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Transmittal Letter

Audit No. 2941-A  July 28, 2009

TO:  David Sundstrom, Auditor-Controller
     Carl Crown, Director, Human Resources Department
     Ronald C. Vienna, County Purchasing Agent, County Procurement Office

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

We have completed the July 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 $793,358.

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 II, Human Resources/Administration
Laurence McCabe, Admin. Manager II, Human Resources/Services and Support
Foreperson, Grand Jury
Darlene J. Bloom, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
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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.  

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 July 2009. Our analysis included a review of the following data:

1. **Duplicate Payments**: 20,242 vendor invoices totaling $121,779,971 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 6/30/09 for individuals exceeding annual limits.
4. **Deleted Vendors**: 105,299 vendors as of 6/27/09 in the Vendor Master Table for suspicious vendor payment activity.
5. **Direct Deposits**: 38,228 payroll direct deposit transactions processed for pay periods 12 (5/22/09 – 6/4/09) and 13 (6/5/09 – 6/18/09) for suspicious direct deposit activity.

RESULTS
For the month of July 2009, we found the following:

- **Objective #1 - Duplicate Payments**: We identified twenty-eight (28) duplicate payments made to vendors totaling $29,660 or .02% of the $122 million of vendor invoices processed during June 2009.

  **Value-added Information**
  Based on the to-date recoveries of $793,358 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 86 monthly performance reports for the CAATs.
Objective #2 – Employee Vendor Match:
In March 2009, we identified 23 potential employee/vendor matches and have submitted them to Human Resources (HR) for further evaluation. As of 7/22/09, HR determined that 1 was not a valid match and 12 were not a conflict. Their review is in process for the remaining 10 matches.

Objective #3 – Retiree/Extra Help Hours:
As of fiscal year-end 6/30/09, twelve (12) working retirees exceeded the annual limits. The excess hours ranged from 9 hours to 61.5 hours, which is less than 1 pay period.

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

Objective #5 – Direct Deposits:
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 June 2009.

A. Results
   We identified twenty-eight (28) duplicate payments totaling $29,660 or .02% of the $122 million of vendor invoices processed during June 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>#’s</td>
<td>$’s</td>
<td>#’s</td>
<td>$’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#’s</td>
<td>$’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$99,980</td>
<td>19 $10,334</td>
<td>80 $87,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$33,306</td>
<td>7 $10,175</td>
<td>39 $21,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$105,779</td>
<td>7 $2,990</td>
<td>24 $101,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$80,162</td>
<td>2 $668</td>
<td>64 $78,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$347,008</td>
<td>16 $33,720</td>
<td>54 $310,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$99,999</td>
<td>12 $8,411</td>
<td>76 $88,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,410</td>
<td>3 $1,303</td>
<td>4 1,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,594</td>
<td>2 $2,126</td>
<td>3 1,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,812</td>
<td>3 $2,343</td>
<td>2 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2008</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$24,188</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>6 24,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,850</td>
<td>1 $144</td>
<td>9 1,706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$788</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>2 518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$21,448</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>4 20,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$2,691</td>
<td>1 $325</td>
<td>7 2,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,492</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>2 2,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2008</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$10,386</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>14 10,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2008</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,053</td>
<td>1 $553</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,293</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>2 1,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,991</td>
<td>1 $3,799</td>
<td>1 $192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2009</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$33,843</td>
<td>3 $625</td>
<td>5 33,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,861</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>3 5,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$29,660</td>
<td>0 $0</td>
<td>0 28 $29,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>$918,594</td>
<td>78 $77,516</td>
<td>401 $793,358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detailed Results

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 July 2009, 20,242 invoices for $121,779,971 were added to this data sub-set representing June 2009 transactions. Currently, the data sub-set includes 911,386 invoices totaling $8,910,297,880.

The total data file from which the sub-set is derived includes 2,710,702 records totaling $17,757,210,371.

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. In March 2009, we identified 23 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. Their review is in process. The table below tracks the status of the potential employee-vendor matches submitted to HR for their review, as of July 22, 2009:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAAT Report Month</th>
<th>Matches Submitted to HR</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>Not a Valid Match</th>
<th>No Conflict Exists</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>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</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).

Status:
This routine is performed annually. For FY 08-09, there were approximately 212 working retirees. As of fiscal year-end 6/30/09, twelve (12) individuals exceeded the annual limits. The excess hours ranged from 9 hours to 61.5 hours, which is less than 1 pay period.

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 July 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 July 2009 with no significant findings.

Attachments:
Provided to the Auditor-Controller: dated 7/7/09 – A-C/Claims & Disbursing Section.