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INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT’S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

April 3, 2008

The Honorable Mark Sanford, Governor
and
Members of the Commission
South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination
Columbia, South Carolina

We have performed the procedures described below, which were agreed to by the governing body and management of the South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination (the Commission), solely to assist you in evaluating the performance of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007, in the areas addressed. The Commission’s management is responsible for its financial records, internal controls and compliance with State laws and regulations. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with attestation standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. The sufficiency of these procedures is solely the responsibility of the specified parties in this report. Consequently, we make no representation regarding the sufficiency of the procedures described below either for the purpose for which this report has been requested or for any other purpose.

The procedures and the associated findings are as follows:

1. **Cash Receipts and Revenues**
   - We inspected selected recorded receipts to determine if these receipts were properly described and classified in the accounting records in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures and State regulations.
   - We inspected selected recorded receipts to determine if these receipts were recorded in the proper fiscal year.
   - We compared amounts recorded in the general ledger and subsidiary ledgers to those in the State's accounting system (STARS) as reflected on the Comptroller General's reports to determine if recorded revenues were in agreement.
   - We made inquiries and performed substantive procedures to determine if revenue collection and retention or remittance were supported by law.
   - We compared current year recorded revenues at the subfund and object code level from sources other than State General Fund appropriations to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the earmarked and federal funds to ensure that revenue was classified properly in the agency’s accounting records. The scope was based on agreed upon materiality levels ($41,600 – earmarked fund and $3,500 – federal fund) and ± 10 percent.
• We made inquiries of management pertaining to the agency’s policies for accountability and security over permits, licenses, and other documents issued for money. We observed agency personnel performing their duties to determine if they understood and followed the described policies.

The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

2. Non-Payroll Disbursements and Expenditures
• We inspected selected recorded non-payroll disbursements to determine if these disbursements were properly described and classified in the accounting records in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures and State regulations, were bona fide disbursements of the Commission and were paid in conformity with State laws and regulations; if the acquired goods and/or services were procured in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.
• We inspected selected recorded non-payroll disbursements to determine if these disbursements were recorded in the proper fiscal year.
• We compared amounts recorded in the general ledger and subsidiary ledgers to those in various STARS reports to determine if recorded expenditures were in agreement.
• We compared current year expenditures at the subfund and major object code level to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the general, earmarked and federal funds to ensure that expenditures were classified properly in the agency’s accounting records. The scope was based on agreed upon materiality levels ($69,300 – general fund, $41,700 – earmarked fund, and $3,300 – federal fund) and ± 10 percent.

The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

3. Payroll Disbursements and Expenditures
• We inspected selected recorded payroll disbursements to determine if the selected payroll transactions were properly described, classified, and distributed in the accounting records; persons on the payroll were bona fide employees; payroll transactions, including employee payroll deductions, were properly authorized and were in accordance with existing legal requirements and processed in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures and State regulations.
• We inspected selected payroll vouchers to determine if the vouchers were properly approved and if the gross payroll agreed to amounts recorded in the general ledger and in STARS.
• We inspected payroll transactions for selected new employees and those who terminated employment to determine if the employees were added and/or removed from the payroll in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures, that the employee’s first and/or last pay check was properly calculated and that the employee’s leave payout was properly calculated in accordance with applicable State law.
• We compared amounts recorded in the general ledger and subsidiary ledgers to those in various STARS reports to determine if recorded payroll and fringe benefit expenditures were in agreement.
• We compared current year payroll expenditures at the subfund and major object code level to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the general, earmarked and federal funds to ensure that expenditures were classified properly in the agency’s accounting records. The scope was based on agreed upon materiality levels ($69,300 – general fund, $41,700 – earmarked fund, and $3,300 – federal fund) and ±10 percent.

• We compared the percentage change in recorded personal service expenditures to the percentage change in employer contributions; and computed the percentage distribution of recorded fringe benefit expenditures by fund source and compared the computed distribution to the actual distribution of recorded payroll expenditures by fund source. We investigated changes of ±5 percent to ensure that payroll expenditures were classified properly in the agency’s accounting records.

The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Distribution of Employer Contributions in the Accountant’s Comments section of this report.

4. Journal Entries, Operating Transfers and Appropriation Transfers
• We inspected selected recorded journal entries, and all operating transfers and appropriation transfers to determine if these transactions were properly described and classified in the accounting records; they agreed with the supporting documentation, the purpose of the transactions was documented and explained, the transactions were properly approved, and were mathematically correct; and the transactions were processed in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures and State regulations.

The individual journal entry transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

5. General Ledger and Subsidiary Ledgers
• We inspected selected entries and monthly totals in the subsidiary records of the Commission to determine if the amounts were mathematically accurate; the numerical sequences of selected document series were complete; the selected monthly totals were accurately posted to the general ledger; and selected entries were processed in accordance with the agency’s policies and procedures and State regulations.

The transactions selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

6. Reconciliations
• We obtained all monthly reconciliations prepared by the Commission for the year ended June 30, 2007, and inspected selected reconciliations of balances in the Commission’s accounting records to those in STARS as reflected on the Comptroller General’s reports to determine if accounts reconciled. For the selected reconciliations, we determined if they were timely performed and properly documented in accordance with State regulations, recalculated the amounts, agreed the applicable amounts to the Commission’s general ledger, agreed the applicable amounts to the STARS
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reports, determined if reconciling differences were adequately explained and properly resolved, and determined if necessary adjusting entries were made in the Commission’s accounting records and/or in STARS.

The reconciliations selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

7. Appropriation Act
   • We inspected agency documents, observed processes, and/or made inquiries of agency personnel to determine the Agency's compliance with Appropriation Act general and agency specific provisos.

   We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

8. Closing Packages
   • We obtained copies of all closing packages as of and for the year ended June 30, 2007, prepared by the Commission and submitted to the State Comptroller General. We inspected them to determine if they were prepared in accordance with the Comptroller General's GAAP Closing Procedures Manual requirements and if the amounts reported in the closing packages agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records.

   Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Operating Lease Closing Package in the Accountant’s Comments section of this report.

   • We obtained a copy of the schedule of federal financial assistance for the year ended June 30, 2007, prepared by the Commission and submitted to the State Auditor. We inspected it to determine if it was prepared in accordance with the State Auditor’s letter of instructions; if the amounts agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records.

   We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

10. Status of Prior Findings
    • We inquired about the status of the findings reported in the Accountant’s Comments section of the State Auditor’s Report on the South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination resulting from our engagement for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, to determine if the Commission had taken corrective action.

    We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.
The Honorable Mark Sanford, Governor
and
Members of the Commission
South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination
April 3, 2008

We were not engaged to and did not conduct an audit, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion on the specified elements, accounts, or items. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. Had we performed additional procedures, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

This report is intended solely for the information and use of the Governor and of the governing body and management of the South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination and is not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties.

Richard H. Gilbert, Jr., CPA
Deputy State Auditor
ACCOUNTANT’S COMMENTS
SECTION A - VIOLATIONS OF STATE LAWS, RULES OR REGULATIONS

Management of each State agency is responsible for establishing and maintaining internal controls to ensure compliance with State Laws, Rules or Regulations. The procedures agreed to by the agency require that we plan and perform the engagement to determine whether any violations of State Laws, Rules or Regulations occurred.

The conditions described in this section have been identified as violations of State Laws, Rules or Regulations.
OPERATING LEASE CLOSING PACKAGE

The Comptroller General’s GAAP Closing Procedures Manual, Section 3.19 requires state agencies to submit an operating leases closing package if the agency has noncancelable lease agreements with more than $200,000 of future payments.

We obtained a copy of the Commission’s lease for newly acquired office space and noted that the lease met the criteria noted above and should have been reported on the operating leases closing package. The Commission considered the lease to be cancelable because it included cancellation clauses. Because it is only remotely possible for the cancellation clauses to occur the lease is considered to be noncancelable.

We recommend the Commission report all noncancelable operating leases with future payments in excess of $200,000 on the operating leases closing package. We also recommend the Commission seek clarification from the Comptroller General’s Office whenever it encounters similar situations in the future.
DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYER CONTRIBUTIONS

Section 8-11-194 of SC Code of Laws states, “Any agency of state government whose operations are covered by funds from other than general fund appropriations must pay from such other sources a proportionate share of the employer costs of retirement, social security, workers’ compensation insurance, unemployment compensation insurance, health and other insurance for active and retired employees, and any other employer contribution provided by the State for the agency’s employees.”

The Commission expended earmarked funds for employer contributions and they did not expend any earmarked funds for personal services.

We recommend the Commission allocate employer contributions based on personal service costs.
SECTION B - STATUS OF PRIOR FINDINGS

During the current engagement, we reviewed the status of corrective action taken on each of the findings reported in the Accountant's Comments section of the State Auditor's Report on the South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006, and dated May 8, 2007. We determined that the Commission has taken adequate corrective action on each of the findings.
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE
Mr. Richard H. Gilbert, Jr., CPA
Deputy State Auditor
1401 Main Street, Suite 1200
Columbia, SC 29201

Dear Mr. Gilbert:

The purpose of this letter is to inform your office that I have reviewed the preliminary draft copy of the report resulting from your performance of agreed-upon procedures to the accounting records of the South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007. I am hereby authorizing the release of this report and am enclosing a current list of the Commission members and their mailing addresses for distribution.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

William D. Bilton
Executive Director
4 copies of this document were published at an estimated printing cost of $1.46 each, and a total printing cost of $5.84. Section 1-11-125 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, as amended requires this information on printing costs be added to the document.