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Audit No. 2941-J  April 28, 2010

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

SUBJECT: Results of Continuous Auditing Using CAATS: Auditor-Controller, Treasurer-Tax Collector, Human Resources, & CEO/Purchasing – Duplicate Vendor Payments & Other Routines

We have completed the April 2010 report of Results of Continuous Auditing Using CAATS (Computer-Assisted Audit Techniques). The final report is attached for your information. Recoveries to date from duplicate vendor payments are $893,962.

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 your offices. 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
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Audit No. 2941-J

TO: David Sundstrom, Auditor-Controller
Chriss Street, Treasurer-Tax Collector
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: Results of Continuous Auditing Using CAATS:
Auditor-Controller, Treasurer-Tax Collector,
Human Resources, & CEO/Purchasing –
Duplicate Vendor Payments and Other Routines

OBJECTIVES

Each month, the Internal Audit Department conducts a variety of continuous auditing of vendor payment and payroll activity utilizing Computer-Assisted Audit Techniques (known by the acronym CAAT). Our objectives are to analyze 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 currently performed quarterly.

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 required by Government Code Sections 31680.6 and 31641.04 are per fiscal year and this CAAT is performed monthly and annually.

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.

5. Employee Delinquent Receivables: Delinquent amounts owed by employees to determine whether opportunities exist to improve the timely collection of amounts owed. This is a new routine and its ongoing merits will be evaluated upon completion.

Audit Highlight

We analyzed 14,857 vendor invoices paid in March 2010 amounting to about $190 million and found 99.99% of the invoices were only paid once.

Of the $190 million vendor invoices, we identified one potential duplicate payment made to vendors for $1,140.

To date we have identified $940,463 in duplicate vendor payments, of which $893,962 has been recovered.
BACKGROUND
Continuous auditing is a change to the traditional audit approach of periodic reviews of a sample of transactions to ongoing audit testing of 100 percent of transactions. Continuous auditing provides efficient and timely testing of transactions and/or controls to allow immediate notification and remediation by management. An important component of continuous auditing is the development of models for the ongoing (continuous) review of transactions at, or close to, the point at which they occur.

As a supplement to traditional audits performed, Internal Audit performs continuous auditing of selected vendor payment and payroll activities utilizing Computer Assisted Audit Techniques (CAATs).

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 April 2010. Our analysis included a review of the following data:

1. **Duplicate Payments**: 14,857 vendor invoices totaling $190,094,943 for potential duplicate payments.
2. **Employee Vendor Match**: Employee and vendor addresses at 6/30/09, 9/30/09 and 12/31/09 and employee and vendor phone numbers at 9/30/09 and 12/31/09 for potential conflicts of interest.
3. **OC Working Retiree/Extra Help Hours**: County working retiree/extra help hours worked as of 4/17/10 for individuals exceeding annual limits of 960 or 720 hours for FY 09-10, as mandated by Government Code Sections 31680.6 and 31641.04.
4. **Payroll Direct Deposits**: 37,136 payroll direct deposit transactions processed for pay periods 5 (2/12/10 – 2/25/10) and 6 (2/26/10 – 3/11/10) for suspicious direct deposit activity.
5. **Employee Delinquent Receivables**: We received the centralized receivables data from Auditor-Controller/CUBS on April 21, 2010 and our analysis is in process.
RESULTS
For the month of April 2010, we found the following:

- **Objective #1 - Duplicate Payments:**
  We identified one (1) duplicate payment made to vendors for $1,140 or 0.0006% of the $190 million of vendor invoices processed during March 2010.

  **Value-added Information**
  Based on the to-date recoveries of $893,962 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 95 monthly performance reports for the CAATs.

- **Objective #2 – Employee Vendor Match:**
  In November 2009, we identified 7 potential employee/vendor matches. In January 2010, we identified an additional 5 potential employee/vendor matches. We have submitted them to Human Resources Department (HRD) for further evaluation. As of April 21, 2010, HRD determined that 8 were not a conflict. Their review is in process for the remaining 4 matches.

- **Objective #3 – OC Working Retiree/Extra Help Hours:**
  As of 4/17/10, no working retirees have exceeded the annual limits of 960 or 720 hours for FY 09/10, as mandated by Government Code Sections 31680.6 and 31641.04.

- **Objective #4 – Payroll Direct Deposits:**
  Analysis performed with no findings noted.

- **Objective #5 – Employee Delinquent Receivables:**
  We received the centralized receivables data from Auditor-Controller/CUBS on April 21, 2010 and our analysis is in process.

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 March 2010.

   A. Results
   We identified one (1) duplicate payment for $1,140 or .0006% of the $190 million of vendor invoices processed during March 2010. The Auditor-Controller continues to investigate all duplicate payments and is pursuing collection. Currently, the County has a recovery rate of about 95% on these duplicate payments that have been identified 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>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>2008</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$77,712</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$6,794</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>$33,843</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2009</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2009</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2009</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$29,441</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$23,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$23,033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$7,770</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$12,944</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$7,693</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$42,827</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>$1,043,442</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$102,979</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.).
Detailed Results

During the month of April 2010, 14,857 invoices for $190,094,943 were added to this data sub-set representing March 2010 transactions. Currently, the data sub-set includes 1,016,830 invoices totaling $10,575,906,597.

The total data file from which the sub-set is derived includes 3,030,358 records totaling $21,505,023,160. 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 or phone number as a vendor. This may identify employees buying goods or issuing contracts to themselves or a related vendor. This routine is performed quarterly.

Status:
In November 2009, 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.

In January 2010, we performed an analysis of employee and vendor addresses and phone numbers as of 12/31/09. In January 2010, we identified 5 potential employee-vendor matches.

Our results have been provided to the Human Resources Department (HRD) for their evaluation as to whether any employee vendor conflicts exist in the matches identified. HRD’s review is currently in process. Status as of April 21, 2010:

<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>November 2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</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 Government Code Sections 31680.6 and 31641.04 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 Government Code Section 31680.6 and 31641.04 mandated limits are per fiscal year and we perform this review monthly. To date in FY 09-10, there have been approximately 109 OC working retirees with hours; non-County working retirees are excluded from these totals (e.g. Superior Court, OCERS, LAFCO, etc.). As of April 17, 2010, no individuals have exceeded the annual limits for FY 09-10.

For FY 09-10, OC working retiree/extra-help data as of April 17, 2010 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>77</td>
<td>23,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care Agency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Executive Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC Public Works</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Counsel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer-Tax Collector</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>41,456</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 April 2010 with no significant findings.

5. Employee Delinquent Receivables (Objective #5)
Prompted by a suggestion from a member of the Board of Supervisors, we performed an analysis of county employees owing monies to the County for delinquent or outstanding receivables.

The goal of the analysis is to identify delinquent amounts owed by employees and determine whether opportunities exist to improve the timely collection of amounts owed to the County.

As a starting point, we determined that a centralized source of delinquent or outstanding receivables would be the Treasurer-Tax Collector (T-TC). The T-TC has three primary types of receivables that it collects:

- Secured property taxes (real property)
- Unsecured property taxes (businesses, boats, etc.)
- Centralized collections recorded in the CUBS system.
CUBS is used by the T-TC to record and collect delinquent receivables submitted by the various County departments. Certain departments utilize the T-TC’s collection services rather than perform their own collections in-house. Examples of receivables managed using CUBS includes: Non-sufficient funds checks, health inspection fees, hazardous waste fees, court ordered child investigation and mediation fees, Auditor-Controller invoices for County services to individuals and businesses, etc.

Note: CUBS does not include decentralized receivables data for County departments that perform their own collections in-house such as SSA, Probation, and Public Defender. At this time, the scope of our CAAT analysis does not include delinquent receivables for which collections are decentralized.

Status:

- **Centralized collections recorded in the CUBS:** We received the data files from Auditor-Controller/CUBS on April 21, 2010 and our analysis is in process. The Auditor-Controller provides system administration support for CUBS.

- **Delinquent Secured Property Taxes:** See results reported in the February 2010 CAAT report (Audit No. 2941-H).

- **Delinquent Unsecured Property Taxes:** See results reported in the February 2010 CAAT report (Audit No. 2941-H).

After our analysis is completed including the CUBS data, we will evaluate the merits of whether to continue analyzing delinquent employee receivables.

Attachments:
Details of Duplicate Payments provided to the Auditor-Controller/Claims & Disbursing Section, dated 4/20/10.