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Transmittal Letter

Audit No. 2941-E  November 20, 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 November 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 **$833,658**.

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, Director
Internal Audit Department

Attachment
Letter from Director Peter Hughes

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
Foreperson, Grand Jury
Darlene J. Bloom, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
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Audit No. 2941-E      November 20, 2009

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, Director  
Internal Audit Department

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. **OC Working Retiree/Extra Help Hours:** County retirees working 
   as extra help in excess of mandated hour limits of 960 or 720 
   hours for FY 09-10.  The mandated limits are per fiscal year and 
   this CAAT is performed on an annual basis.

4. **Payroll 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 November 2009. Our analysis included a review of the following data:

1. **Duplicate Payments:** 12,080 vendor invoices totaling $154,039,427 for potential duplicate payments.

2. **Employee Vendor Match:** Employee and vendor addresses at 6/30/09 and 9/30/09 and employee and vendor phone numbers at 9/30/09 for potential conflicts of interest.

3. **OC Working Retiree/Extra Help Hours:** County working retiree/extra help hours worked as of 10/31/09 for individuals exceeding annual limits of 960 or 720 hours for FY 09-10.

4. **Payroll Direct Deposits:** 56,117 payroll direct deposit transactions processed for pay periods 20 (9/11/09 – 9/24/09), 21 (9/25/09 – 10/8/09), and 22 (10/9/09 – 10/22/09) for suspicious direct deposit activity.

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

- **Objective #1 - Duplicate Payments:** We identified six (6) duplicate payments made to vendors totaling $12,944 or .008% of the $154 million of vendor invoices processed during October 2009.

  **Value-added Information**
  Based on the to-date recoveries of $833,658 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 90 monthly performance reports for the CAATs.

- **Objective #2 – Employee Vendor Match:**
  In November 2009, we identified 7 potential employee/vendor matches and have submitted them to Human Resources for further evaluation. Their review is in process.
Objective #3 – OC Working Retiree/Extra Help Hours:
As of 10/31/09, no working retirees have exceeded the annual limits of 960 or 720 hours for FY 09/10.

Objective #4 – Payroll 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 October 2009.

A. Results
   We identified six (6) duplicate payments totaling $12,944 or .008% of the $154 million of vendor invoices processed during October 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 93% 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 #’s</th>
<th>Total $’s</th>
<th>Not Duplicates #’s</th>
<th>Not Duplicates $’s</th>
<th>Recovered #’s</th>
<th>Recovered $’s</th>
<th>In Process #’s</th>
<th>In Process $’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>$99,980</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$10,334</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$87,808</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$33,306</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$10,175</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$21,020</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$105,779</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,990</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$101,460</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$80,162</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$668</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$78,472</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$347,008</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$33,720</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$310,019</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$99,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$8,411</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>$88,735</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$2,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$77,712</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$6,794</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$67,780</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,293</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</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>
<td>1</td>
<td>$192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2009</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$33,843</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$33,218</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,861</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,861</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2009</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$29,660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$29,660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$29,441</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,891</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3,470</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$20,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$23,033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,391</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$4,670</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$16,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$7,771</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$7,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$12,944</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$12,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>$991,783</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$84,798</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>$833,658</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$73,327</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 November 2009, 12,080 invoices for $154,039,427 were added to this data sub-set representing October 2009 transactions. Currently, the data sub-set includes 949,756 invoices totaling $9,712,420,532.

The total data file from which the sub-set is derived includes 2,839,933 records totaling $19,074,384,694. For FY 08-09, established vendor payments were about $1.1 billion.

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 at 6/30/09 and 9/30/09 as well as an analysis of employee and vendor phone numbers at 9/30/09. In November 2009, we identified 7 potential employee-vendor matches. Our results were provided to the Human Resources Department (HR) for their evaluation as to whether any employee vendor conflicts exist in the matches identified. HR’s review is currently in process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAAT Report Month</th>
<th>Matches Submitted to HR</th>
<th>In Progress</th>
<th>HR Disposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not a Valid Match</td>
<td>No Conflict Exists</td>
<td>No Conflict – Potential HR Policy Issue Resolved to HR’s Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. OC Working 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:
The mandated limit is per fiscal year and we perform this review monthly. To date in FY 09-10, there have been approximately 99 OC working retirees; non-County working retirees are excluded from these totals (e.g. Superior Court, OCERS, LAFCO, etc.). As of October 31, 2009, no individuals have exceeded the annual limits for FY 09-10.

For FY 09-10, OC working retiree/extra-help data as of October 31, 2009 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>No. of OC Working Retirees</th>
<th>Total FY Hours to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff-Coroner</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Agency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Executive Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Public Works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Counsel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>99</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,003</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Payroll Direct Deposits (Objective #4)
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. For FY 08-09, direct deposits for payroll were about $1.3 billion.

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

Attachments: