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INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT’S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

July 30, 2014

The Honorable Nikki R. Haley, 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, 2013, 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 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 account level from sources other than State General Fund appropriations to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the general, 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 ($0 – general fund, $47,600 – earmarked fund, and $10,600 – federal fund) and ±10 percent.
The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Account Coding and Transaction Processing in the Accountant’s Comments section of this report.

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 current year expenditures at the subfund and account 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 ($78,100 – general fund, $54,100 – earmarked fund, and $9,900 – federal fund) and ± 10 percent.

The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Account Coding and Transaction Processing in the Accountant’s Comments section of this report.

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 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 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 current year payroll expenditures at the subfund and account level to those of the prior year. We investigated changes in the general 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 ($78,100 – general fund and $9,900 – 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 ± 10 percent to ensure that payroll expenditures were classified properly in the agency’s accounting records.
The individual payroll disbursements selected were chosen randomly. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

4. Journal Entries and Appropriation Transfers
   • We inspected selected recorded journal entries 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. Appropriation Act
   • We inspected agency documents, observed processes, and/or made inquiries of agency personnel to determine the Commission's compliance with Appropriation Act general and agency specific provisos.

We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

6. Reporting Packages
   • We obtained copies of all reporting packages as of and for the year ended June 30, 2013, 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 Reporting Policies and Procedures Manual requirements and if the amounts reported in the reporting packages agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records.

We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

7. Schedule of Federal Financial Assistance
   • We obtained a copy of the schedule of federal financial assistance for the year ended June 30, 2013, 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.

8. 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 Commission resulting from our engagement for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, to determine if the Commission had taken corrective action. We applied no procedures to the Commission’s accounting records and internal controls for the year ended June 30, 2012.

Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Account Coding and Transaction Processing in the Accountant’s Comments section of this report.
The Honorable Nikki R. Haley, Governor
and
Members of the Commission
South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination
July 30, 2014

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 - VIOLATION 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 condition described in this section has been identified as a violation of State Laws, Rules or Regulations.
The accountant’s comment titled Account Coding reported in the State Auditor’s Report on the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011 reported miscoding of certain revenue and expenditure transactions.

We sampled twenty-five disbursement transactions and noted that the Commission miscoded one of the transactions. The Commission coded a disbursement of state appropriated funds for aid to a governmental entity (SCEIS Account 5180210000) as a distribution of other than state appropriated funds (SCEIS Account 5170750000). In addition, a revenue transaction, identified during our analytical procedures, was incorrectly coded as a refund of prior year expenditure (SCEIS Account 4520010000) instead of sale of surplus materials (SCEIS Account 4480070000). Also, the documentation supporting this transaction showed that the transaction should have been recorded as a fiscal year 2012 transaction instead of a fiscal year 2013 transaction. A combination of keying errors and misinterpretations of account code definitions led to the exceptions described above.

We recommend the Commission develop and implement procedures to ensure that the individuals responsible for recording accounting transactions and those reviewing and approving the transactions are utilizing the Comptroller General’s Office definitions to help ensure proper coding and that transactions are being recorded in the proper fiscal year.
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 Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, and dated June 19, 2012. We applied no procedures to the Commission's accounting records and internal controls for the year ended June 30, 2012. We determined that the Commission has taken adequate corrective action on each of the findings except we have repeated the finding related to Account Coding in the current year finding titled Account Coding and Transaction Processing.
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE
August 12, 2014

Mr. Richard H. Gilbert, Jr., CPA
Deputy State Auditor
1401 Main Street, Suite 1200
Columbia, SC 29201

Dear Mr. Gilbert:

This letter is in response to the Accountant’s Comments in the Agreed-Upon Procedures Report for the period ending June 30, 2013, for the South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination.

Each of the findings noted in your report has been reviewed and the necessary corrections to procedures have been implemented.

The South Carolina Commission on Prosecution Coordination continues to work diligently to ensure compliance with all State laws, rules, and regulations. We will continue to strive to be a good steward of taxpayers’ dollars while ensuring that our financial reporting is accurate and timely.

We authorize the release of the final report and have enclosed a current list of Commission members along with their contact information. We appreciate your diligent efforts on behalf of the State of South Carolina and commend your staff for the efficiency and courtesy demonstrated during the review.

Sincerely,

David M. Ross
Executive Director

Enclosure
4 copies of this document were published at an estimated printing cost of $1.40 each, and a total printing cost of $5.60. Section 1-11-425 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, as amended, requires this information on printing costs be added to the document.