Audit Results

- 1	2	-				
Transpetient Wells Falgo	Date					
Iransactions	Check #	Amount	Payee	Expense	GIA Date/Approval	Verified on Quickbooks
check 1 June 1	2183	6.000	14Am Expensions	Auction - trip	1/A	7
Check 2 May	2160	1,46960	1,46960 DIDI D Farms	Contract Labor N/A	N/A	
Mad Nay	2170	11,92000	Advanced Telemetry Services	Colf Temple	Yes	_
Deposit 4 April		506.18				
Bank Statement Wells Fargo/Checking/Investr Date	Date	Amount	Payee	Income	Explanation	Verified on Ouickhooks
Deposity April	4/15/2016	506 18	Gred Pope	Re Member		Cultura on Kincknoons
2				() () () () () () () () () ()		
ω						
-4-						
two or three people who are r	two or three people who are not signors on any hard socionate					

wo or tiree people who are not signors on any bank accounts.

Dirk Q
Dirk C
Dirk Comments:
Sven
Collins Tope
11/17/2016 McDermott 12/3/16 12/3/16

I don't have any suggestions. I would say your approach is fine provided it is just two or three people who are not signors on any bank accounts.

start with the bank statement, trace that check back to the system and verify payee, classification of expense, authorization from the board (if applicable like GIA) and look at the signors on the check. Verify the amounts as well on the check versus GL. Deposits I would probably go from the GL to the bank statement.

The high risk audit area you are not going to be able to audit is the convention.

That is the real risk of losing cash. If I am running a game there is no way you can tell if I pocket \$100 from that gamebut not much you can do about it unless you add more controls to the process on that games.