



Agreed-Upon Procedures Report

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS COUNCIL

JULY 1, 2005 Through
DECEMBER 31, 2006



Office of the Oklahoma State Auditor and Inspector
Jeff A. McMahan, CFE

District Attorneys Council

Agreed-upon Procedures Report

For the Period
July 1, 2005 to December 31, 2006



STATE OF OKLAHOMA
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR AND INSPECTOR

Jeff A. McMahan
State Auditor and Inspector


July 2, 2007

TO THE DISTRICT ATTORNEYS COUNCIL

Transmitted herewith is the agreed-upon procedures report for the District Attorneys Council. The Office of the State Auditor and Inspector is committed to serving the public interest by providing independent oversight and by issuing reports that serve as a management tool to the State. Our goal is to ensure a government that is accountable to the people of the State of Oklahoma.

We wish to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the agency's staff for the assistance and cooperation extended to our office during the course of our engagement.

Sincerely,



JEFF A. McMAHAN
State Auditor and Inspector

Mission Statement

The mission of the District Attorneys Council is to protect the citizens of Oklahoma through effective and efficient administration of justice and to strengthen the criminal justice system in Oklahoma by providing a professional organization for the education, training, and coordination of technical efforts of all state prosecutors.

Board Members

Richard Smothermon, District Attorney, District 23 Chair
Dennis Smith, District Attorney, District 2 Vice-Chair
W.A. “Drew” Edmondson, Attorney General Member
Cathy Stocker, District Attorney, District 4 Member
Tim Harris, District Attorney, District 14..... Member

Key Staff

Suzanne McClain-Atwood, Executive Coordinator
Trent Baggett, Assistant Executive Coordinator



STATE OF OKLAHOMA
OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR AND INSPECTOR

Jeff A. McMahan
State Auditor and Inspector

**INDEPENDENT ACCOUNTANT'S REPORT
ON APPLYING AGREED-UPON PROCEDURES**

We have performed the procedures enumerated below, which were agreed to by management of the District Attorneys Council, solely to assist you in evaluating your internal controls over the receipt and disbursement process, and in determining whether selected receipts and disbursements are supported by underlying records for the period July 1, 2005 to December 31, 2006. This agreed-upon procedures engagement was conducted in accordance with standards applicable to attestation engagements contained in *Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. 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.

1. We compared the District Attorneys Council's internal controls over receipts and disbursements with the following criteria:
 - Accounting duties were segregated by functions into those who initiate or authorize transactions; those who execute transactions; and those who have responsibility for the asset, liability, expenditure, or revenue resulting from the transaction;
 - Incoming checks were restrictively endorsed upon receipt;
 - Receipts not deposited daily were safeguarded;
 - Receipts and disbursements were reconciled to Office of State Treasurer and Office of State Finance records;
 - Disbursements were supported by an original invoice;
 - Timesheets were prepared by employees and approved by supervisory personnel.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

2. We randomly selected 20 deposits and:
 - Compared the Treasurer's deposit date to agency deposit slip date to determine if dates were within one working day.
 - Agreed the total check copies for the day to the deposit slip.
 - Inspected agency records to determine whether receipts of \$100 or more were deposited on the same banking day as received.
 - Inspected agency records to determine whether receipts of less than \$100 were deposited on the next business day when accumulated receipts equaled \$100 or after five business days, whichever occurred first.
 - Inspected agency records to determine whether receipts were safeguarded.
 - Compared the fund type to which the deposit was posted in CORE to the CAFR fund type listing for consistency;
 - Compared the nature of the deposit to the account code description to determine consistency.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

3. We randomly selected 60 vouchers and:
 - Compared the voucher amount and payee to the invoice amount and payee;
 - Compared the voucher amount and payee to the CORE system;
 - Compared the fund type to which the disbursement was charged in CORE to the CAFR fund type listing for consistency;
 - Compared the nature of the purchase to the account code description to determine consistency.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

4. We compared salaries set by statute to the actual salary paid to determine the statutory limit was not exceeded.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

5. We randomly selected 1 employee who appeared on the December 2006 payroll but not on the July 2005 payroll and observed the initial "Request for Personnel Action" (OPM-14) or equivalent form to determine it was signed by the appointing authority.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

6. We randomly selected 1 employee who appeared on the July 2005 payroll but not on the December 2006 payroll and:

- Observed the final "Request for Personnel Action" (OPM-14) or equivalent form to determine it was signed by the appointing authority.
- Observed the main payroll funding sheet for the month subsequent to termination to determine employee no longer appeared.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

7. We randomly selected two employees whose gross salary at December 2006 had increased since July 2005 (excluding legislative pay raises) and observed the "Request for Personnel Action" (OPM-14) or equivalent form to determine it was signed by the appointing authority.


There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

8. We randomly selected 4 employees from the December 2006 payroll and agreed the amount paid to the "Request for Personnel Action" (OPM-14) or equivalent form that was in effect for December 2006.

There were no findings as a result of applying the procedures.

We were not engaged to, and did not, conduct an examination or a review, the objective of which would be the expression of an opinion or limited assurance on the cash, receipts, and disbursements for the agency. Accordingly, we do not express such an opinion or limited assurance. 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 management of the District Attorneys Council and should not be used for any other purpose. This report is also a public document pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act (51 O.S., § 24A.1 et seq.), and shall be open to any person for inspection and copying.



JEFF A. McMAHAN
State Auditor and Inspector

June 21, 2007

Protecting Your Tax Dollars



Office of the State Auditor and Inspector
2300 N. Lincoln Boulevard, Room 100
Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4896

www.sai.state.ok.us