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INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT’S REPORT ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES

October 6, 2006

The Honorable Mark Sanford, Governor
and
Members of the Commission
South Carolina Commission on Indigent Defense
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 Indigent Defense (the Commission), solely to assist you in evaluating the performance of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005, 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 and internal controls over the selected receipt transactions were adequate to detect errors and/or irregularities.
   - 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 from sources other than State General Fund appropriations to those of the prior year and we used estimations and other procedures to evaluate the reasonableness of collected and recorded amounts by revenue account.
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, 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; and if internal controls over the selected disbursement transactions were adequate to detect errors and/or irregularities.
   • 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 to those of the prior year to determine the reasonableness of amounts paid and recorded by expenditure account.

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 internal controls over the selected payroll transactions were adequate to detect errors and/or irregularities.
   • 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 internal controls over these transactions were adequate.
   • 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 recorded payroll expenditures to those of the prior year and 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 to determine if recorded payroll and fringe benefit expenditures were reasonable by expenditure account.

The individual transactions selected were chosen randomly. Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Transfers of Personal Services Expenditures in the Accountant’s Comment section of this report.
4. **Journal Entries and Appropriation Transfers**
   - We inspected selected recorded journal entries and all interagency appropriation transfers to determine if these transactions were properly described and classified in the accounting records; they agreed with the supporting documentation, were adequately documented and explained, were properly approved, and were mathematically correct; and the internal controls over these transactions were adequate to detect errors and/or irregularities.

   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 the internal controls over the selected transactions were adequate to detect errors and/or irregularities.

   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, 2005, 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 they were accurate and complete. 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 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.

   We judgmentally selected the fiscal year-end reconciliation and randomly selected one month’s reconciliation for testing. We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

7. **Compliance**
   - We confirmed through inspection of payroll and non-payroll disbursement vouchers, cash receipts and other documents, inquiry of agency personnel and/or observation of agency personnel performing their assigned duties, the Commission’s compliance with all applicable financial provisions of the South Carolina Code of Laws, Appropriation Act, and other laws, rules, and regulations for fiscal year 2005.

   Our finding as a result of these procedures is presented in Transfers of Personal Services Expenditures in the Accountant’s Comment section of this report.
8. **Closing Packages**  
   - We obtained copies of all closing packages as of and for the year ended June 30, 2005, 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; if the amounts were reasonable; and if they agreed with the supporting workpapers and accounting records.

   We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

9. **Status of Prior Findings**  
   - We inquired about the status of the deficiencies described in 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, 2003, to determine if adequate corrective action has been taken. We applied no procedures to the Commission’s accounting records and internal controls for the year ended June 30, 2004.

   We found no exceptions as a result of the procedures.

   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 areas, 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 Commission 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
SECTION A - MATERIAL WEAKNESS AND/OR VIOLATION OF STATE LAWS, RULES OR REGULATIONS

The procedures agreed to by the agency require that we plan and perform the engagement to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the requirements of State Laws, Rules, or Regulations occurred and whether internal accounting controls over certain transactions were adequate. Management of the entity is responsible for establishing and maintaining internal controls. A material weakness is a condition in which the design or operation of one or more of the specific internal control components does not reduce to a relatively low level the risk that errors or irregularities in amounts that would be material in relation to the financial statements may occur and not be detected within a timely period by employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions. Therefore, the presence of a material weakness or violation will preclude management from asserting that the entity has effective internal controls.

The condition described in this section has been identified as a material weakness or a violation of State Laws, Rules, or Regulations.
TRANSFERS OF PERSONAL SERVICES EXPENDITURES

During our review of the Commission’s explanation for the change in fringe benefit expenditures in the restricted fund (subfund 4313) and our analysis of the change in personal services expenditures between fiscal years 2005 and 2004, we found that the Commission prepared two journal vouchers to transfer personal services expenditures totaling $27,731 from the general fund (subfund 1001) to the restricted fund (subfund 4313, the Civil Fund) to cover a deficit in the general fund.

According to Commission personnel, the expenditures were transferred under the authority of Proviso 35.11 of the fiscal year 2005 Appropriation Act which states that of the $3,200,000 generated by the seven and one-half percent increase of assessments on court fines imposed by Sections 14-1-206, 14-1-207 and 14-1-208 of the 1976 South Carolina Code of Laws, as amended, $1,750,000 is to be allocated to the Office of Indigent Defense for use in offsetting budget cuts. Our comparison of the Commission’s fiscal year 2005 to 2004 general fund appropriations for personal services disclosed that personal services appropriations for 2005 actually increased; therefore, in our opinion these expenditures should not have been transferred to the restricted fund account under the authority of Proviso 35.11. We also noted the Commission carried forward $13,576 of general fund appropriations to fiscal year 2006 which potentially could have been used to cover part of the deficit in general fund personal services.

We recommend that the Commission strengthen its policies and procedures to ensure expenditures are in compliance with all applicable State laws, rules, and regulations.
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, 2003, and dated August 5, 2004 (We applied no procedures to the Commission's accounting records and internal controls for the year ended June 30, 2004). We determined that the Commission has taken adequate corrective action on each of the findings.
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE
October 30, 2006

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

Re: Preliminary Draft of Audit Report Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 2005

Dear Mr. Gilbert:

This letter will acknowledge receipt of the above document and will acknowledge that our review of the report has been completed.

The transfer of personal service expenditures was made after discussion with the Office of State Budget and the Office of the Comptroller General, both of whom agreed that the transfer was appropriate under Proviso 35.11. The Commission had inadequate funding due to budget cuts in previous years that were not restored and determined that the language in this proviso allowed this transfer for the purpose of "offsetting budget cuts".

You are authorized to release the final version of this report. We are also providing a copy of this letter to you on diskette.

If you have questions, or need additional clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Lisa Graves
Assistant Director
5 copies of this document were published at an estimated printing cost of $1.31 each, and a total printing cost of $6.57. Section 1-11-125 of the South Carolina Code of Laws, as amended requires this information on printing costs be added to the document.