payments when compared to the population.

   Results:
   Our analysis included 2,248,786 invoices totaling $14,449,716,819 for the period 1/1/05 - 6/30/08. We identified 23 payments exceeding $20 million. We reviewed the payment type (i.e. tax apportionment) and/or supporting invoice for the payments and determined the 23 payments appear reasonable. No findings were identified.

   Attachments: