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# Important Information (please read)

**This FACCR has been tailored for local governments and Not-For–Profits. It does not include all required references and testing for Institutes of Higher Learning or State organizations.**

**If your program had COVID funding expenditures, please refer to the terms and conditions of the grant to determine if any additional requirements were imposed. If additional material requirements are identified, auditors will need to create procedures to test those requirements. If you have questions, AOS Auditors please open a Spiceworks ticket for assistance (IPAs email** [**FACCR@ohioauditor.gov**](mailto:FACCR@ohioauditor.gov)**).**

**Also see guidance in** [**Appendix VII**](OMB_Compliance_Supplement_APP_VII.pdf) **of the Compliance Supplement.**

**Note: During 2020, The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) revised sections of the Uniform Guidance (UG).  These revisions to the UG were effective for funds awarded on or after November 12, 2020 (except for the amendments to §§ 200.216 and 200.340, which were effective on August 13, 2020).  The** [**eCFR**](https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/ECFR?page=browse) **has been updated to reflect these revisions, but guidance prior to the date of the revision is still accessible through the eCFR by selecting a date prior to 11/12/20 using the “Browse/Search Previous” button.**

**NAVIGATION PANE**

**This file has been arranged to be navigable. Click on the view tab above and check the box that says “Navigation Pane” to bring up the headings. Click on the various sections within the navigation pane to go directly to that section.**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**The Table of Contents starts on page. On the table of contents page, users can also click on listed sections to go directly to that section. Please note that as information is added into the unrestricted portions of the FACCRs, page numbering can change and won’t necessarily reflect the footer page numbers. The table of contents can be updated to reflect the proper footer page numbers by clicking on word “contents” directly above the line starting with Introduction, will bring up the icon “update table”. Clicking on the update table icon will allow users to update the page numbers to reflect current footer page numbers.**

# AGENCY ADOPTION OF THE UG AND EXAMPLE CITATIONS

Federal awarding agencies adopted or implemented the Uniform Guidance in 2 CFR part 200. The OMB guidance is directed to Federal agencies and, by itself, does not establish regulatory requirements binding on non-federal entities. The Federal awarding agency implementation gives regulatory effect to 2 CFR part 200 for that agency’s Federal awards and, thereby, establishes requirements with which the non-Federal entity must comply when incorporated in the terms and conditions of the federal award. The following code sections are where ED, HHS, USDA, DOT, EPA, DOL and HUD have adopted the Uniform Guidance in 2 CFR part 200. For the complete list of agencies adopting 2 CFR 200, as of the date of the OMB Compliance Supplement, see [**Appendix II**](OMB_Compliance_Supplement_APP_II.pdf)**.**

In implementing the UG, agencies were able to make certain changes to the part 200 by requesting needed exceptions. A few adopted the UG with no changes; however most agencies did make changes to the UG by either adding specific requirements or editing/modifying the existing language within certain sections of the UG. OMB does not maintain a complete listing of approved agency exception to the UG. Auditors should review the OMB Compliance Supplement and, as necessary, agency regulations adopting/implementing the OMB uniform guidance in 2 CFR part 200 to determine if there is any exception related to the compliance requirements that apply to the program (see link below)

**Auditors should review this** [**link**](Agency%20Adoption%20of%20the%20UG%20and%20Example%20Citations.pdf) **for a full discussion of agency adoption of the UG and how to cite non-compliance exception.**

*(Source: AOS CFAE)*
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# Introduction: Materiality by Compliance Requirement Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Planning Federal Materiality by Compliance Requirement**  See Footnotes 1-6 below the matrix table for further explanation, in particular, review note 6 which discusses tailoring the matrix assessments. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | **(1)** | **(2)** | **(6)** | **(6)** | **(3)** | **(4)** | **(5)** | **(5)** | **(6)** |
| **Compliance Requirement** | | | **Applicable per Compl.**  **Suppl.** | **Direct & material to program / entity** | **Monetary or nonmonetary** | **If monetary, population subject to require.** | **Inherent risk (IR) assess.** | **Final control risk (CR) assess.** | **Detection risk of noncompl.** | **Overall audit risk of noncompl.** | **Federal materiality by compl. requirement** |
|
|
|
| *(Yes or No)* | *(Yes or No)* | *(M/N)* | *(Dollars)* | *(High/Low)* | *(High/Low)* | *(High/Low)* | *(High/Low)* | *typically 5% of population subject to requirement* |
| **A** |  | **Activities Allowed or Unallowed** | Yes |  | M |  |  |  |  |  | *5%* |
| **B** |  | **Allowable Costs/Cost Principles** | Yes |  | M |  |  |  |  |  | *5%* |
| **C** |  | **Cash Management** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **D** |  | ***RESERVED*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **E** |  | **Eligibility** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **F** |  | **Equipment & Real Property Mgmt** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **G** |  | **Matching, Level of Effort, Earmark** | Yes |  | M |  |  |  |  |  | *5%* |
| **H** |  | **Period of Performance** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **I** |  | **Procurement & Sus. & Debarment** | Yes |  | N |  |  |  |  |  | *5%* |
| **J** |  | **Program Income** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **K** |  | ***RESERVED*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **L** |  | **Reporting** | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **M** |  | **Subrecipient Monitoring** | Yes |  | N |  |  |  |  |  | *5%* |
| **N** |  | **Special Tests & Provisions – EBT Reconciliation and EBT Card Security – Controls Only** | Yes |  | N |  |  |  |  |  | *5%* |

Note: Generally, E, “Eligibility,” G.1, “Matching,” I, “Procurement and Suspension and Debarment” (with respect to procurement), and N, “Special Tests and Provisions,” apply only to state governments. However, when states have delegated to the local governments functions normally performed by the state as administering agency (e.g., eligibility determination, issuance of SNAP) the related compliance requirements will apply to the local government.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

**NOTE: For all compliance requirements marked as applicable in Column (1) you MUST document in your working papers or this FACCR why a requirement is not direct and material to your program/entity as marked in Column (2). When making that determination all parts of that compliance requirement have to be considered. For example, Equipment and Real Property contains procedures regarding Acquisitions, Dispositions, and Inventory Management. The documentation on why the compliance requirement is not be applicable to the program/entity must cover all parts of that compliance requirement.**

**(1)** Taken form Part 2, Matrix of Compliance Requirements, of the [OMB Compliance Supplement](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/OMB-2021-Compliance-Supplement_Final_V2.pdf). When Part 2 of the Compliance Supplement indicates that a type of compliance requirement is not applicable, the remaining assessments for the compliance requirement are not applicable.

**(2)** If the Supplement notes a compliance requirement as being applicable to the program in column (1), it still may not apply at a particular entity either because that entity does not have activity subject to that type of compliance requirement, or the activity could not have a material effect on a major program. If the Compliance Supplement indicates that a type of compliance requirement is applicable and the auditor determines it also is direct and material to the program at the specific entity being audited, the auditor should answer this question “Yes,” and then complete the remainder of the line to document the various risk assessments, sample sizes, and references to testing. Alternatively, if the auditor determines that a particular type of compliance requirement that normally would be applicable to a program (as per part 2 of the Compliance Supplement) is not direct and material to the program at the specific entity being audited, the auditor should answer this question “No.” Along with that response, the auditor should document the basis for the determination (for example, "per the Compliance Supplement, eligibility requirements only apply at the state level").

**(3)** Refer to the AICPA Audit Guide, Government Auditing Standards and Single Audits, chapter 10, Compliance Auditing Applicable to Major Programs, for considerations relating to assessing inherent risk of noncompliance for each direct and material type of compliance requirement. The auditor is expected to document the inherent risk assessment for each direct and material compliance requirement.

**(4)** Refer to the AICPA Audit Guide, Government Auditing Standards and Single Audits, chapter 9, Consideration of Internal Control over Compliance for Major Programs, for considerations relating to assessing control risk of noncompliance for each direct and material types of compliance requirement. To determine the control risk assessment, the auditor is to document the five internal control components of the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission (COSO) (that is, control environment, risk assessment, control activities, information and communication, and monitoring) for each direct and material type of compliance requirement. Keep in mind that the auditor is expected to perform procedures to obtain an understanding of internal control over compliance for federal programs that is sufficient to plan the audit to support a low assessed level of control risk. If internal control over compliance for a type of compliance requirement is likely to be ineffective in preventing or detecting noncompliance, then the auditor is not required to plan and perform tests of internal control over compliance. Rather, the auditor must assess control risk at maximum, determine whether additional compliance tests are required, and report a significant deficiency (or material weakness) as part of the audit findings. The control risk assessment is based upon the auditor's understanding of controls, which would be documented outside of this template. Auditors may use the practice aid, Controls Overview Document, to support their control assessment. The Controls Overview Document assists the auditor in documenting the elements of COSO, identifying key controls, testing of those controls, and concluding on control risk. The practice aid is available in either a checklist or narrative format.

**(5)** Audit risk of noncompliance is defined in AICPA, Professional Standards, vol. 1, AU-C 935, as the risk that the auditor expresses an inappropriate opinion on the entity's compliance when material noncompliance exists. Audit risk of noncompliance is a function of the risks of material noncompliance and detection risk of noncompliance. A “Low” assessment of Detection Risk in this matrix means that the risk has been reduced to an acceptable level.

**(6)** CFAE included the typical monetary vs. nonmonetary determinations for each compliance requirement in this program. However, auditors should tailor these assessments as appropriate based on the facts and circumstances of their entity’s operations. The AICPA Single Audit Guide 10.56 states the auditor's tests of compliance with compliance requirements may disclose instances of noncompliance. The Uniform Guidance refers to these instances of noncompliance, among other matters, as “audit findings.” Such findings may be of a monetary nature and involve questioned costs or may be nonmonetary and not result in questioned costs. AU-C 935.13 & .A7 require auditors to establish and document two materiality levels: (1) a materiality level for the program as a whole. The column above documents quantitative materiality at the COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENT LEVEL for each major program; and (2) a second materiality level for the each of the applicable 12 compliance requirement listed in Appendix XI to Part 200.

*Note:*

a. If the compliance requirement is of a monetary nature, and

b. The requirement applies to the ***total*** population of program expenditure,

Then the compliance materiality amount for the program also equals materiality for the requirement. For example, the population for allowable costs and cost principles will usually equal the total Federal expenditures for the major program as a whole. Conversely, the population for some monetary compliance requirements may be less than the total Federal expenditures. Auditors must carefully determine the population subject to the compliance requirement to properly assess Federal materiality. Auditors should also consider the qualitative aspects of materiality. For example, in some cases, noncompliance and internal control deficiencies that might otherwise be immaterial could be significant to the major program because they involve fraud, abuse, or illegal acts. Auditors should document PROGRAM LEVEL materiality in the Record of Single Audit Risk (RSAR).

*(Source: AOS CFAE)*

[***Performing Tests to Evaluate the Effectiveness of Controls throughout this FACCR***](Performing%20Tests%20to%20Evaluate%20the%20Effectiveness%20of%20Controls%20throughout%20this%20FACCR.pdf)

[***Improper Payments***](Improper%20Payments.pdf)

# Part I – OMB Compliance Supplement Information

Although the below information may not impact counties directly, to effectively audit these program auditors should understand all aspects of each program. This information is directly from the OMB Compliance Supplement and gives the auditors information on how SNAP (Food Assistance) operates.

*(Source: CFAE)*

### I. Program Objectives

The objective of SNAP is to help low-income households buy the food they need for good health.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

### II. Program Procedures

**A. Administration**

The US Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) administers SNAP in cooperation with state and local governments.

State human services agencies (or county human services agencies under the oversight of the state government) certify eligibility and provide benefits to households. They also provide nutrition education. FNS provides funding for state administration and benefits and oversees the operation of state agencies to ensure compliance with federal laws and regulations. In addition, FNS is solely responsible for authorizing and monitoring retail stores that accept SNAP benefits in exchange for food.

**B. Federal Funding of Benefits and State Administrative Costs**

The federal government pays 100 percent of the value of SNAP benefits and generally reimburses states for 50 percent of their costs to administer the program, except for those functions listed in III G.1, “Matching, Level of Effort, Earmarking – Matching.” SNAP’s authorizing statute places no cap on the amount of funds available to reimburse states at the 50 percent rate for allowable administrative expenses. No reimbursement is allowed for state expenditures for activities undertaken as a condition of settlement of quality control claims against the state for low payment accuracy.

States receive federal funds for SNAP nutrition education and obesity prevention (SNAP-Ed) activities based on a formula. The state agency must use these funds for the administrative costs of planning, implementing, and operating a SNAP-Ed program in accordance with its approved SNAP-Ed Plan. The federal government pays 100 percent of the costs. However, the state agency is prohibited from obligating additional federal funds for SNAP-Ed activities.

**C. Certification**

Eligibility for SNAP is based primarily on income and resources. Although a number of available state design options can affect benefits for recipients, a key feature of the program is its status as an entitlement program with standardized eligibility and benefits.

*1. Assessing Need*

Households generally cannot exceed a gross income eligibility standard set at 130 percent of the federal poverty standard. Households also cannot exceed a net income standard, which is set at 100 percent of the federal poverty standard. The net income standard allows specified deductions from gross income (e.g., a standard deduction and deductions for medical expenses (elderly and disabled only)), excess shelter costs, and work expenses. Nonfinancial eligibility criteria include school status, citizenship/legal immigration status, residency, household composition, work requirements, and disability status. Some noncitizens are ineligible to participate in the program. Able-bodied adults without dependents are subject to a time limit for receiving benefits if certain requirements are not met.

A total of 42 states have adopted the policy known as broad based categorical eligibility (BBCE). This policy allows a state to base SNAP eligibility determinations on households’ receipt of a Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)-funded noncash benefits or service (Assistance Listing 93.558). Depending on the eligibility criteria of the TANF program used to confer SNAP categorical eligibility, the BBCE may enable a state to (1) use a higher threshold (up to 200 percent of the poverty level) when applying the gross income test, and/or (2) eliminate the asset test altogether.

*2. Application Process for SNAP Benefits*

The application process for SNAP benefits includes the completion and filing of an application form, an interview, and the verification of certain information. In addition to using information supplied by the applicants, state or county agencies use data from other agencies, such as the Social Security Administration and the state employment security agency, to verify the household’s identity, income, resources, and other eligibility criteria.

**D. Benefits**

Benefit amounts vary with household size and income. As required by law, allotments for various household sizes are revised October 1 of each year to reflect the cost of the Thrifty Food Plan, a model plan for a low-cost nutritious diet that is developed and costed by USDA. The benefits each household receives are used to purchase food at authorized retail stores. States issue benefits in the form of debit cards, which recipients can use to purchase food. This is known as electronic benefits transfer (EBT).

**E. Benefit Redemption**

Generally, households must use program benefits to purchase foods for preparation and consumption at home. There are, however, very few exceptions to this general policy. For example, there are provisions for seniors, disabled persons, and homeless persons to use program benefits in authorized restaurants and for residents of some small institutional settings to participate in the program.

The state’s EBT contractor is responsible for settlement, or payment, to retailers that have accepted EBT cards for food purchases. The contractor’s “concentrator bank” makes the payment through the National Automated Clearing House (ACH) system. The concentrator bank is reimbursed for the payments by a draw made on the state’s EBT benefit account with the US Treasury. States usually authorize their EBT contractors to make these draws, although some states draw the cash and pay the concentrator banks themselves. The state is responsible for reconciling the payments made to retailers by its EBT contractor with the amounts drawn from its EBT account with the US Treasury.

States must obtain an examination report by an independent auditor of the state EBT service providers (service organizations) regarding the issuance, redemption, and settlement of benefits under SNAP in accordance with the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants Statement on Standards for Attestation Engagements (AT) Section 801, Reporting on Controls at a Service Organization. Appendix VIII to the Supplement provides additional guidance on these examinations and service auditor reports, referred to as a “service organization control (SOC) 1 type 2 report.” In performing audits of SNAP under 2 CFR Part 200, Subpart F, an auditor may use these SOC 1 type 2 reports to gain an understanding of internal controls and obtain evidence about the operating effectiveness of controls.

**F. State Responsibilities**

A state administering SNAP must sign a federal/state agreement that commits it to observe applicable laws and regulations in carrying out the program. Although legislation provides a measure of administrative flexibility, the authorizing legislation remains highly prescriptive. Both the law and regulations prescribe detailed requirements for (1) meeting program goals, such as providing timely service and rights to appeal; and (2) ensuring program integrity, such as verifying eligibility, establishing and collecting claims for benefit overpayments, and prosecuting fraud.

To ensure that states operate in compliance with the law, program regulations and their own Plans of Operation, each state is required to have a system for monitoring and improving its administration of SNAP, particularly the accuracy of eligibility and benefit determinations. This performance monitoring system includes management evaluation reviews, quality control reviews, and reporting to FNS on program performance. State agencies shall conduct management evaluation reviews once every year for large project areas, once every two years for medium project areas, and once every three years for small project areas, unless an alternative schedule is approved by FNS. Projects are classified as large, medium, or small, based on regulations at 7 CFR section 271.2, although states may request approval by FNS to use “management units” instead of project areas for management evaluation reviews. The state must also ensure corrective action in response to the detection of program deficiencies.

**G. Federal Oversight and Compliance Mechanisms**

FNS oversees state operations through an organization consisting of headquarters and seven regional offices. FNS program oversight includes budget review and approval, reviews of financial and program reports and state management review reports, and on-site FNS reviews. Each year FNS headquarters conveys to its regions the concerns that were elevated to the national level through audits or other mechanisms. Regions combine this with their knowledge of individual states to inform the states of possible vulnerabilities to include in their internal management reviews and corrective action plans.

FNS also assesses penalties related to payment accuracy. FNS has other mechanisms to recover losses and the cost of negligence. For other forms of noncompliance, FNS has the authority to give notice and, if improvements do not occur, withhold administrative funds from states for failure to implement program requirements.

USDA’s Office of Inspector General (OIG) has primary responsibility for investigating authorized retailers, but the OIG has delegated most such authority to FNS. Consequently, FNS makes most of the investigations of retailers. The Retailer Investigations Branch of the FNS Retailer Operations Division conducts undercover investigations. FNS also uses EBT transaction data to identify retailers who engage in trafficking. SNAP legislation and regulations provide for sanctions against such retailers, which may be temporary or permanent depending on the severity of the violations. In certain circumstances, monetary penalties may be imposed.

**H. Certification Quality Control System**

SNAP maintains an extensive quality control system required by law and regulation. The system provides state and national measures of the accuracy of eligibility and benefit amount determination (often referred to as payment accuracy), both underpayment and overpayment, and of the correctness of actions to deny, terminate, or suspend benefits.

*1. Measurement*

States are required to select a statistical sample of cases, both active (currently receiving benefits) and negative case actions (benefits denied); review the active cases for eligibility and benefit amount; and review the negative cases for the correctness of the decision to deny benefits. Review methods in this sample are generally more intensive than those used in determining eligibility. States submit findings of all sampled cases, including incomplete and not-subject-to-review cases, to an automated database maintained by the federal government. State quality control data allow a state to be aware on an ongoing basis of its level of accuracy and allow for the identification of trends and appropriate corrective action.

The applicable FNS regional office reviews each state’s sampling plan annually and re-reviews a statistical subsample of the state quality control reviews. The FNS re-review process provides feedback to each state on its quality control system. FNS uses the state’s sample and the FNS subsample in a regression formula (described in regulation) to determine payment error rates and negative case error rates. By law, the payment error rate is the combined value of overpayments and under payments to participating households. The FNS national office also reviews its regional operations and provides technical assistance to assure consistency in the national quality control system.

*2. Corrective Action and Penalties*

Program regulations require corrective action for any of the following reasons: (1) a payment error rate of 6 percent or greater, (2) any negative case error rate that exceeds 1 percent, (3) deficiencies identified from any FNS review, Government Accountability Office (GAO) audit, contract audit, or reports to FNS regarding the implementation of major changes as discussed in 7 CFR 272.15, (4) a result of 5 percent or more of the state’s quality control (QC) caseload being coded as incomplete, or (5) any state agency rules or procedures that lead to under issuances, improper denials, improper suspensions, improper terminations, or improper systemic suspension of benefits to eligible households. FNS maintains an extensive system of technical assistance for states as they develop and implement corrective action. FNS also monitors the implementation of corrective action plans. States with persistently high error rates are assessed fiscal liabilities based on the amount of benefits issued in error.

*3. Implications of Quality Control for the Compliance Supplement*

The SNAP Quality Control system uses an intensive state review of a sample of active cases across the United States to measure the accuracy of SNAP eligibility determinations and benefit amounts. An FNS re-review of a subset of those cases follows. Information from federal program oversight indicates that this sampling system is operating adequately to provide assurances that FNS is measuring the accuracy of eligibility decisions and that these data provide a basis for corrective action to improve the accuracy of eligibility decisions. Therefore, the Quality Control System sufficiently tests individual eligibility in SNAP.

However, in those situations where computer systems are integral to the operation of the program (e.g., automated eligibility determination, the auditor should perform tests as deemed necessary to obtain assurance of the integrity of these systems). In those instances where multiple programs share the same systems (e.g., automated intake systems for TANF, SNAP, Medicaid) testing may be done as part of the work on multiple programs.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

### III. Source of Governing Requirements

**Source of Governing Requirements**

SNAP is authorized by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 USC 2011 et seq.), which replaced the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended. This description of SNAP procedures incorporates provisions of the following amendments to the Act: the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Pub. L. No. 110-246, 122 Stat. 923, enacted June 18, 2008) and the Agriculture Act of 2014 (Pub. L. No. 113-79, 128 Stat. 649, enacted February 7, 2014). SNAP regulations are found in 7 CFR parts 271 through 285.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

### IV. Other Information

**Availability of Other Program Information**

Other program information is available from FNS’s SNAP site at <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/supplemental-nutrition-assistance-program>.

**Other Information**

Note: Generally, E, “Eligibility,” G.1, “Matching,” I, “Procurement and Suspension and Debarment” (with respect to procurement), and N, “Special Tests and Provisions,” apply only to state governments. However, when states have delegated to the local governments functions normally performed by the state as administering agency (e.g., eligibility determination, issuance of SNAP) the related compliance requirements will apply to the local government.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

***Multiple Program Covid-19 Waivers:***

Pursuant to the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (the Act) (Pub. L. No. 116-127), and in light of the exceptional circumstances of this public health emergency, the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) is granting several waivers for the aforementioned programs to ease program operations at the state and local levels and minimize the potential exposure to the novel coronavirus (COVID-19).

To view a complete portfolio of waivers, their descriptions, and states electing or requesting to implement these waivers, please go to <https://www.fns.usda.gov/disaster/pandemic/covid-19> . Each individual waiver contains a link to view the full description along with each state approved to implement the waiver. In addition, copies of individual state waivers are available at the links for each state.

For auditing purposes during this public health emergency, it is recommended that the audit community obtain the list of waivers from the audited state agency and local agency and adapt the audit test steps to reflect these flexibilities. Each waiver offered has reporting requirements that must be adhered to by the state agency. For example, pursuant to section 2202(d) of the Act, each state that elects to be subject to a waiver under section 2202(a)(b)(c) must submit a report to the secretary not later than one year after the date such state received the waiver. The report must include: (1) a summary of the use of this waiver by the state agency and local program operators; and (2) a description of whether and how this waiver resulted in improved services to program participants. Although there is no requirement for auditors to test reporting requirements for waivers applied by the state agency, auditors should be aware of this reporting requirement for each waiver exercised by the state agency. Documentation must be maintained by the state agency summarizing the use of each waiver and how each waiver improved its services to program participants.

In addition, the 2021 Compliance Supplement for the FNS programs listed in this document contain the procedures that auditors would normally follow during customary program operations. Due to COVID-19 and the subsequent closures, as in the case of the public schools, FNS would expect instances when it is not possible to perform certain audit steps as written in the Compliance Supplement. Such instances should be documented by the auditors.

Questions regarding this document should be directed to FNS’s Office of Financial Management, Office of Internal Controls, Audits, and Investigations at [jon.garcia@usda.gov](mailto:jon.garcia@usda.gov) .

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, Multiple Program Covid-19 Waivers)*

# Part II – Pass through Agency and Grant Specific Information

SNAP is the name for the Food Stamp Program. It stands for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, and reflects the changes made to meet the needs of their clients, including a focus on nutrition and an increase in benefit amounts.

States are encouraged, but not required, to change their program name to SNAP. Ohio has had authority under temporary law renewed the past two biennia to refer to the program as SNAP.

Additional PRC and SNAP Funds were released in May 2019 for tornados in Ohio. See [FAL 176](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofam/FAL---176-Tornado-Damage-Disaster-Funding.stm) and [FAL 176B](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofam/FAL176B_Montgomery_06212019.stm) for additional guidance regarding these funds.

Additional ODJFS Program Information can be obtained at <http://jfs.ohio.gov/factsheets/foodassistance.pdf>.

*(Source: ODJFS)*

### Program Overview

**County Structure**

Each County is segregated into the following three areas:

• County Department of Job and Family Services (CDJFS) - Administers the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Cluster, TANF, Child Care Cluster, Social Services Block Grant, lSCHIP, and Medicaid (i.e. all Public Assistance programs).

• Public Children Services Agency (PCSA) - Administers the Foster Care and Adoption Assistance programs.

• Child Support Enforcement Agency (CSEA) - Administers the Child Support Enforcement program.

*Note: In some Counties, all three areas are combined (Combined Agencies), whereas in other Counties, there may be two or three separate agencies.*

**Subgrant Agreement**

Each County agency (or agencies) enters into an Ohio Department of Job and Family Services Subgrant Agreement. This agreement describes the subgrant duties, ODJFS & subgrantee responsibilities, effective date of the subgrant, amount of grant/payments, audits of subgrantee, suspension and termination, breach and default, etc. Auditors should review their applicable County’s subgrant agreement. This agreement indicates if each agency (Public Assistance (PA), Public Children Services Agency (PCSA), and Child Support Enforcement Agency (CSEA) is a stand-alone agency or if they are combined agencies. This will determine the cost pools that will need tested as part of the RMS process tested in Section A. The grants passed down from ODJFS are funded on a federal fiscal year. The various CFIS reports indicate grant years so receipt and expenditure of awards is identifiable.

ODJFS has county profiles and web links at <http://jfs.ohio.gov/County/County_Directory.pdf>.

**County Collaborations**

**Collabor8**

Collabor8, formed in 2011, is a project that involves nine county department and family services that will work together under a common agreement to process and manage administrative workloads as one project area.   The MOU was extended indefinitely, and there have not been any changes to participants for SFY 21 or SFY 22.  The fiscal sharing splits for SFY 21 & 22 obtained from Collabor8 documentation provided are below.  This information is unaudited.  Auditors should evaluate for accuracy / reasonableness not only the fiscal split percentages used below but also but also any other costs allocated as a result of this collaborative effort. [OAC 5101:4-1-16](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/CashFoodAssist/FACM/FAH1000/5101-4-1-16.stm) states that ODJFS issues the names of the approved county collaborations that can be found in the food assistance certification manual on the ODJFS website.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **County** | **State Fiscal Year 21**  **IM Allocations** | **Percentage** | **State Fiscal Year 22**  **IM Allocations** | **Percentage** |
| Carroll | $273,301 | 7.56% | $278,076 | 7.28% |
| Delaware | 282,573 | 7.82% | 438,058 | 11.47% |
| Hancock | 404,643 | 11.20% | 409,280 | 10.72% |
| Holmes | 282,618 | 7.82% | 283,569 | 7.43% |
| Knox | 419,201 | 11.60% | 421,931 | 11.05% |
| Marion | 587,322 | 16.25% | 605,734 | 15.87% |
| Morrow | 280,685 | 7.77% | 283,651 | 7.43% |
| Sandusky | 436,590 | 12.08% | 438,058 | 11.47% |
| Wood | 646,854 | 17.90% | 659,530 | 17.27% |
| Total | $3,613,788 |  | $3,817,887 |  |

**Joint County Department of Job and Family Services**

Ohio Revised Code § 329.40-329.46 allows for the formation of joint county departments of job and family services. The boards of county commissioners of any two or more counties may enter into a written agreement to form a joint county department of job and family services. Once the agreement is in effect the department should operate a single new entity replacing the contributing counties JFS offices. The agreements will specify the reporting periods for the new departments, which are not required to be on a 12/31 reporting timeframe. If auditors are aware of the formation of a new district they should inquire as soon as possible with the district to determine the reporting period that was established. Auditors should familiarize themselves with the ORC code sections mentioned and should also obtain the agreement establishing the district; perform a potential component unit evaluation to determine if the district is a legally separate entity and if they are a subrecipient of ODJFS or of the contributing counties. Also keep in mind ORC § 329.44 allows for JFS Districts to hold title to real property. Auditors will need to evaluate if the district is holding title to real property and will need to import testing procedures from the General boilerplate FACCR. Also keep in mind costs incurred for the acquisition of buildings and land, as “capital expenditures,” are unallowable as direct charges, except where approved in advance by the awarding agency. See 2 CFR [200.311](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-D/subject-group-ECFR8feb98c2e3e5ad2/section-200.311), [200.329](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-D/subject-group-ECFR36520e4111dce32/section-200.329) and [200.439](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-E/subject-group-ECFRed1f39f9b3d4e72/section-200.439)(b) (1). We are aware of two districts that have currently formed. See below. [OAC 5101:4-1-16](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/CashFoodAssist/FACM/FAH1000/5101-4-1-16.stm) was updated and designated county collaborations as certification offices responsible for program operations which include, but not limited to: application processing; eligibility determinations; and operation of employment and training programs. Approved counties were removed from the code section and OAC 5101:4-1-16(B) indicates that approved county collaborations can be found in food assistance change transmittal letters, which can be found in the [food assistance certification manual](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/CashFoodAssist/FACM/) at the ODJFS website.

1. South Central Job and Family Services District is a combination of Ross, Vinton and Hocking Counties and it is operating on a 6/30 state fiscal year end and,

2. Defiance/Paulding Consolidated Department of Job and Family Services is a combination of Defiance and Paulding Counties and it is operating on a 12/31 federal fiscal year end.

Per [BCFTA Update 2016-07](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/2016-Updates/2016-07FAET_PeriodOfAvailability.stm) effective 6/22/16 SNAP Employment and Training (SNAP E&T) program allocations no longer have a liquidation period. All expenditures must be made by 9/30 and final reports are due by 12/31.

Additional information per ODJFS:

**•** 7 CFR 272.4 codifies that the SNAP eligibility process cannot be contracted out to subrecipients; however, work and training services can be contracted out to subrecipients. Auditors should review contracts entered into by the County JFS for services to determine if a subrecipient relationship exists. Auditors should also look for recurring expenditures to determine if such a relationship exists without entering into a formal contract.

• Counties cannot adopt policies to broaden or restrict the SNAP (Food Assistance) program, including eligibility of recipients or services provided.

• ODJFS Bureau of Monitoring and Consulting Services (BMCS) performs ODJFS program County compliance reviews. The Counties do receive written results of these reviews. Auditors should consider the results of the reviews for planning purposes.

**This is a brief description of the Fiscal Process:**

The County JFS receives different types of Funding:

1. Mandated Share - ORC requires the county commissioners to share in the cost of the certain programs (known as mandated share). County JFS receive a mandated share from the County Commissioners. Mandated share is calculated by ODJFS and ODJFS enters the amounts for each funding source as a budget into the CFIS (fiscal computer system). ODJFS notifies the County Commissioners in May or June of their mandated share for the next calendar year so the Counties have time to budget accordingly. Counties are required to make an adjustment equal to 1/12 of the total mandated share when they submit their monthly expenditure reports. County JFS sends a drawdown request for their anticipated needs and then enter their expenditures monthly and submit their expenditures quarterly to ODJFS. ODJFS quarterly reconciliation evaluates and adjusts for the differences. While some counties may not pay their mandated share to the County JFS monthly, the County JFS must deduct no less than 1/12th of the amount on their monthly reporting of expenditures to ODJFS. (For example, if the County’s mandated share is $1,200, the County JFS would include $100 or more on the monthly reporting of expenditures regardless when the county paid the $1,200.)

Per [OAC 5101:9-6-31](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter06/5101-9-6-31.stm), Commissioners are required to appropriate the County Share of Public Assistance Expenditures. The County’s total Mandated Share Budget is limited to a maximum of 105% of the county’s preceding SFY mandated share.

2. Federal Allocation – There are two ways federal monies are allocated by the State (There are no local requirements for the calculating or receiving of these allocations.):

• Allocation specific to the grant – Adoption, Foster Care, Child Care Block Grant, Social Services Block Grant and TANF receive allocations specific to their grants. These allocations are based on mandated methodology guidelines, including demographics, expenditure information pulled from CFIS, etc. The County receives notification of their grant allocation from ODJFS via the CFIS web system beginning.

• ODJFS issues initial pass-through allocations based on the greater of:

a. The average expenditures of the last two years reported expenditures: or

b. The total of the last four completed quarters’ reported expenditures.

An agency with no reported expenditures over either time period will receive a minimum budget ([OAC 5101:9-6-44](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter06/5101-9-6-44.stm)). An agency may request an increase at any time during the fiscal year. Counties receive notification of their allocation via CFIS Web.

3. Income Maintenance (State Allocation) - County JFS also receives Income Maintenance (IM) monies. These are State monies County JFS can use to meet matching requirements or reimburse the county for administrative expenditures incurred in the administration of certain programs (See Section A of this document). There are two IM allocations. One allocation for administrative expenditures incurred in the administration of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and a separate allocation for medical assistance (MA) including the Medicaid program and the state children's health insurance program (SCHIP) on behalf of the Ohio Department of Medicaid. IM amounts for each county are also entered into CFIS as budgets by ODJFS. County JFS offices can request to move funding between the allocations. The request must be submitted to ODJFS no later than the last day of the liquidation period. A County JFS may also elect to transfer all or a portion of its IM allocations to the CSEA. Clarification on the two separate IM allocations is in [OAC 5101:9-6-05](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter06/5101-9-6-05.stm).

4. Other program specific State Allocations

In addition to their County JFS allocations, there are two opportunities for County agencies to release or receive monies: 1) They can swap funds with other counties, (this process must be approved by evidence of County Commissioners sign off) which goes through ODJFS to change the allocations in CFIS; or 2) There are at least 2 opportunities in the fiscal year in which they can apply for additional funds or to release excess funds for re-distribution to other counties. In this case, the County JFS must indicate need and ODJFS may provide additional funds as made available by other counties; however, the pass-through allocations are not included in either process. ODJFS changes the allocation in the CFIS system. While this does not require testing at the local level, auditors should be aware this may be the reason any such re-allocations in the system. Note: The Ohio Department of Job and Family Services developed a process to allow for specific allocated funds to be exchanged between counties. The process is detailed in OAC [5101:9-6-82](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter06/5101-9-6-82.stm).

For most grants, the County JFS can draw down funds on a weekly basis from the ODJFS. However, federal grants received by the Public Children Services Agency (PCSA) (Foster Care & Adoption Assistance) are reimbursement grants. There may be portions of a program that are on a reimbursement basis (such as E&T for SNAP) however, the remainder of the programs the County JFS agency draws down an advance of funds for anticipated needs . Quarterly adjustments are made for the differences between funds drawn and actual expenditures.

County JFS submit quarterly data via CFIS. There is a quarterly reconciliation process performed by ODJFS. See also [OAC 5101:9-7-03](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter07/5101-9-7-03.stm) and [OAC 5101:9-7-03.1](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter07/5101-9-7-03-1.stm) for additional information on the financing, reconciliation and closeout procedures. Auditors should review these sections for specific details on this process. Counties are still required to submit monthly financial data as an upload in CFIS no later than the eighteenth day of the month following the month of the transaction (see [OAC 5101:9-7-29](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter07/5101-9-7-29.stm)).

The reconciliation process with CFIS Web is reflected in [OAC 5101:9-7-03.1](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter07/5101-9-7-03-1.stm). The CDJFS has access to system reporting throughout the quarter in order to make ongoing adjustments/corrections. County JFS enters expenditures monthly into CFIS Web and submit to OAKS quarterly. They file quarterly the certification of monthly expenditure reports with ODJFS. The CDJFS is given five business days after the eighteenth day of the month following the last month of the quarter to review reports for accuracy. No later than five business days after the eighteenth day of the month following the last month of the quarter, the CDJFS shall submit any final adjustments and/or revisions to OAKS. When the eighteenth day of the month falls on a weekend or state recognized holiday, the CDJFS shall submit on the first business day following the weekend or recognized holiday. Once the five-day review period is complete, ODJFS suspends reporting access to OAKS for the closing quarter in order to begin the quarter reconciliation process. The CDJFS can complete adjusting draws in CFIS prior to the end of the five-day review period. ODJFS reconciles refunds and collections at the end of each quarter. ODJFS reconciles state funded allocations and federally funded subgrants at the end of their period. The period of performance includes the funding period and the liquidation period.

The CFIS Web system does not link information into the county auditor’s expenditure ledgers. Counties can manually reenter the information or they may use a computer program for this upload process. Auditors should check to see if the information uploads to the County Auditor’s system accurately by reconciling Form 2827 to the County Auditor’s & JFS records.

For most programs, expenditures are drawn down and expended based on State and Federal financial participation percentages. For SNAP (Food Assistance), except for Food Assistance Employment and Training (formally FAET or FSET) expenditures, the Federal share is 50% (See Section G) so the County JFS would be reimbursed 50% from Federal share and 50% from State (IM) or they could use county funding for the 50% state/local match. Once they use all their IM allocation, they must use local funding for the 50% match. This allocation is programmed into CFIS so auditors are not required to test the allocation; however, should be aware of this when testing the federal program. SNAP E&T expenditures do not require a matching share. SNAP Employment and Training is coded separately in CFIS and is 100% Federal reimbursement (see [OAC 5101:9-6-09](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter06/5101-9-6-09.stm)).

SNAP E&T operating funding is authorized under [OAC 5101:9-6-09.3](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter06/5101-9-6-09-3.stm) and participant allowance under [OAC 5101:9-6-09.4](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter06/5101-9-6-09-4.stm). [5101:9-6-09.3](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter06/5101-9-6-09-3.stm). allows a CDJFS to move excess expenditures from the FAET allocation to the FAET operating allocation by performing a post allocation adjustment. The adjustments can be either moving 50% of the ceiling excess to the SNAP E&T operating allocation or moving 50% of the ceiling excess to the FA income maintenance allocation as outlined in rule [5101:9-6-02](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter06/5101-9-6-02.stm).

ODJFS will allocate the SNAP E&T Participation Allowance in accordance with [OAC 5101:9-6-09.](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter06/5101-9-6-09.stm) Counties will be required to estimate and submit to ODJFS the amount of the preliminary allocation amount that will be designated for an OB expenditures budget. Once the estimate is received, ODJFS will reduce each county's preliminary SNAP E&T Participant Allowance allocation by their projected OB expenditure amount. Counties that do not submit an estimate will not be permitted to draw on the FAET Participation Allowance allocation.

See [FAL #165](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofam/FAL-165---FFY-2018-ABAWD-Waiver.stm) for guidance on Federal Fiscal Year 2018: Able-Bodied Adults without Dependents work program waivers.

See [FAL #171](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofam/FAL-171-FFY-2019-ABAWD-090718.stm) for guidance on Federal Fiscal Year 2019 Able-Bodied Adults without Dependents work program waivers.

See [FAL #180](https://jfs.ohio.gov/ofam/FAL180-ABAWD-Waiver.stm) and [FAL#184](https://jfs.ohio.gov/ofam/1FAL-184-Federal-Fiscal-Year-2020-ABAWDs.stm) for guidance on Federal Fiscal Year 2020 Able-Bodied Adults without Dependents work program waivers.

See [FAL #188](https://jfs.ohio.gov/ofam/FAL188FFY21ABAWDs.stm) for guidance on Federal Fiscal Year 2021 Able-Bodied Adults without Dependents.

See [BCFTA Update 2017-03](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/BCFTA_Update_Cost_Associated_with_County_Lay_off_or_SFY18.stm) and [BCFTA Update 2018-01](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/2018-Updates/2018-01_cost-associated-with-staff-lay-offs.stm) regarding costs associated with county lay-off of staff.

See also [FAPL No. 34](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/FAPL/FAPL-34.stm), Abnormal or Mass Severance Pay.

*(Source: ODJFS)*

### Testing Considerations

Auditors should evaluate cost pools and reporting requirements that are consistent between ODJFS grant programs and only test these once rather than with each grant program. The following table shows where some efficiencies can be gained for common cost pools (FACCR Section A) and reports (FACCR Section L):

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reported on:** | **Program:** | **County Fund Paid from:** | **RMS Cost Pool** |
| JFS 02827 | Medicaid, CHIP, Food Assistance, TANF, SSBG, CCDF | Public Assistance (PA) Fund | IMRMS / SSRMS |
| JFS 02750 | Child Support Enforcement | Child Support Administrative Fund | CSRMS |
| JFS 02820 | Foster Care & Adoption | Children Services Workers | CWRMS or SSRMS (if combined agency) |

For an overview of requirements tested by program: see AOS spreadsheet, ODJFS list of program & applicable requirements. These reports are in CFIS Web.

### Information systems, including a description on how they operate (i.e. State Automated Eligibility System, CFIS Web, CFIS Web LR)

**Computer Systems**

The following State-level systems are utilized by Counties for these programs:

* State Automated Eligibility System - Used primarily to determine eligibility and benefit amounts for Food Assistance, TANF, SCHIP, and Medicaid; and generates the voucher summary detail for these programs. It also maintains data entered by the case workers related to the recipients and their cases.
* CFIS – (County Finance Information System) July 1, 2009 County JFS finance offices began using CFIS which drives the financial reporting (Forms 2827, 2750, and 2820, RMS activity, etc.). The CFIS application became a web-based application in 2012. The current and archived CFIS information can be accessed at the County JFS site. At the county level financial data is imported (pulled) from templates or from interfaced systems like WebRMS into the CFIS Web reporting system. Information flows from the county system through CFIS and up to OAKS. Each grant is coded separately. ODJFS has a spreadsheet for coding in CFIS. ODJFS updates this information each year.

DITA will be testing CFIS Web (including the RMS System used to track Random Moment Sampling activity and allocation of program expenditure. A recap of that work performed and any user control considerations will be sent out when available for 2021.

The OAKS general controls portion tested as part of the Statewide SSAE 16 SOC 1, however, will continue to be on a state fiscal year (6/30).

* County JFS fiscal offices use CFIS Web to record their expenditures. However, this system does not link the information into the county auditor’s expenditure ledgers. The counties can manually reenter the information or they may use a computer program for this upload process. The State Region does not look at these type of programs. In 2015 ODJFS made available to its subrecipients, a PET replacement system called the CFIS Web Ledger Reporting (LR) system. Maximus discontinued PET in 2014.
* The process known as “Adjustment to a Prior Period Allocated and Approved Expenditure” or APAA, allows agencies to make adjustments in instances when direct coding is not available (i.e. audit, ERIP, and errors). This process can be initiated by the local agency or by ODJFS and is recorded on form JFS 01179. See [BCFTA updated 2013-17](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/20130228-BCFTA-Update-2013-17-APAA.stm) dated 2/28/13 for further information.

NOTE: ODJFS is not granting auditors of County JFS programs access to the JFS systems. ODJFS is encouraging County JFS offices to cooperate with audit requests. Per [Office of Fiscal and Monitoring Services’ County Monitoring Advisory Bulletin 2012-01 / Workforce Investment Act Advisory Bulletin 2012-01](https://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bmcs/County-Monitoring-Advisory-Bulletin-2012-01.pdf), dated February 13, 2012, in part:

“County agency management personnel are obligated to provide the necessary data to the regional auditors or their designees. However, due care must be taken to safeguard the information provided to the AOS and its contractors. Under no circumstances should agency management or staff give the AOS audit staff access to any ODJFS systems. Each agency must make a reasonable effort to limit the disclosure of protected health information to the minimum necessary to accomplish the intended purpose of the disclosure. The agencies must provide the data to the AOS via encrypted media, i.e. memory sticks, CDs or DVDs, external hard drives etc., in accordance with state guidelines on secure portable media. The method through which data are transferred is at the sole discretion of each local director.”

*(Source: ODJFS)*

### Reporting

Additional SEFA and Footnote resources available for AOS Staff in the Audit Employees Briefcase and on the [IPA Resource Internet Page](http://www.ohioauditor.gov/references/practiceaids.html):

* Examples SEFA and Footnote shells
* Additional SEFA Guidance in the “Single Audit SEFA 2021 Completeness Guide”

*(Source: CFAE)*

# PART III – APPLICABLE COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

## A. ACTIVITIES ALLOWED OR UNALLOWED

**Federal awarding agencies adopted/implemented the Uniform Guidance in 2 CFR part 200. The OMB guidance is directed to Federal agencies and, by itself, does not establish regulatory requirements binding on non-federal entities. Throughout the FACCR 2 CFR part 200 has been referenced, however in determining compliance auditors need to refer the applicable agency codification of 2 CFR Part 200. Auditors should review this** [**link**](Agency%20Adoption%20of%20the%20UG%20and%20Example%20Citations.pdf) **for a full discussion of agency adoption of the UG and how to cite non-compliance exceptions. Auditors will need to start with the agency codification of the UG when citing exceptions.**

### OMB Compliance Requirements

**Important Note:** For a cost to be allowable, it must (1) be for a purpose the specific award permits and (2) fall within [2 CFR 200 subpart E](2CFR200_Subpart%20E.pdf) Cost Principles. These two criteria are roughly analogous to classifying a cost by both program/function and object. That is, the grant award generally prescribes the allowable program/function while 2 CFR 200 subpart E prescribes allowable object cost categories and restrictions that may apply to certain object codes of expenditures.

For example, could a government use an imaginary Homeland Security grant to pay OP&F pension costs for its police force? To determine this, the client (and we) would look to the grant agreement to see if police activities (security of persons and property function cost classification) met the program objectives. Then, the auditor would look to Subpart E (provisions for selected items of cost [§ 200.420-200.476](2CFR200.420_thru_200.476.pdf)) to determine if pension costs (an object cost classification) are permissible. (200.431(g) states they are allowable, with certain provisions, so we would need to determine if the auditee met the provisions.) Both the client and we should look at 2 CFR 200 subpart E even if the grant agreement includes a budget by object code approved by the grantor agency. Also, keep in mind that granting agencies have codified 2 CFR 200 and some agencies have been granted exceptions to provisions within 2 CFR 200.

*(Source: AOS CFAE)*

The specific requirements for activities allowed or unallowed are unique to each Federal program and are found in the laws, regulations, and the provisions of the Federal award contracts or grant agreements pertaining to the program. For programs listed in this Supplement, the specific requirements of the governing statutes and regulations are included in Part 4, “Agency Program Requirements” or Part 5, “Clusters of Programs,” as applicable. This type of compliance requirement specifies the activities that can or cannot be funded under a specific program.

**Source of Governing Requirements**

The requirements for activities allowed or unallowed are contained in program legislation, Federal awarding agency regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Agency Codification Adjustments/Exceptions:**

* HHS, DOL, HUD, DOT, and EPA have not made any adjustments or exceptions that directly impact references within this compliance requirement.

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

Funds made available for administrative costs must be used to screen and certify applicants for program benefits, issue benefits to eligible households, conduct fraud investigations and prosecutions, provide fair hearings to households for which benefits have been denied or terminated, conduct nutrition education activities, prepare financial and special reports, operate automated data processing (ADP) systems, monitor subrecipients (where applicable), and otherwise administer the program. Portions of the award made available for specific purposes, such as ADP systems development or Employment and Training (E&T) activities, must be used for such purposes (7 CFR Part 277).

SNAP-Ed funds must be used for the administrative costs of planning, implementing, operating, and evaluating a SNAP-Ed program in accordance with the state’s approved SNAP-Ed Plan. However, the state agency is prohibited from obligating additional federal funds for SNAP-Ed activities (7 CFR section 272.2(d)(2)).

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**ODJFS Program Specific Requirements**

**RMS**

The following transmittal letters communicate the most recent changes to the OAC rules concerning the web-based RMS system:

* [OAC 5101:9-7-23](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter07/5101-9-7-23.stm) Child Support Random Moment Sample (RMS) Time Study – See code section for tracked changes
* [OAC 5101:9-7-20](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter07/5101-9-7-20.stm) Income Maintenance, Workforce, Social Services, and Child Welfare Random Moment Sample (RMS) Time Studies – See code section for tracked changes

See also BCFTA Web WebRMS reports at:

* <http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/TOOLS/RMS/RMSTADocument.pdf>
* Desk Guide at <http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/TOOLS/RMS/RMSDeskGuide.pdf> .
* RMS user manual is available here <https://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/2018-Updates/RMS-Manual-Final-10302020.stm>

The RMS observations are time studies, which are designed to measure county staff activity regarding income maintenance and social services programs. Both the Income Maintenance RMS (IMRMS) and the Social Services RMS (SSRMS) are completed on a quarterly basis by all positions performing directly related program functions, with the exception of positions performing administrative support or supervisory functions unless the person actually provides direct services. The RMS system selects the staff sample for completing the RMS from FTE reporting done in CFIS.

Data collected from these time studies are used to calculate the percentage of time spent on the program. The percentages are used by the County agency system to allocate expenditures reported on the ODJFS 02827 financial statements.

County expenditures primarily consist of administrative expenses, most of which are captured through the RMS process discussed above; however, there may be non-RMS related expenditures as noted above performing administrative support or supervisory functions only, such as the JFS Director, human resource employees, etc. These are the administrative staff whose expenses belong in the shared cost pool. If it can be determined that a supervisor only supervises staff in one program- type cost pool, that supervisor’s expenses are included in the program-type cost pool and allocated along with their staff’s expenses by the RMS statistics for that particular program type.

RMS based funding has a one month lag time. For example, RMS reporting for September, October and November drives the quarterly funding for October, November and December.

**RMS sample sizes required per OAC:**

**IMRMS/SSRMS/CWRMS:** [OAC 5101:9-7-20](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter07/5101-9-7-20.stm)(G) – effective 12/1/2019

**CSRMS:** [OAC 5101:9-7-23](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter07/5101-9-7-23.stm)(G) – effective 12/1/2019

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| RMS Type | Agency Size | # of Observations |
| Income Maintenance (IMRMS) | Ten County Agencies with the Largest IM Cost Pool Expenditures | Minimum of 2,300 |
| Income Maintenance (IMRMS) | All Other County Agencies | Minimum of 354 |
| Social Services (SSRMS), Child Welfare (CWRMS), Juvenile Ct, WF | 1-10 Participating Positions | Minimum of 33 per worker |
| Social Services (SSRMS), Child Welfare (CWRMS), Juvenile Ct, WF | 11-74 Participating Positions | Minimum of 354 |
| Social Services (SSRMS), Child Welfare (CWRMS), Juvenile Ct | 75 or more Participating Positions | Minimum of 2,400 |
| Child Support (CSRMS) | 1-10 Participating positions | Minimum of 33 per worker |
| Child Support (CSRMS) | 11 or more Participating positions | Minimum of 354 |

**AOS Additional Testing Consideration**

Sections A & B are most often tested using them same sample. Additional program specific requirements / testing considerations are included in Section A that would also affect Section B.

County testing will primarily consist of the following:

* Administrative expenses
* FTE/RMS/Cost pools
* Direct expenditures

Auditors will need to test pooled costs separately (RMS) from direct charges (County ledgers).

All salaries and indirect expenses are included in cost pools. There are two levels of allocation for County JFS expenditures. Costs benefiting all programs (rent, leases, utilities, supplies, indirect employee costs for positions such as the agency director, personnel, fiscal, related compensation, etc.) are included in the Shared Costs Pool and are allocated based on the Quarterly Report of County JFS Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Positions submitted to ODJFS. Shared costs are distributed in CFIS Web based on the IM, SS, and CSEA FTE percentages.

More information regarding FTE reporting is available at <http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/TOOLS/TOOLS.stm>. FTE reporting was previously accomplished on Form 4290, which has been replaced by CFIS Web form CR 445.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Allowable costs on FTE Report associated with Employees** | | | |
| **Reported on:** | **Program:** | **County Fund Paid from:** | **RMS Cost Pool** |
| JFS 02827 | Medicaid, CHIP, Food Assistance, TANF, SSBG, CCDF | Public Assistance (PA) Fund | IMRMS / SSRMS |
| JFS 02750 | Child Support Enforcement | Child Support Administrative Fund | CSRMS |
| JFS 02820 | Foster Care & Adoption | Children Services Workers | CWRMS or SSRMS (if combined agency) |

These electronic reports are in CFIS Web.

Costs are then allocated to the program level based on the RMS studies.

Auditors will need to test both FTE reporting and RMS.

Auditors can determine population for RMS testing from a summary report for the quarter on CFIS that uploads from the RMS system. There is a data file with this information in CFIS that can be downloaded at the County JFS site.

[BCFTA Update 2016-04](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/2016-Updates/2016-04FAET_Coding.stm) should be reviewed for additional clarification of FAET Direct Costs and RMS Costs.

[BCFTA Update 2017-01](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/2016-Updates/BCFTAUpdate2017_01_PAAsforFAET100-andFAETParticipation_3_28_17.stm) addresses new PAAs for FAET 100% and FAET Participation.

*(Source: ODJFS)*

### Audit Objectives and Control Testing

[**See here for the OMB Supplement Audit Objectives and Compliance Requirements**](Activities_Allowed_or_Unallowed_Audit_Objectives.pdf)

|  |
| --- |
| **What Control Procedures Address the Compliance Requirement (reference/link to documentation or where the testing was performed):** |
| **Basis for the control** (reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors):  **Control Procedure** (description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct or detect errors):  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** (title):  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** (i.e. sampling unit):  **Here are some questions that can help in documenting the above control requirements:**  **(Note: The County/District JFS Policies should document controls for meeting compliance requirements. Auditors should review the information provided by the County/District JFS to gain an understanding of the procedures in place.)**   1. Does the County/district JFS pay expenditures to the County via a CAP? 2. How does the County ensure only applicable costs are included in the CAP? 3. What procedures does the County/district JFS have in place to ensure they are only paying for allowable activities? 4. What controls does the County/district JFS have to ensure costs are not paid through the CAP and directly to the County/Fiscal Agent? 5. What procedures does the County/district JFS have in place for only allowable costs input into CFIS? 6. What procedures does the County/district JFS have to ensure administrative employees / costs are not reported as part of RMS, unless these employees provide direct services? 7. How does the County ensure that:  * Employees are properly completing the RMS observation; * Documentation is available to support the program and activity claimed; * Observations for absent employees are properly completed; * FTE allocations for the shared cost pool are correct; * Employees are assigned to the correct cost pool; and * Employees are completing the correct RMS observation.  1. Interview the RMS Coordinator. Document RMS coordinator name and date of interview. Document any weaknesses noted. Interview could include questions such as the following:    1. Are you familiar with the RMS procedures summarized in the [RMS User Manual](https://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/2018-Updates/RMS-Manual-Final-10302020.stm)?    2. What is your role in the RMS process?    3. What do you do if you receive an RMS observation for an employee who no longer works in your office?    4. How do you ensure the observation is filled out correctly?    5. Have you received any special training or instructions on RMS procedures within the past 12 months?    6. How do you complete the RMS control sample? What is the purpose of the control sample? 2. Interview case workers who participate in RMS. Document employee name and date of interview. Interview could include questions such as the following:    * 1. Are you familiar with the RMS procedures summarized in the [RMS User Manual](https://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/2018-Updates/RMS-Manual-Final-10302020.stm)?      2. What do you do when you receive an observation?         1. Complete immediately         2. Hold until appropriate time         3. Complete at my convenience         4. Other (explain)      3. What items need to be completed for the observation?         1. What program you are working with         2. Activity code         3. Case number (or unique identifier)         4. Comment section completed |

### Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance

|  |
| --- |
| **Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance (Substantive Tests)**  **(Reference / link to documentation where testing was performed testing):** |
| **Consider the results of the testing of internal control in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.**  **ODJFS Steps** |
| 1. Identify the types of activities which are either specifically allowed or prohibited by the laws, regulations, and the provisions of the contract or grant agreements pertaining to the program.  2. When allowability is determined based upon summary level data, perform procedures to verify that:  a. Activities were allowable.  b. Individual transactions were properly classified and accumulated into the activity total.  3. When allowability is determined based upon individual transactions, select a sample of transactions and perform procedures to verify that the transaction was for an allowable activity.  4. The auditor should be alert for large transfers of funds from program accounts which may have been used to fund unallowable activities.  **Additional ODJFS Steps**  5. If the client has made subawards under the program, select a representative number of awards and determine whether they were only approved for activities as identified in step 1 above. See also Section M.  6. Obtain management’s explanation for any significant questionable expenditures/subawards. Analyze responses and obtain any additional documentation considered necessary.  7. In conjunction with Allowable Costs/Cost Principles in Section B, determine if the disbursements met [2 CFR 200, subpart E](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200?toc=1) requirements.  Other Attributes:   * Charges were properly coded. * Voucher was properly computed. * Invoice amount agrees to voucher amount * Invoice date precedes voucher date. * If a reimbursement, reimbursement was not claimed greater than 21 months following the payment of the expenditure. (This would only be for reimbursement of placement administration as placement maintenance is not reimbursed for ProtectOhio counties.) * Payments can be made on behalf of eligible and non-eligible children, allowable activities and non-allowable activities per federal terms and conditions.   **CAP (see also CAP testing in Section B)**   1. Summarize monthly payments to the County and review CAP for accuracy of payment. Ensure that payments made were for the current or prior period and they were within the current biennium. 2. Review CAP for reasonableness of County/district JFS expenditures.   **FTE Reporting- the roster is uploaded through the WebRMS system (See** [**OAC 5101:9-7-23**](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter07/5101-9-7-23.stm) **&** [**5101:9-7-20**](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter07/5101-9-7-20.stm) **for additional information.)**   1. Determine if the number of FTE by program area category is consistent with the payroll in the previous quarter. 2. Select employees and determine if they are reported in the correct program area category based on documentation. (i.e. job duties, job description, personnel file, employee interview, etc.)   **RMS**   1. Determine RMS cost pools that require testing (i.e. Income Maintenance, Social Services, Child Support, Child Welfare). 2. Scan all 4 quarterly RMS Tabulation Reports to identify any indications of misuse or manipulation of RMS codes (could help determine which quarter to test in step 3):    1. High instances of un-funded codes    2. Large variances (over 20%) in RMS coding between quarters    3. Distribution of RMS codes between programs 3. The information that was previously included in the County RMS Sample Reference list (the list was a recap from ODJFS of the RMS observations information input into the system by the County/district JFS) is available in the WebRMS system.    * Determine if the required number of observations were performed 4. Obtain RMS observations for each cost pool being tested (i.e. Income Maintenance, Social Services, Child Support, Child Welfare)   Select a representative sample of observations, test for the following attributes and note any exceptions.   * + 1. Observation includes a case number or other identifier     2. Observation includes the activity, where applicable     3. Determine if documentation exists to substantiate the claimed program and/or activity on the RMS sample observation     4. Employee must respond to the observation within 48 business hours.     5. The RMS Coordinator reviewed and approved all observation moment responses within 72 hours.     6. If the observation had been flagged as part of the quality assurance control group, determine the supervisor/supervisor designee validated the response within the same forty-eight-hour response period that is available to the employee.   Also, determine if it was approved by the supervisor/supervisor designee, and that the response was accepted by the RMS coordinator.     7. No unauthorized or vacant positions were included in the RMS sample     8. Obtain payroll listing with job titles and compare to RMS observations completed        1. Review job duties from observation and / or interview with employee        2. Match job activities from RMS with job descriptions in personnel file     9. If employee is an administrative or supervisory, determine whether they are appropriately completing the RMS observations        1. Administrative support employees can participate in RMS if they provide direct services 50% of the time        2. Supervisory employees can participate in RMS if they provide direct services over 50% of the time   **Reminder:** Auditors should not put confidential information in the current working papers and should follow established procedures for protection of confidential information |

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| **Audit Implications (adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies / material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments)** |
| 1. **Results of Test of Controls: (including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies and management letter items)** 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive Test) including Sample Size:** 4. **Results of Compliance (Substantive Tests) Tests:** 5. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

## B. ALLOWABLE COSTS/COST PRINCIPLES

**Federal awarding agencies adopted/implemented the Uniform Guidance in 2 CFR part 200. The OMB guidance is directed to Federal agencies and, by itself, does not establish regulatory requirements binding on non-federal entities. Throughout the FACCR 2 CFR part 200 has been referenced, however in determining compliance auditors need to refer the applicable agency codification of 2 CFR Part 200. Auditors should review this** [**link**](Agency%20Adoption%20of%20the%20UG%20and%20Example%20Citations.pdf) **for a full discussion of agency adoption of the UG and how to cite non-compliance exceptions. Auditors will need to start with the agency codification of the UG when citing exceptions.**

### Applicability of Cost Principles

**Important Note:** For a cost to be allowable, it must (1) be for a purpose the specific award permits and (2) fall within 2 CFR 200 subpart E Cost Principles. These two criteria are roughly analogous to classifying a cost by both program/function and object. That is, the grant award generally prescribes the allowable program/function while 2 CFR 200 subpart E prescribes allowable object cost categories and restrictions that may apply to certain object codes of expenditures.

For example, could a government use an imaginary Homeland Security grant to pay OP&F pension costs for its police force? To determine this, the client (and we) would look to the grant agreement to see if police activities (security of persons and property function cost classification) met the program objectives. Then, the auditor would look to Subpart E (provisions for selected items of cost §200.420-200.475) to determine if pension costs (an object cost classification) are permissible. (200.431(g) states they are allowable, with certain provisions, so we would need to determine if the auditee met the provisions.) Both the client and we should look at 2 CFR 200 subpart E even if the grant agreement includes a budget by object code approved by the grantor agency. Also keep in mind that granting agencies have codified 2 CFR 200 and some agencies have been granted exceptions to provisions within 2 CFR 200.

*(Source: AOS CFAE)*

The cost principles in [2 CFR part 200, subpart E](2CFR200_Subpart%20E.PDF) (Cost Principles), prescribe the cost accounting requirements associated with the administration of Federal awards by:

1. States, local governments and Indian tribes
2. Institutions of higher education (IHEs)
3. Nonprofit organizations

As provided in [2 CFR section 200.101](2CFR200.101.pdf), the cost principles requirements apply to all Federal awards with the exception of grant agreements and cooperative agreements providing food commodities; agreements for loans, loan guarantees, interest subsidies, insurance; and programs listed in [2 CFR section 200.101(e)](2CFR200.101(e).pdf) (see [Appendix I](2CFR200_APPENDIX_I.pdf) of this Supplement). Federal awards administered by publicly owned hospitals and other providers of medical care are exempt from 2 CFR part 200, subpart E, but are subject to the requirements [45 CFR part 75, Appendix IX](45CFR75_Appendix_IX.pdf), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) implementation of 2 CFR part 200. The cost principles applicable to a non-Federal entity apply to all Federal awards received by the entity, regardless of whether the awards are received directly from the Federal awarding agency or indirectly through a pass-through entity. For this purpose, Federal awards include cost-reimbursement contacts under the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). The cost principles do not apply to Federal awards under which a non-Federal entity is not required to account to the Federal awarding agency or pass-through entity for actual costs incurred.

**Source of Governing Requirements**

The requirements for allowable costs/cost principles are contained in [2 CFR part 200, subpart E](2CFR200_Subpart%20E.PDF), program legislation, Federal awarding agency regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award.

The requirements for the development and submission of indirect (facilities and administration (F&A)) cost rate proposals and cost allocation plans (CAPs) are contained in [2 CFR part 200, Appendices III-VII](2CFR200_Appendix_III_thru_VII.pdf) as follows:

* Appendix III to Part 200—Indirect (F&A) Const Identification and Assignment and Rate Determination for Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)
* Appendix IV to Part 200—Indirect (F&A) Costs Identification and Assignment, and Rate Determination for Nonprofit Organizations
* Appendix V to Part 200—State/Local Government-Wide Central Service Cost Allocation Plans
* Appendix VI to Part 200—Public Assistance Cost Allocation Plans
* Appendix VII to Part 200—States and Local Government and Indian Tribe Indirect Cost Proposals

Except for the requirements identified below under “Basic Guidelines,” which are applicable to all types of non-Federal entities, this compliance requirement is divided into sections based on the type of non-Federal entity. The differences that exist are necessary because of the nature of the non-Federal entity organizational structures, programs administered, and breadth of services offered by some non-Federal entities and not others.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Agency Codification Adjustments/Exceptions:**

* HHS, USDA, and DOL have made additions and edits to subpart E. The most recent compilation of agency additions and exceptions is provided on the CFO website here <https://www.cfo.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Agency-Exceptions.pdf>. However, this list is only updated through 12/2014. AOS evaluated agency exceptions through August 2019. For further evaluation of exceptions, AOS auditors only will need to reference our internal AOS evaluation process [at the following link](https://ohauditor.sharepoint.com/sites/Intranet/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?FolderCTID=0x0120002FFBFB1F4A3C3F47AE37C7A44E1C1EDE&id=%2Fsites%2FIntranet%2FShared%20Documents%2FAudit%5FResources%2FFederal%2FOther%20Federal%20Resources&viewid=68cb3ab2%2D567e%2D456a%2D975c%2Da88f3e9c3727).

**Basic Guidelines**

Except where otherwise authorized by statute, cost must meet the following general criteria in order to be allowable under Federal awards;

1. Be necessary and reasonable for the performance of the Federal award and be allocable thereto under the principles in [2 CFR part 200, subpart E](2CFR200_subpart%20E.PDF).

2. Conform to any limitations or exclusions set forth in 2 CFR part 200, subpart E or in the Federal award as to types or amount of cost items.

3. Be consistent with policies and procedures that apply uniformly to both federally financed and other activities of the non-Federal entity.

4. Be accorded consistent treatment. A cost may not be assigned to a Federal award as a direct cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose in like circumstances has been allocated to the Federal award as an indirect cost.

5. Be determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP), except, for State and local governments and Indian tribes only, as otherwise provided for in 2 CFR part 200.

6. Not be included as a cost or used to meet cost-sharing or matching requirements of any other federally financed program in either the current or a prior period.

7. Be adequately documented.

**Selected Items of Cost**

*Note that the 2 CFR was revised on August 12, 2020 and the revisions are effective November 13, 2020. Auditors are reminded to check the proper and applicable versions of 2 CFR 200 depending on the occurrence date of the transactions reviewed. The August revisions are reflected in all references in this section.*

[2 CFR sections 200.420 through 200.476](2CFR200.420_thru_200.476.pdf) provide the principles to be applied in establishing the allowability of certain items of cost, in addition to the basic considerations identified above. These principles apply whether or not a particular item of cost is treated as a direct cost or indirect (F&A) cost. Failure to mention a particular item of cost is not intended to imply that it is either allowable or unallowable; rather, determination of allowability in each case should be based on the treatment provided for similar or related items of cost and the principles described in [2 CFR sections 200.402 through 200.411](2CFR200.402_thru_411.pdf).

[List of Selected Items of Cost Contained in 2 CFR Part 200](Selected_Items_of_Cost_Part_3_ComplianceSupplement.pdf)

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

There are no Program Specific requirements for this compliance requirement.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

**Written Procedure Requirements:**

[2 CFR 200.302](2CFR200.302.pdf)(b)(7) requires written procedures for determining the allowability of costs in accordance with Subpart E-Cost Principles of this part and the terms and conditions of the Federal award.

[2 CFR 200.430](2CFR200.430.pdf) states that costs of compensation are allowable to the extent that they satisfy the specific requirements of this part, and that the total compensation for individual employees: (1) Is reasonable for the services rendered and conforms to the established written policy of the non-Federal entity consistently applied to both Federal and non-Federal activities; (2) Follows an appointment made in accordance with a non-Federal entity's laws and/or rules or written policies and meets the requirements of Federal statute, where applicable; and (3) Is determined and supported as provided in paragraph (i) of this section, Standards for Documentation of Personnel Expenses, when applicable.

[2 CFR 200.431](2CFR200.431.pdf) requires established written leave policies if the entity intends to pay fringe benefits.

[2 CFR 200.464](2CFR200.464.pdf)(a)(2) requires reimbursement of relocation costs to employees be in accordance with an established written policy must be consistently followed by the employer.

[2 CFR 200.475](2CFR200.475.pdf) requires reimbursement and/or charges to be consistent with those normally allowed in like circumstances in the non-Federal entity's non-federally-funded activities and in accordance with non-Federal entity's written travel reimbursement policies.

*(Source: CFAE/eCFR)*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**ODJFS Program Specific Requirements**

**Sections A & B are most often test together using the same sample. See also Section A.**

The most significant administrative costs of the County JFS is compensation. Costs of compensation must be allocated by means of full-time equivalents (FTEs) and the RMS system, as set forth in the state cost allocation plan. The costs of providers should normally be charged directly to the benefiting program. Provider costs, including provider administrative costs, should not be charged to a cost pool as this would likely cause costs to be charged to non-benefiting programs, contrary to the federal cost allocation principles ([2 CFR 200, subpart E](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200?toc=1)). Costs which are readily assignable as direct costs should be charged in that manner and not charged to a cost pool, unless required by the statewide cost allocation plan. Costs, whether charged directly or indirectly, should be charged only to benefiting federal programs. Subrecipients may not be paid any amounts in excess of allowable costs, whether as a fee or any other increment. For example, where a contractor is providing both WIA and TANF program services (if it is assignable to each program), each cost should be allocated by the contractor to the appropriate program and charged as direct program costs. On the other hand, where a contractor is providing general administrative services, such as the development of an agency-wide classification system for employees and (is not assignable to individual programs), those costs are not direct program costs. As the costs benefit all programs within the agency, they should be charged to the shared cost pool.

Counties have a cost allocation plan (CAP) for centralized services that includes County JFS Agencies. County JFS pays the County Auditor for their portion of the CAP.

Agencies place administrative expenditures in a pool; for combined agencies, it is referred to as the shared cost pool. ODJFS allocates funding from the shared cost pool through FTE statistics and divides the expenditures into program cost pools (IM, SS, CS). Random Moment Sampling (RMS) statistics are used to allocate the expenditures in each of the separate program (IM, SS, CS) cost pools.

Auditors should be alert for the following:

* Expenditures reimbursed as part of the County CAP and being paid directly (could be charged directly to the program or allocated to a cost pool). Many County CAPs include rent therefore the County JFS should not be paying for rent as a direct expense. The County JFS could be paying the County twice for the same expenditure.
* Instances where County JFS offices may show these County CAP expenditures in the CFIS system even when they did not pay them to the County (offset by a negative expenditure in order to balance to the county auditor’s records).
* Less than arm’s length transactions (see example rent issue discussed below).

County family services agencies are not authorized under Ohio law to hold title to real properly; however, joint county departments of Job and Family Services organized under ORC 329 can hold title to real property. The agencies routinely rent or lease (for federal grants management purposes, the terms are interchangeable) the facilities necessary for their operation. Rental costs are allowable costs to federal programs under [2 CFR 200.465](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-E/subject-group-ECFRed1f39f9b3d4e72/section-200.465). However, rates must be reasonable in light of such factors as:

* Rental costs of comparable property, if any;
* Market conditions in the area;
* Alternatives available; and
* The type, life expectancy, condition, and value of the property leased.

If the County JFS rents facilities from the board of county commissioners, they are subject to additional restrictions under [2 CFR 200.465](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-E/subject-group-ECFRed1f39f9b3d4e72/section-200.465). As the county family services agency and the board of county commissioners are “related parties,” a rental transaction between the two is considered a “less-than-arm’s-length” transaction. As a result, allowable rental costs are limited to the amount that would be allowed had title to the property vested in the governmental unit; i.e., depreciation, maintenance, taxes and insurance. If the lease amount is tied to a bond schedule for the repayment of the county’s indebtedness on the building in question, this amount may be more than the allowable rental costs under [2 CFR 200.465](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-E/subject-group-ECFRed1f39f9b3d4e72/section-200.465), and the excessive amount would not be an allowable cost to federal programs.

ODJFS issued [County Monitoring Advisory Bulletin 2008-001](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/TOOLS/LEASE/CountyMonitoringAdvisoryBulletin2008-001.pdf) regarding this matter.

Please note if the County capitalizes the interest, they can’t charge the JFS depreciation + interest as this would result in the County double-charging for the interest.

See also [OAC 5101:9-4-11](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter04/5101-9-4-11.stm) Rental Costs and Lease Agreements for the rule governing this requirement.

Note: ORC § 329.44 allows for JFS Districts to hold title to real property. Auditors will need to evaluate if the district is holding title to real property and will need to import testing procedures from the General boilerplate FACCR. Also keep in mind costs incurred for the acquisition of buildings and land, as “capital expenditures,” are unallowable as direct charges, except where approved in advance by the awarding agency. See 2 CFR [200.311](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-D/subject-group-ECFR8feb98c2e3e5ad2/section-200.311), [200.329](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-D/subject-group-ECFR36520e4111dce32/section-200.329), and [200.439](https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-2/subtitle-A/chapter-II/part-200/subpart-E/subject-group-ECFRed1f39f9b3d4e72/section-200.439).

[BCFTA Update 2016-04](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/2016-Updates/2016-04FAET_Coding.stm) should be reviewed for additional clarification of FAET Direct Costs and RMS Costs.

*(Source: ODJFS)*

### Indirect Cost Rate

Except for those non-Federal entities described in [2 CFR part 200, Appendix VII, paragraph D.1.b](2CFR200_Appendix_VII_Para_D(1)(b).pdf), if a non-Federal entity has never received a negotiated indirect cost rate, it may elect to charge a de minimis rate of 10 percent of modified total direct costs (MTDC). Effective on November 12, 2020, any non-federal entity can use the de minimus rate. Such a rate may be used indefinitely or until the non-Federal entity chooses to negotiate a rate, which the non-Federal entity may do at any time. If a non-Federal entity chooses to use the de minimis rate, that rate must be used consistently for all of its Federal awards. Also, as described in [2 CFR section 200.403](2CFR200.403.pdf), costs must be consistently charged as either indirect or direct, but may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. In accordance with [2 CFR section 200.400(g)](2CFR200.400(g).pdf), a non-Federal entity may not earn or keep any profit resulting from Federal financial assistance, unless explicitly authorized by the terms and conditions of the award. A non-federal entity can always choose to charge the federal award less than the negotiated rates or the de minimis rate.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

#### Audit Objectives (Deminimis Indirect Cost Rate) and Control Testing Procedures

[**See here for the OMB Supplement Audit Objectives and Compliance Requirements**](Allowable%20Costs%20audit%20objectives_deminimis%20indirect%20cost%20rate.pdf)

|  |
| --- |
| **What Control Procedures Address the Compliance Requirement (reference/link to documentation or where the testing was performed):** |
| **Basis for the control** (reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors):  **Control Procedure** (description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct or detect errors):  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** (title):  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** (i.e. sampling unit): |

#### Suggested Compliance Audit Procedures – De Minimis Indirect Cost Rate

**Note**: The following subsections identify requirements specific to each type of non-Federal entity.

|  |
| --- |
| **Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance (Substantive Tests)**  **(Reference / link to documentation where testing was performed testing):** |
| The following suggested audit procedures apply to any non-Federal entity using a de minimis indirect cost rate, whether as a recipient or a subrecipient. None of the procedures related to indirect costs in the sections organized by type of non-Federal entity apply when a de minimis rate is used.  **Consider the results of the testing of internal control in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.** |
| 1. Determine that the non-Federal entity has not previously claimed indirect costs on the basis of a negotiated rate. Auditors are required to test only for the three fiscal years immediately prior to the current audit period.  2. Test a sample of transactions for conformance with [2 CFR section 200.414(f)](2CFR200.414(f).pdf).  a Select a sample of claims for reimbursement of indirect costs and verify that the de minimis rate was used consistently, the rate was applied to the appropriate base, and the amounts claimed were the product of applying the rate to a modified total direct costs base.  b Verify that the costs included in the base are consistent with the costs that were included in the base year, i.e., verify that current year modified total direct costs do not include costs items that were treated as indirect costs in the base year.  3. For a non-Federal entity conducting a single function, which is predominately funded by Federal awards, determine whether use of the de minimis indirect cost rate resulted in the non-Federal entity double-charging or inconsistently charging costs as both direct and indirect. |

**2 CFR PART 200**

### Cost Principles for States, Local Governments and Indian Tribes

**Introduction**

[2 CFR part 200, subpart E](2CFR200_subpart%20E.PDF), and [Appendices III-VII](2CFR200_Appendix_III_thru_VII.pdf) establish principles and standards for determining allowable direct and indirect costs for Federal awards. This section is organized into the following areas of allowable costs: States and Local Government and Indian Tribe Costs (Direct and Indirect); State/Local Government Central Service Costs; and State Public Assistance Agency Costs.

In addition the 2 CFR 200 was revised on August 13, 2020. Section 200.216, Prohibition on certain telecommunication and video surveillance services or equipment, is effective on August 13, while other revisions are effective November 12, 2020. Auditors are reminded to check the proper and applicable versions of 2 CFR 200 depending on the occurrence date of the transactions reviewed.

***Cognizant Agency for Indirect Costs***

[2 CFR part 200, Appendix V, paragraph F](2CFR200_Appendix_V_Para_F.pdf), provides the guidelines to use when determining the Federal agency that will serve as the cognizant agency for indirect costs for States, local governments, and Indian tribes. References to the “cognizant agency for indirect costs” are not equivalent to the cognizant agency for audit responsibilities, which is defined in [2 CFR section 200.1\_Cognizant\_Agency](2CFR200.1_Cognizant_Agency.PDF).

For indirect cost rates and departmental indirect cost allocation plans, the cognizant agency is generally the Federal agency with the largest value of direct Federal awards (excluding pass-through awards) with a governmental unit or component, as appropriate. In general, unless different arrangements are agreed to by the concerned Federal agencies or described in 2 CFR part 200, Appendix V, paragraph F, the cognizant agency for central service cost allocation plans is the Federal agency with the largest dollar value of total Federal awards (including pass-through awards) with a governmental unit.

Once designated as the cognizant agency for indirect costs, the Federal agency remains so for a period of 5 years. In addition, 2 CFR part 200, Appendix V, paragraph F, lists the cognizant agencies for certain specific types of plans and the cognizant agencies for indirect costs for certain types of governmental entities. For example, HHS is cognizant for all public assistance and State-wide cost allocation plans for all States (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico), State and local hospitals, libraries, and health districts and the Department of the Interior (DOI) is cognizant for all Indian tribal governments, territorial governments, and State and local park and recreational districts.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

#### Audit Objectives/Compliance Requirements and Control Tests Allowable Costs –– Direct and Indirect Costs

The individual State/local government/Indian tribe departments or agencies (also known as “operating agencies”) are responsible for the performance or administration of Federal awards. In order to receive cost reimbursement under Federal awards, the department or agency usually submits claims asserting that allowable and eligible costs (direct and indirect) have been incurred in accordance with [2 CFR part 200, subpart E](2CFR200_subpart%20E.PDF).

The indirect cost rate proposal (ICRP) provides the documentation prepared by a State/local government/Indian tribe department or agency to substantiate its request for the establishment of an indirect cost rate. The indirect costs include (1) costs originating in the department or agency of the governmental unit carrying out Federal awards, and (2) for States and local governments, costs of central governmental services distributed through the State/local government-wide central service CAP that are not otherwise treated as direct costs. The ICRPs are based on the most current financial data and are used to either establish predetermined, fixed, or provisional indirect cost rates or to finalize provisional rates (for rate definitions refer to [2 CFR part 200, Appendix VII, paragraph B](2CFR200_Appendix_VII_Para_B.pdf)).

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

[**See here for the OMB Supplement Audit Objectives and Compliance Requirements**](Allowable%20Costs_DirectandIndirect_ComplianceReq_Auditobjectives.pdf)

**Additional Control Test Objectives for Written Procedures**

When documenting and identifying the key control(s) in place to address the compliance requirement, consider if the client has written procedures to document the control process.

* UG requires written policies for the requirements outlined in [2 CFR 200.302](2CFR200.302.pdf)(b)(7), [2 CFR 200.430](2CFR200.430.pdf), [2 CFR 200.431](2CFR200.431.pdf), [2 CFR 200.464](2CFR200.464.pdf)(a)(2), and [2 CFR 200.475](2CFR200.475.pdf)*.*
* Document whether the non-Federal entity established written procedures consistent with the following requirements:
  + 2 CFR 200.302(b)(7) for determining the allowability of costs in accordance with Subpart E-Cost Principles.
  + 2 CFR 200.430 for allowability of compensation costs.
  + 2 CFR 200.431 for written leave policies.
  + 2 CFR 200.464(a)(2) for reimbursement of relocation costs.
  + 2 CFR 200.475 for travel reimbursements.
* It is auditor judgment how to report instances where the entity either lacks having a written policy or their written policy is insufficient to meet the requirements of 2 CFR 200.302(b)(7), 2 CFR 200.430, 2 CFR 200.431, 2 CFR 200.464(a)(2), and 2 CFR 200.475.
  + While auditors would normally use a written policy as the basis for the compliance control, there could be other key controls in place to ensure program compliance.
  + The lack of a policy would be noncompliance, which could rise to the level of material noncompliance and even a control deficiency (SD / MW) if there were underlying internal control deficiencies.
    - If there are key controls in place operating effectively, AOS auditors would report the lack of the required UG policy as a management letter citation. However, in subsequent audits, evaluate if the noncompliance should be elevated if not adopted. Written policies aid in consistency and adherence to requirements strengthening internal control processes.

|  |
| --- |
| **What Control Procedures Address the Compliance Requirement (reference/link to documentation or where the testing was performed):** |
| **Basis for the control** (reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors):  **Control Procedure** (description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct or detect errors):  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** (title):  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** (i.e. sampling unit): |

#### Suggested Compliance Audit Procedures – Direct and Indirect Costs

|  |
| --- |
| **Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance (Substantive Tests)**  **(Reference / link to documentation where testing was performed testing):** |
| **Consider the results of the testing of internal control in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.** |
| ***Direct Costs***  Test a sample of transactions for conformance with the following criteria contained in 2 CFR part 200, as applicable:   1. If the auditor identifies unallowable direct costs, the auditor should be aware that “directly associated costs” might have been charged. Directly associated costs are costs incurred solely as a result of incurring another cost, and would not have been incurred if the other cost had not been incurred. For example, fringe benefits are “directly associated” with payroll costs. When an unallowable cost is incurred, directly associated costs are also unallowable. 2. Costs were approved by the Federal awarding agency, if required (see the above table (Selected Items of Cost, Exhibit 1) or [2 CFR section 200.407](2CFR200.407.pdf) for selected items of cost that require prior written approval). 3. Costs did not consist of improper payments, including (1) payments that should not have been made or that were made in incorrect amounts (including overpayments and underpayments) under statutory, contractual, administrative, or other legally applicable requirements; (2) payments that do not account for credit for applicable discounts; (3) duplicate payments; (4) payments that were made to an ineligible party or for an ineligible good or service; and (5) payments for goods or services not received (except for such payments where authorized by law).   d. Costs were necessary and reasonable for the performance of the Federal award and allocable under the principles of [2 CFR part 200, subpart E](2CFR200_subpart%20E.PDF).  e. Costs conformed to any limitations or exclusions set forth in 2 CFR part 200, subpart E, or in the Federal award as to types or amount of cost items.  f. Costs were consistent with policies and procedures that apply uniformly to both federally financed and other activities of the State/local government/Indian tribe department or agency.  g. Costs were accorded consistent treatment. Costs were not assigned to a Federal award as a direct cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose in like circumstances was allocated to the Federal award as an indirect cost.  h. Costs were not included as a cost of any other federally financed program in either the current or a prior period.  i. Costs were not used to meet the cost-sharing or matching requirements of another Federal program, except where authorized by Federal statute.  j. Costs were adequately documented.  ***Indirect Costs***  a. If the State/local department or agency is not required to submit an ICRP and related supporting documentation, the auditor should consider the risk of the reduced level of oversight in designing the nature, timing, and extent of compliance testing.  b. *General Audit Procedures* – The following procedures apply to charges to cost pools that are allocated wholly or partially to Federal awards or used in formulating indirect cost rates used for recovering indirect costs under Federal awards.  (1) Test a sample of transactions for conformance with:  (a) The criteria contained in the “Basic Considerations” section of [2 CFR sections 200.402 through 200.411](2CFR200.402_thru_411.pdf).  (b) The principles to establish allowability or unallowability of certain items of cost ([2 CFR sections 200.420 through 200.476](2CFR200.420_thru_200.476.pdf)).  Note: While several selected items of cost are included in Exhibit 1 , one item to note is *Compensation - Personnel Services*, (formally referred to as Time and Effort/Semi Annual Certification). See [2 CFR 200.430](2CFR200.430.pdf).  (2) If the auditor identifies unallowable costs, the auditor should be aware that directly associated costs might have been charged. Directly associated costs are costs incurred solely as a result of incurring another cost, and would have not been incurred if the other cost had not been incurred. When an unallowable cost is incurred, directly associated costs are also unallowable. For example, occupancy costs related to unallowable general costs of government are also unallowable.  c. *Special Audit Procedures for State, Local Government, and Indian Tribe ICRPs (see also the AOS discussion on* [*testing the ICRP*](Testing%20the%20ICRP%20discussion.pdf)*)*  (1) Verify that the ICRP includes the required documentation in accordance with [2 CFR part 200, Appendix VII, paragraph D](2CFR200_Appendix_VII_Para_D.pdf).  (2) *Testing of the ICRP* – There may be a timing consideration when the audit is completed before the ICRP is completed. In this instance, the auditor should consider performing interim testing of the costs charged to the cost pools and the allocation bases (e.g., determine from management the cost pools that management expects to include in the ICRP and test the costs for compliance with 2 CFR part 200). Should there be audit exceptions, corrective action may be taken earlier to minimize questioned costs. In the next year’s audit, the auditor should complete testing and verify management’s representations against the completed ICRP.  The following procedures are some acceptable options the auditor may use to obtain assurance that the costs collected in the cost pools and the allocation methods used are in compliance with [2 CFR part 200, subpart E](2CFR200_subpart%20E.PDF):  (a) *Indirect Cost Pool* – Test the indirect cost pool to ascertain if it includes only allowable costs in accordance with 2 CFR part 200.  (i) Test to ensure that unallowable costs are identified and eliminated from the indirect cost pool (e.g., capital expenditures, general costs of government).  (ii) Identify significant changes in expense categories between the prior ICRP and the current ICRP. Test a sample of transactions to verify the allowability of the costs.  (iii) Trace the central service costs that are included in the indirect cost pool to the approved State/local government or central service CAP or to plans on file when submission is not required.  (b) *Direct Cost Base* – Test the methods of allocating the costs to ascertain if they are in accordance with the applicable provisions of 2 CFR part 200 and produce an equitable distribution of costs.  (i) Determine that the proposed base(s) includes all activities that benefit from the indirect costs being allocated.  (ii) If the direct cost base is not limited to direct salaries and wages, determine that distorting items are excluded from the base. Examples of distorting items include capital expenditures, flow-through funds (such as benefit payments), and subaward costs in excess of $25,000 per subaward.  (iii) Determine the appropriateness of the allocation base (e.g., salaries and wages, modified total direct costs).  (c) *Other Procedures*  (i) Examine the records for employee compensation to ascertain if they are accurate, and the costs are allowable and properly allocated to the various functional and programmatic activities to which salary and wage costs are charged. (Refer to [2 CFR section 200.430](2CFR200.430.pdf) for additional information on support of salaries and wages.)  (ii) For an ICRP using the multiple allocation base method, test statistical data (e.g., square footage, audit hours, salaries and wages) to ascertain if the proposed allocation or rate bases are reasonable, updated as necessary, and do not contain any material omissions.  (3) *Testing of Charges Based Upon the ICRA* – Perform the following procedures to test the application of charges to Federal awards based upon an ICRA:  (a) Obtain and read the current ICRA and determine the terms in effect.  (b) Select a sample of claims for reimbursement and verify that the rates used are in accordance with the rate agreement, that rates were applied to the appropriate bases, and that the amounts claimed were the product of applying the rate to the applicable base. Verify that the costs included in the base(s) are consistent with the costs that were included in the base year (e.g., if the allocation base is total direct costs, verify that current-year direct costs do not include costs items that were treated as indirect costs in the base year).  (4) *Other Procedures* – No Negotiated ICRA  (a) If an indirect cost rate has not been negotiated by a cognizant agency for indirect costs, the auditor should determine whether documentation exists to support the costs. Where the auditee has documentation, the suggested general audit procedures under paragraph 3.b above should be performed to determine the appropriateness of the indirect cost charges to awards.  (b) If an indirect cost rate has not been negotiated by a cognizant agency for indirect costs, and documentation to support the indirect costs does not exist, the auditor should question the costs based on a lack of supporting documentation. |

### Allowable Costs – State/Local Government-wide Central Service Costs

Most governmental entities provide services, such as accounting, purchasing, computer services, and fringe benefits, to operating agencies on a centralized basis. Since the Federal awards are performed within the individual operating agencies, there must be a process whereby these central service costs are identified and assigned to benefiting operating agency activities on a reasonable and consistent basis. The State/local government-wide central service cost allocation plan (CAP) provides that process. ([Refer to 2 CFR part 200, Appendix V](2CFR200_Appendix_V.pdf), for additional information and specific requirements.)

The allowable costs of central services that a governmental unit provides to its agencies may be allocated or billed to the user agencies. The State/local government-wide central service CAP is the required documentation of the methods used by the governmental unit to identify and accumulate these costs, and to allocate them or develop billing rates based on them.

Allocated central service costs (referred to as Section I costs) are allocated to benefiting operating agencies on some reasonable basis. These costs are usually negotiated and approved for a future year on a “fixed-with-carry-forward” basis. Examples of such services might include general accounting, personnel administration, and purchasing. Section I costs assigned to an operating agency through the State/local government-wide central service CAP are typically included in the agency’s indirect cost pool.

Billed central service costs (referred to as Section II costs) are billed to benefiting agencies and/or programs on an individual fee-for-service or similar basis. The billed rates are usually based on the estimated costs for providing the services. An adjustment will be made at least annually for the difference between the revenue generated by each billed service and the actual allowable costs. Examples of such billed services include computer services, transportation services, self- insurance, and fringe benefits. Section II costs billed to an operating agency may be charged as direct costs to the agency’s Federal awards or included in its indirect cost pool.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

#### Audit Objectives/Compliance Requirements and Control Tests Allowable Costs - State/Local Government-wide Central Service Costs

[**See here for the OMB Compliance Supplement Audit Objectives and Compliance Requirements**](Allowable%20Costs_StateLocal_Govtwide_Centralservicecosts_ComplianceReq_Auditobjectives.pdf)

|  |
| --- |
| **What Control Procedures Address the Compliance Requirement (reference/link to documentation or where the testing was performed):** |
| **Basis for the control** (reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors):  **Control Procedure** (description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct or detect errors):  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** (title):  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** (i.e. sampling unit): |

#### Suggested Compliance Audit Procedures – State/Local Government-Wide Central Service Costs

|  |
| --- |
| **Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance (Substantive Tests)**  **(Reference / link to documentation where testing was performed testing):** |
| **Consider the results of the testing of internal control in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.** |
| a. For local governments that are not required to submit the central service CAP and related supporting documentation, the auditor should consider the risk of the reduced level of oversight in designing the nature, timing and extent of compliance testing.  b. *General Audit Procedures for State/Local Government-Wide Central Service CAPs* – The following procedures apply to charges to cost pools that are allocated wholly or partially to Federal awards or used in formulating indirect cost rates used for recovering indirect costs under Federal awards.  (1) Test a sample of transactions for conformance with:  (a) The criteria contained in the “Basic Considerations” section of [2 CFR part 200, subpart E](2CFR200_subpart%20E.PDF) (sections [200.402 through 200.411](2CFR200.402_thru_411.pdf)).  (b) The principles to establish allowability or unallowability of certain items of cost [(2 CFR sections 200.420 through 476](2CFR200.420_thru_200.476.pdf)).  (2) If the auditor identifies unallowable costs, the auditor should be aware that directly associated costs might have been charged. Directly associated costs are costs incurred solely as a result of incurring another cost, and would have not been incurred if the other cost had not been incurred. When an unallowable cost is incurred, directly associated costs are also unallowable. For example, occupancy costs related to unallowable general costs of government are also unallowable.  c. *Special Audit Procedures for State/Local Government-Wide Central Service CAPs*  (1) Verify that the central service CAP includes the required documentation in accordance with [2 CFR part 200 Appendix V, paragraph E](2CFR200_Appendix_V_Para_E.pdf).  (2) *Testing of the State/Local Government-Wide Central Service CAPs – Allocated Section I Costs*  (a) If new allocated central service costs were added, review the justification for including the item as Section I costs to ascertain if the costs are allowable (e.g., if costs benefit Federal awards).  (b) Identify the central service costs that incurred a significant increase in actual costs from the prior year’s costs. Test a sample of transactions to verify the allowability of the costs.  (c) Ascertain if the bases used to allocate costs are appropriate, i.e., costs are allocated in accordance with relative benefits received.  (d) Ascertain if the proposed bases include all activities that benefit from the central service costs being allocated, including all users that receive the services. For example, the State-wide central service CAP should allocate costs to all benefiting State departments and agencies, and, where appropriate, non-State organizations, such as local government agencies.  (e) Perform an analysis of the allocation bases by selecting agencies with significant Federal awards to determine if the percentage of costs allocated to these agencies has increased from the prior year. For those selected agencies with significant allocation percentage increases, ascertain if the data included in the bases are current and accurate.  (f) Verify that carry-forward adjustments are properly computed in accordance with [2 CFR part 200, Appendix V, paragraph G.3](2CFR200_Appendix_V_Para_G(3).pdf).  (3) *Testing of the State/Local Government-Wide Central Service CAPs – Billed Section II Costs*  (a) For billed central service activities accounted for in separate funds (e.g., internal service funds), ascertain if:  (i) Retained earnings/fund balances (including reserves) are computed in accordance with the cost principles;  (ii) Working capital reserves are not excessive in amount (generally not greater than 60 calendar days for cash expenses for normal operations incurred for the period exclusive of depreciation, capital costs, and debt principal costs); and  (iii) Adjustments were made when there is a difference between the revenue generated by each billed service and the actual allowable costs.  (b) Test to ensure that all users of services are billed in a consistent manner. For example, examine selected billings to determine if all users (including users outside the governmental unit) are charged the same rate for the same service.  (c) Test that billing rates exclude unallowable costs, in accordance with the cost principles and Federal statutes.  (d) Test, where billed central service activities are funded through general revenue appropriations, that the billing rates (or charges) were developed based on actual costs and were adjusted to eliminate profits.  (e) For self-insurance and pension funds, ascertain if the fund contributions are appropriate for such activities as indicated in the current actuarial report.  (f) Determine if refunds were made to the Federal Government for its share of funds transferred from the self-insurance reserve to other accounts, including imputed or earned interest from the date of the transfer. |

### Allowable Costs – State Public Assistance Agency Costs

State public assistance agency costs are (1) defined as all costs allocated or incurred by the State agency except expenditures for financial assistance, medical vendor payments, and payments for services and goods provided directly to program recipients (e.g., day care services); and (2) normally charged to Federal awards by implementing the public assistance cost allocation plan (CAP). The public assistance CAP provides a narrative description of the procedures that are used in identifying, measuring, and allocating all costs (direct and indirect) to each of the programs administered or supervised by State public assistance agencies.

[2 CFR part 200, Appendix VI, paragraph A](2CFR200_Appendix_VI_Para_A.pdf), states that, since the federally financed programs administered by State public assistance agencies are funded predominantly by HHS, HHS is responsible for the requirements for the development, documentation, submission, negotiation, and approval of public assistance CAPs. These requirements are specified in [45 CFR part 95, subpart E](45CFR95%20Subpart%20E.pdf).

Major Federal programs typically administered by State public assistance agencies include: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (AL 93.558), Medicaid (AL 93.778), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (AL 10.561), Child Support Enforcement (AL 93.563), Foster Care (AL 93.658), Adoption Assistance (AL 93.659), and Social Services Block Grant (AL 93.667).

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

#### Audit Objectives/Compliance Requirements and Control Tests Allowable Costs - State Public Assistance Agency Costs

[**See here for the OMB Compliance Supplement Audit Objectives and Compliance Requirements**](Allowable%20Costs_State%20Public%20Assistance%20Agency%20Costs_OMB%20supplement.pdf)

|  |
| --- |
| **What Control Procedures Address the Compliance Requirement (reference/link to documentation or where the testing was performed):** |
| **Basis for the control** (reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors):  **Control Procedure** (description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct or detect errors):  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** (title):  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** (i.e. sampling unit): |

#### Suggested Compliance Audit Procedures – State Public Assistance Agency Costs

|  |
| --- |
| **Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance (Substantive Tests)**  **(Reference / link to documentation where testing was performed testing):** |
| **Consider the results of the testing of internal control in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.** |
| This may be applicable to public assistance programs at the local level  a. Since a significant amount of the costs in the public assistance CAP are allocated based on employee compensation reporting systems, it is suggested that the auditor consider the risk when designing the nature, timing, and extent of compliance testing.  b. *General Audit Procedures* – The following procedures apply to direct charges to Federal awards as well as charges to cost pools that are allocated wholly or partially to Federal awards.  (1) Test a sample of transactions for conformance with:  (a) The criteria contained in the “Basic Considerations” section of 2 CFR part 200 ([sections 200.402 through 200.411](2CFR200.402_thru_411.pdf)).  (b) The principles to establish allowability or unallowability of certain items of cost ([2 CFR sections 200.420 through 200.476](2CFR200.420_thru_200.476.pdf)).  (2) If the auditor identifies unallowable costs, the auditor should be aware that directly associated costs might have been charged. Directly associated costs are costs incurred solely as a result of incurring another cost, and would have not been incurred if the other cost had not been incurred. When an unallowable cost is incurred, directly associated costs are also unallowable. For example, occupancy costs related to unallowable general costs of government are also unallowable.  c. *Special Audit Procedures for Public Assistance CAPs*  (1) Verify that the State public assistance agency is complying with the submission requirements, i.e., an amendment is promptly submitted when any of the events identified in [45 CFR section 95.509](45CFR95.509.pdf) occur.  (2) Verify that public assistance CAP includes the required documentation in accordance with [45 CFR section 95.507](45CFR95.507.pdf).  (3) *Testing of the Public Assistance CAP* – Test the methods of allocating the costs to ascertain if they are in accordance with the applicable provisions of the cost principles and produce an equitable distribution of costs. Appropriate detailed tests may include:  (a) Examining the results of the employee compensation system or in addition the records for employee compensation to ascertain if they are accurate, allowable, and properly allocated to the various functional and programmatic activities to which salary and wage costs are charged.  (b) Since the most significant cost pools in terms of dollars are usually allocated based upon the distribution of income maintenance and social services workers’ efforts identified through random moment time studies, determining whether the time studies are implemented and operated in accordance with the methodologies described in the approved public assistance CAP. For example, verifying the adequacy of the controls governing the conduct and evaluation of the study, and determining that the sampled observations were properly selected and performed, the documentation of the observations was properly completed, and the results of the study were correctly accumulated and applied. Testing may include observing or interviewing staff who participate in the time studies to determine if they are correctly recording their activities.  (c) Testing statistical data (e.g., square footage, case counts, salaries and wages) to ascertain if the proposed allocation bases are reasonable, updated as necessary, and do not contain any material omissions.  (4) *Testing of Charges Based Upon the Public Assistance CAP* – If the approved public assistance CAP is determined to be in compliance with the cost principles and produces an equitable distribution of costs, verify that the methods of charging costs to Federal awards are in accordance with the approved CAP and the provisions of the approval documents issued by HHS. Detailed compliance tests may include:  (a) Verifying that the cost allocation schedules, supporting documentation and allocation data are accurate and that the costs are allocated in compliance with the approved CAP.  (b) Reconciling the allocation statistics of labor costs to employee compensation records (e.g., random moment sampling observation forms).  (c) Reconciling the allocation statistics of non-labor costs to allocation data, (e.g., square footage or case counts).  (d) Verifying direct charges to supporting documents (e.g., purchase orders).  (e) Reconciling the costs to the Federal claims. |

### Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations

If the federal program is an NPO, pull up the 2021 OMB compliance supplement [Allowable Costs/Cost Principles section](Cost%20Principles%20for%20Nonprofit%20Organizations.pdf). This section can be completed as an addendum to the FACCR, saved within in your working papers and can the cross referenced section can also be added on this page.

Cross Reference to the NPO Allowable cost principles testing: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| **Audit Implications (adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies / material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments)** |
| 1. **Results of Test of Controls: (including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies and management letter items)** 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive Test) including Sample Size:** 4. **Results of Compliance (Substantive Tests) Tests:** 5. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

## G. MATCHING, LEVEL OF EFFORT, EARMARKING

**Federal awarding agencies adopted/implemented the Uniform Guidance in 2 CFR part 200. The OMB guidance is directed to Federal agencies and, by itself, does not establish regulatory requirements binding on non-federal entities. Throughout the FACCR 2 CFR part 200 has been referenced, however in determining compliance auditors need to refer the applicable agency codification of 2 CFR Part 200. Auditors should review this** [**link**](Agency%20Adoption%20of%20the%20UG%20and%20Example%20Citations.pdf) **for a full discussion of agency adoption of the UG and how to cite non-compliance exceptions. Auditors will need to start with the agency codification of the UG when citing exceptions.**

### OMB Compliance Requirements

The specific requirements for matching, level of effort, and earmarking are unique to each Federal program and are found in the statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of awards pertaining to the program. For programs listed in this Supplement, these specific requirements are in Part 4, “Agency Program Requirements,” or Part 5, “Clusters of Programs,” as applicable.

However, for matching, [2 CFR section 200.306](2CFR200.306.pdf) provides detailed criteria for acceptable costs and contributions. The following is a list of the basic criteria for acceptable matching:

- Are verifiable from the non-Federal entity’s records;

- Are not included as contributions for any other Federal award;

- Are necessary and reasonable for accomplishment of project or program objectives;

- Are allowed under [2 CFR part 200, subpart E](2CFR200_subpart%20E.PDF) (Cost Principles);

- Are not paid by the Federal Government under another award, except where the Federal statute authorizing a program specifically provides that Federal funds made available for such program can be applied to matching or cost sharing requirements of other Federal programs;

- Are provided for in the approved budget when required by the Federal awarding agency; and

- Conform to other provisions of this part, as applicable.

“Matching,” “level of effort,” and “earmarking” are defined as follows:

1. *Matching* or cost sharing includes requirements to provide contributions (usually non-Federal) of a specified amount or percentage to match Federal awards. Matching may be in the form of allowable costs incurred or in-kind contributions (including third-party in-kind contributions).

2. *Level of effort* includes requirements for (a) a specified level of service to be provided from period to period, (b) a specified level of expenditures from non-Federal or Federal sources for specified activities to be maintained from period to period, and (c) Federal funds to supplement and not supplant non-Federal funding of services.

3. *Earmarking* includes requirements that specify the minimum and/or maximum amount or percentage of the program’s funding that must/may be used for specified activities, including funds provided to subrecipients. Earmarking may also be specified in relation to the types of participants covered.

**Source of Governing Requirements**

The requirements for matching are contained in [2 CFR section 200.306,](2CFR200.306.pdf) program legislation, Federal awarding agency regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award. The requirements for level of effort and earmarking are contained in program legislation, Federal awarding agency regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Agency Codification Adjustments/Exceptions:**

* USDA, HUD, DOT, HHS and EPA have not made any adjustments or exceptions that directly impact references within this compliance requirement.

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

**1. Matching**

There are no Program Specific requirements for this compliance requirement at the Local Level. However, in order for ODJFS to comply with the state requirements, Counties do need to follow in the next section – Additional Program Specific Information - ODJFS Compliance Requirements.

**2. Level of Effort** - Not Applicable

**3. Earmarking** - Not Applicable

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**ODJFS Compliance Requirements**

[BCFTA update 2013-13](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/20121119_BCFTA_Update_2013-13_FAET_Funding.pdf) and [BCFTA Update 2017-01](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/2016-Updates/BCFTAUpdate2017_01_PAAsforFAET100-andFAETParticipation_3_28_17.stm) outline changes to the FAET funding. Additional funding streams were added and as a result there were changes and or additions to the FAET financial coding and FAET RMS coding. The financial coding changes were effective 10-1-12 and the RMS coding changes on 12-1-12. As a result of the changes, a portion of the FAET allocations will be 100% federal and another 50% with a 50% match. The existing allocation is 100%. The FAET operating and participant allocations will be 50% federal and 50% state. Counties should exhaust the regular FAET before using the additional funding streams. Auditors should review the BCFTA update for financial and RMS codes. [BCFTA Update 2016-04](http://jfs.ohio.gov/ofs/bcfta/BB/2016-Updates/2016-04FAET_Coding.stm) should be reviewed for additional clarification of Direct Costs and RMS Costs.

For SNAP administrative expenses, the Federal Share is 50% so the County JFS would be reimbursed 50% from the Federal share and use 50% from State (IM) or use local monies for match requirements. When the County requests funding, the required match of IM funding is automatically sent with the Federal share (until the IM allocation is exhausted). This IM allocation is programmed into CFIS so auditors are not required to test the IM allocation. The amount of Federal funding is unlimited as long as the County can provide the matching funds.

Once the County uses all their IM allocation, they must use local funding for the 50% match. County JFS share of administering the program is included in the County’s mandated share amount. If the mandated share is exhausted, the County may use additional allowable local monies to meet the required share.

*(Source: ODJFS)*

### Audit Objectives and Control Testing

[**See here for the OMB Supplement Audit Objectives and Compliance Requirements**](Matching_LevelofEffort_Earmarking_Auditobjectives.pdf)

|  |
| --- |
| **What Control Procedures Address the Compliance Requirement (reference/link to documentation or where the testing was performed):** |
| **Basis for the control** (reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors):  **Control Procedure** (description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct or detect errors):  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** (title):  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** (i.e. sampling unit): |

### Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance

|  |
| --- |
| **Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance (Substantive Tests)**  **(Reference / link to documentation where testing was performed testing):** |
| **Consider the results of the testing of internal control in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and- extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.** |
| **1.** **Matching**  a. Perform tests to verify that the required matching contributions were met.  b. Ascertain the sources of matching contributions and perform tests to verify that they were from an allowable source.  c. Test records to corroborate that the values placed on in-kind contributions (including third party in-kind contributions) are in accordance with [2 CFR sections 200.306](2CFR200.306.pdf), [200.434](2CFR200.434.pdf), and [200.414](2CFR200.414.pdf), and the terms and conditions of the award.  d. Test transactions used to match for compliance with the allowable costs/cost principles requirements. This test may be performed in conjunction with the testing of the requirements related to allowable costs/cost principles.  **2. Level of Effort – Not Applicable**  **3. Earmarking – Not Applicable** |

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| **Audit Implications (adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies / material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments)** |
| 1. **Results of Test of Controls: (including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies and management letter items)** 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive Test) including Sample Size:** 4. **Results of Compliance (Substantive Tests) Tests:** 5. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

## I. PROCUREMENT AND SUSPENSION AND DEBARMENT

### OMB Compliance Requirements – Procurement

**Federal awarding agencies adopted/implemented the Uniform Guidance in 2 CFR part 200. The OMB guidance is directed to Federal agencies and, by itself, does not establish regulatory requirements binding on non-federal entities. Throughout the FACCR 2 CFR part 200 has been referenced, however in determining compliance auditors need to refer the applicable agency codification of 2 CFR Part 200. Auditors should review this** [**link**](Agency%20Adoption%20of%20the%20UG%20and%20Example%20Citations.pdf) **for a full discussion of agency adoption of the UG and how to cite non-compliance exceptions. Auditors will need to start with the agency codification of the UG when citing exceptions.**

***Procurement—Grants and Cooperative Agreements***

*Non-Federal Entities Other than States*

2020 Revision to the Uniform Guidance Procurement Rules

Note that the 2 CFR was revised on August 12, 2020 and the revisions are effective November 13, 2020. The revisions included higher thresholds for micro-purchase ($10,000) and simple acquisitions ($250,000). The August revisions are reflected in all references in this section.

Expectations for reporting findings related to the purchase threshold changes in the 2020 revision to the Uniform Guidance.

The 2020 revision to the Uniform Guidance included changes to purchase thresholds for procurement. Although the UG revisions were effective on November 12, 2020, for awards provided by agencies that had adopted the revisions as of that date, certain agencies adopted the revisions after that date or have not adopted them as of the date of this Supplement. The status of adoption by agency is provided in Part 8, Appendix 2 to this Supplement. Due to the challenge and burden for an entity of adopting increased purchase thresholds policies for awards provided by certain agencies, but not for awards provided by other agencies, auditors are not expected to develop audit findings for entities that have implemented increased the purchase thresholds for all awards after November 12, 2020.

Non-Federal entities other than States, including those operating Federal programs as subrecipients of States, must follow the procurement standards set out at [2 CFR sections 200.317 through 200.327](2CFR200.317_thru_200.327.pdf). They must use their own documented procurement procedures, which reflect applicable State and local laws and regulations, provided that the procurements conform to applicable Federal statutes and the procurement requirements identified in 2 CFR part 200. A non-Federal entity must:

1. Meet the general procurement standards in 2 CFR section 200.318, which include oversight of contractors’ performance, maintaining written standards of conduct for employees involved in contracting, awarding contracts only to responsible contractors, and maintaining records to document history of procurements.

2. Conduct all procurement transactions in a manner providing full and open competition, in accordance with 2 CFR section 200.319.

3. Use the micro-purchase and small purchase methods only for procurements that meet the applicable criteria under 2 CFR sections 200.320(a)(1) and (2). Under the micro-purchase method, the aggregate dollar amount does not exceed $10,000 ($2,000 in the case of acquisition for construction subject to the Wage Rate Requirements (Davis-Bacon Act)). Small purchase procedures are used for purchases that exceed the micro-purchase amount but do not exceed the simplified acquisition threshold ($250,000). Micro-purchases may be awarded without soliciting competitive quotations if the non-Federal entity considers the price to be reasonable (2 CFR section 200.320(a)). If small purchase procedures are used, price or rate quotations must be obtained from an adequate number of qualified sources (2 CFR section 200.320(b)).

4. For acquisitions exceeding the simplified acquisition threshold, the non-Federal entity must use one of the following procurement methods: the sealed bid method if the acquisition meets the criteria in 2 CFR section 200.320(b); the competitive proposals method under the conditions specified in 2 CFR section 200.320(b)(2); or the noncompetitive proposals method (i.e., solicit a proposal from only one source) but only when one or more of four circumstances are met, in accordance with 2 CFR section 200.320(c).

5. Perform a cost or price analysis in connection with every procurement action in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold, including contract modifications (2 CFR section 200.323(a)). The cost plus a percentage of cost and percentage of construction cost methods of contracting must not be used (2 CFR section 200.323(b)).

6. Ensure that every purchase order or other contract includes applicable provisions required by 2 CFR section 200.326. These provisions are described in Appendix II to 2 CFR part 200, “Contract Provisions for Non-Federal Entity Contracts Under Federal Awards.”

***Procurement—Cost-Reimbursement Contracts under the Federal Acquisition Regulation***

When awarding subcontracts, non-Federal entities receiving cost-reimbursement contracts under the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) must comply with the clauses at [48 CFR section 52.244-2](48CFR52.244-2.pdf) (consent to subcontract), [52.244-5](48CFR52.244-5.pdf) (competition), [52.203-13](48CFR52.203-13.pdf) (code of business ethics), [52.203-16](48CFR52.203-16.pdf) (conflicts of interest), and [52.215.12](48CFR52.215-12.pdf) (cost or pricing data); and the terms and conditions of the contract. The FAR defines “subcontracts” as a contract, i.e., a mutually binding legal relationship obligating the seller to furnish the supplies or services (including construction) and the buyer to pay for them, entered into by a subcontractor to furnish supplies or services for performance of a prime contract or a subcontract. It includes, but is not limited to, purchase orders, and changes and modifications to purchase orders.

**Source of Governing Requirements – Procurement**

The requirements that apply to procurement under grants and cooperative agreements are contained in [2 CFR sections 200.317 through 200.327](2CFR200.317_thru_200.327.pdf), program legislation, Federal awarding agency regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award. The requirements that apply to procurement under cost-reimbursement contracts under the FAR are contained in 48 CFR parts [03](48CFR_Part_3.pdf), [15](48CFR_Part_15.pdf), [44](48CFR_Part_44.pdf) and the clauses at [48 CFR section 52.244-2](48CFR52.244-2.pdf), [52.244-5](48CFR52.244-5.pdf), [52.203-13](48CFR52.203-13.pdf), [52.203-16](48CFR52.203-16.pdf), and [52.215-12](48CFR52.215-12.pdf); agency FAR Supplements; and the terms and conditions of the contract.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Agency Codification Adjustments/Exceptions:**

* USDA, HUD, and DOL have not made any adjustments or exceptions that directly impact references within this compliance requirement.

### OMB Compliance Requirements – Suspension and Debarment

**Auditors will need to review Appendix II in the link under Source of Governing requirements to determine where the agency codified 2 CFR 180. Citations of non-compliance must start with the agencies codification of 2 CFR part 180.**

Non-Federal entities are prohibited from contracting with or making subawards under covered transactions to parties that are suspended or debarred. “Covered transactions” include contracts for goods and services awarded under a non-procurement transaction (e.g., grant or cooperative agreement) that are expected to equal or exceed $25,000 or meet certain other criteria as specified in [2 CFR section 180.220](2CFR180.220.pdf). All non-procurement transactions entered into by a pass-through entity (i.e., subawards to subrecipients), irrespective of award amount, are considered covered transactions, unless they are exempt as provided in [2 CFR section 180.215](2CFR180.215.pdf).-

When a non-Federal entity enters into a covered transaction with an entity at a lower tier, the non-Federal entity must verify that the entity, as defined in [2 CFR section 180.995](2CFR180.995.pdf) and agency adopting regulations, is not suspended or debarred or otherwise excluded from participating in the transaction. This verification may be accomplished by (1) checking the System for Award Management (SAM) Exclusions maintained by the General Services Administration (GSA) and available at <https://www.sam.gov/> (click on Search Record, then click on Advanced Search-Exclusions) (**Note:** The OMB guidance at 2 CFR part 180 and agency implementing regulations still refer to the SAM Exclusions as the Excluded Parties List System (EPLS)), (2) collecting a certification from the entity, or (3) adding a clause or condition to the covered transaction with that entity ([2 CFR section 180.300](2CFR180.300.pdf)).

Non-Federal entities receiving contracts from the Federal Government are required to comply with the contract clause at [48 CFR 52.209-6](48CFR52.209-6.pdf) before entering into a subcontract that will exceed $30,000, other than a subcontract for a commercially available off-the-shelf item.

**Source of Governing Requirements – Suspension and Debarment**

The requirements for nonprocurement suspension and debarment are contained in OMB guidance in [2 CFR part 180](2CFR_Part_180.pdf), which implements Executive Orders 12549 and 12689, “Debarment and Suspension;” Federal awarding agency regulations in Title 2 of the CFR adopting/implementing the OMB guidance in 2 CFR part 180; program legislation; and the terms and conditions of the award.

Most of the Federal agencies have adopted or implemented 2 CFR part 180, generally by relocating their associated agency rules in Title 2 of the CFR. [Appendix II to the Supplement](OMB_Compliance_Supplement_APP_II.pdf) includes the current CFR citations for all agencies adoption or implementation of the nonprocurement suspension and debarment guidance.

Government-wide requirements related to suspension and debarment and doing business with suspended or debarred subcontractors under cost reimbursement contracts under the FAR are contained in [48 CFR section 9.405-2(b)](48CFR9.405-2(b).pdf) and the clause at [48 CFR section 52.209-6](48CFR52.209-6.pdf).

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

* 1. *ADP Systems Development* – For competitive acquisitions of ADP equipment and services costing $6 million or more (combined federal and state shares), the state must submit an Advanced Planning Document (APD) for the costs to be approved and allowable as charges to FNS. This threshold is for the total project cost. Contracts resulting from noncompetitive procurements of more than $1 million and contracts for EBT systems, regardless of cost, also must be provided to FNS for prior written approval (7 CFR section 277.18).
  2. For procurement activity covered by the USDA implementation of the A-102 Common Rule (see Part 3 of the Supplement for effective dates), regardless of whether the state elects to follow state or federal rules, the following requirements must be followed for procurements initiated on or after October 1, 2000:
     1. A state or local government shall not award a contract to a firm it used to orchestrate the procurement leading to that contract. Examples of services that would disqualify a firm from receiving the contract include preparing the specifications, drafting the solicitation, formulating contract terms and conditions, etc. (7 CFR section 3016.60(b)).
     2. A state or local government shall not apply in-state or local geographical preference, whether statutorily or administratively prescribed, in awarding contracts (7 CFR section 3016.60(c)).
  3. For procurements covered by the USDA adoption of 2 CFR part 200 and the regulations at 2 CFR section 416.1, the following applies:
     1. A prospective contractor that develops or drafts specifications, requirements, statements of work, invitations for bids, requests for proposals, contract term and conditions or other documents for use by a state shall be excluded from competing for such procurements. Such prospective contractors are ineligible for contract awards resulting from such procurements regardless of the procurement method used. However, prospective contractors may provide states with specification information related to a state procurement and still compete for the procurement if the state, and not the prospective contractor, develops or drafts the specifications, requirements, statements of work, invitations for bid, and/or requests for proposals used to conduct the procurement (2 CFR section 416.1(a)).
     2. Procurements by states shall be conducted in a manner that prohibits the use of statutorily or administratively imposed in-state or local geographic preferences except as provided for in 2 CFR section 200.319(b) (2 CFR section 416.1(b)).

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

**Written Procedure Requirements:**

[2 CFR 200.318](2CFR200.318.pdf)(c)(1) requires non-Federal entities maintain written standards of conduct covering conflicts of interest and governing the actions of its employees engaged in the selection, award and administration of contracts.

[2 CFR 200.318](2CFR200.318.pdf)(c)(2) requires non-Federal entities maintain written standards of conduct covering organizational conflicts of interest when the non-federal entity has a parent, affiliate, or subsidiary organization that is not a state, local government, or Indian tribe.

[2 CFR 200.320](2CFR200.320.pdf)(d)(3) requires non-federal entities to have a written method for conducting technical evaluations of the competitive proposals received and for selecting contract recipients.

[2 CFR 200.319](2CFR200.319.pdf)(c) requires that the written procedures required by 2 CFR 200.320(d)(3) ensure all solicitations incorporate a clear and accurate description of the technical requirements for the material, product, or service to be procured and identify all requirements which the offerors must fulfill and all other factors to be used in evaluating bids or proposals.

*(Source: CFAE/eCFR)*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**ODFJS Compliance Requirements**

[2 CFR 200.320](2CFR200.320.pdf) includes procurement requirements.

These methods are:

* Micro-purchases;
* Small Purchases;
* Sealed bids;
* Competitive proposals; and
* Noncompetitive proposals.

The federal regulation provides specific requirements as to the circumstances under which each procurement method may be used and as to the manner in which each procurement method is applied. All procurements with federal monies are to be made in accordance with one of the four approved procedures.

[OAC 5101:9-4-07](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter04/5101-9-4-07.stm) and [5101:9-4-07.1](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter04/5101-9-4-07-1.stm) was revised to include Uniform Guidance updates in regards to Procurement methods. Auditors should review these requirements for specific information on the procurement methods.

Auditors should review [OAC 5101:9-4-07](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter04/5101-9-4-07.stm), [5101:9-4-07.1](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter04/5101-9-4-07-1.stm) and [2 CFR 200.320](2CFR200.320.pdf) for further detail on the procurement methods above as well as other procurement requirements. The rule updates do not change the requirements or allowable methods of procurement, but have only been formatted to provide a better understanding of the competitive and noncompetitive process.

*(Source: ODJFS)*

### Audit Objectives and Control Testing

[**See here for the OMB Supplement Audit Objectives and Compliance Requirements**](Procurement_Suspension_Debarment_Auditobjectives.pdf)

**Additional Control Test Objectives for Written Procedures:**

When documenting and identifying the key control(s) in place to address the compliance requirement, consider if the client has written procedures to document the control process.

* UG requires a written policy for the requirements outlined in [2 CFR 200.318](2CFR200.318.pdf)(c)(1), [2 CFR 200.318](2CFR200.318.pdf)(c)(2), [2 CFR 200.320](2CFR200.320.pdf)(d)(3), and [2 CFR 200.319](2CFR200.319.pdf)(c)*.*
* Document whether the non-Federal entity established written procedures consistent with the following requirements:
  + 2 CFR 200.318(c)(1) for employee conflicts of interest.
  + 2 CFR 200.318(c)(2) for organizational conflicts of interest.
  + 2 CFR 200.320(d)(3) for selection and awarding of competitive contracts.
  + 2 CFR 200.319(c) for minimum evaluation criteria for bids and proposals.
* It is auditor judgment how to report instances where the entity either lacks having a written policy or their written policy is insufficient to meet the requirements of 2 CFR 200.318(c)(1), 2 CFR 200.318(c)(2), 2 CFR 200.320(d)(3), and 2 CFR 200.319(c).
  + While auditors would normally use a written policy as the basis for the compliance control, there could be other key controls in place to ensure program compliance.
  + The lack of a policy would be noncompliance, which could rise to the level of material noncompliance and even a control deficiency (SD / MW) if there were underlying internal control deficiencies.
    - If there are key controls in place operating effectively, AOS auditors would report the lack of the required UG policy as a management letter citation. However, in subsequent audits, evaluate if the noncompliance should be elevated if not adopted. Written policies aid in consistency and adherence to requirements strengthening internal control processes.

|  |
| --- |
| **What Control Procedures Address the Compliance Requirement (reference/link to documentation or where the testing was performed):** |
| **Basis for the control** (reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors):  **Control Procedure** (description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct or detect errors):  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** (title):  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** (i.e. sampling unit):  **Here are some questions that can help in documenting the above control requirements**   * Has the County/district JFS agency established written acquisition standards to ensure that all purchases of services, supplies, and equipment performed in accordance with applicable state / federal law and regulations? * Has the County/district JFS agency established procedures to ensure that any sub-grantee entity was aware of the requirements contained in paragraph (A) of the OAC rule above and given written notice contained in any contract or grant agreement that all acquisitions made by the sub-grantee entity must conform to these requirements?   **The County/District JFS Policies should document controls for meeting compliance requirements. Auditors should review the information provided by the County/District JFS to gain an understanding of the procedures in place.** |

### Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance

|  |
| --- |
| **Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance (Substantive Tests)**  **(Reference / link to documentation where testing was performed testing):** |
| **Consider the results of the testing of internal control in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.** |
| *(Procedures 2 – 5 apply to non-Federal entities other than States.)*  2. Obtain the entity’s procurement policies and verify that the policies comply with the compliance requirements highlighted above.  3. Verify that the entity has written standards of conduct that cover conflicts of interest and govern the performance of its employees engaged in the selection, award, and administration of contracts ([2 CFR section 200.318(c)](2CFR200.318(c).pdf) and [48 CFR sections 52.203-13](48CFR52.203-13.pdf) and [52.203-16](48CFR52.203-16.pdf)).  4. Ascertain if the entity has a policy to use statutorily or administratively imposed in‑State or local geographical preferences in the evaluation of bids or proposals. If yes, verify that these limitations were not applied to federally funded procurements except where applicable Federal statutes expressly mandate or encourage geographic preference ([2 CFR section 200.319(c)](2CFR200.319(c).pdf)).  5. Select a sample of procurements and perform the following procedures:  a. Examine contract files and verify that they document the history of the procurement, including the rationale for the method of procurement, selection of contract type, basis for contractor selection, and the basis for the contract price ([2 CFR section 200.318(i)](2CFR200.318(i).pdf) and [48 CFR part 44](48CFR_Part_44.pdf) and section [52.244-2](48CFR52.244-2.pdf)).  b. For grants and cooperative agreements, verify that the procurement method used was appropriate based on the dollar amount and conditions specified in [2 CFR section 200.320](2CFR200.320.pdf).Current micro-purchase and simplified acquisition thresholds can be found in the FAR (48 CFR subpart 2.1, “Definitions”)  c. Verify that procurements provide full and open competition ([2 CFR section 200.319](2CFR200.319.pdf) and [48 CFR section 52.244-5](48CFR52.244-5.pdf)).  d. Examine documentation in support of the rationale to limit competition in those cases where competition was limited and ascertain if the limitation was justified ([2 CFR sections 200.319](2CFR200.319.pdf) and [200.320(c)](2CFR200.320(c).pdf) and [48 CFR section 52.244-5](48CFR52.244-5.pdf)).  e. Ascertain if cost or price analysis was performed in connection with all procurement actions exceeding the simplified acquisition threshold, including contract modifications, and that this analysis supported the procurement action [(2 CFR section 200.324](2CFR200.324.pdf) and [48 CFR section 15.404-3](48CFR15.404-3.pdf)).  **Note**: A cost or price analysis is required for each procurement action, including each contract modification, when the total amount of the contract and related modifications is greater than the simplified acquisition threshold.)  f. Verify consent to subcontract was obtained when required by the terms and conditions of a cost reimbursement contract under the FAR ([48 CFR section 52.244-2](48CFR52.244-2.pdf)).  **Note**: If the non-Federal entity has an approved purchasing system, consent to subcontract may not be required unless specifically identified by contract terms or conditions. The auditor should verify that the approval of the purchasing system is effective for the audit period being reviewed.  *(Procedures 6 and 7 apply to all non-Federal entities)*  6. Review the non-Federal entity’s procedures for verifying that an entity with which it plans to enter into a covered transaction is not debarred, suspended, or otherwise excluded ([2 CFR sections 200.213](2CFR200.213.pdf) and [200.318(h)](2CFR200.318(h).pdf); [2 CFR section 180.300](2CFR180.300.pdf); [48 CFR section 52.209-6](48CFR52.209-6.pdf)).  7. Select a sample of procurements and subawards and test whether the non-Federal entity followed its procedures before entering into a covered transaction. |

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| **Audit Implications (adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies / material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments)** |
| 1. **Results of Test of Controls: (including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies and management letter items)** 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive Test) including Sample Size:** 4. **Results of Compliance (Substantive Tests) Tests:** 5. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

## M. SUBRECIPIENT MONITORING

**Federal awarding agencies adopted/implemented the Uniform Guidance in 2 CFR part 200. The OMB guidance is directed to Federal agencies and, by itself, does not establish regulatory requirements binding on non-federal entities. Throughout the FACCR 2 CFR part 200 has been referenced, however in determining compliance auditors need to refer the applicable agency codification of 2 CFR Part 200. Auditors should review this** [**link**](Agency%20Adoption%20of%20the%20UG%20and%20Example%20Citations.pdf) **for a full discussion of agency adoption of the UG and how to cite non-compliance exceptions. Auditors will need to start with the agency codification of the UG when citing exceptions.**

**Note:** Transfers of Federal awards to another component of the same auditee under [2 CFR part 200, subpart F](2CFR200_subpart_F.pdf), do not constitute a subrecipient or contractor relationship.

### OMB Compliance Requirements

A pass-through entity (PTE) must (see here for [2 CFR 200.332(a)](2CFR200.332(a).pdf)):

- *Identify the Award* *and Applicable Requirements* – Clearly identify to the subrecipient: (1) the award as a subaward at the time of subaward (or subsequent subaward modification) by providing the information described in 2 CFR section 200.331(a)(1); (2) all requirements imposed by the PTE on the subrecipient so that the Federal award is used in accordance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award (2 CFR section 200.331(a)(2)); and (3) any additional requirements that the PTE imposes on the subrecipient in order for the PTE to meet its own responsibility for the Federal award (e.g., financial, performance, and special reports) (2 CFR section 200.331(a)(3)).

- *Evaluate Risk* – Evaluate each subrecipient’s risk of noncompliance for purposes of determining the appropriate subrecipient monitoring related to the subaward (2 CFR section 200.331(b)). This evaluation of risk may include consideration of such factors as the following (see here for [2 CFR 200.332(b)-(f)](2CFR200.332(b)_through_(f).pdf)):

1. The subrecipient’s prior experience with the same or similar subawards;
2. The results of previous audits including whether or not the subrecipient receives single audit in accordance with 2 CFR part 200, subpart F, and the extent to which the same or similar subaward has been audited as a major program;
3. Whether the subrecipient has new personnel or new or substantially changed systems; and
4. The extent and results of Federal awarding agency monitoring (e.g., if the subrecipient also receives Federal awards directly from a Federal awarding agency).

- *Monitor* – Monitor the activities of the subrecipient as necessary to ensure that the subaward is used for authorized purposes, complies with the terms and conditions of the subaward, and achieves performance goals (2 CFR sections 200.332(d) through (f)). In addition to procedures identified as necessary based upon the evaluation of subrecipient risk or specifically required by the terms and conditions of the award, subaward monitoring must include the following:

1. Reviewing financial and programmatic (performance and special reports) required by the PTE.
2. Following-up and ensuring that the subrecipient takes timely and appropriate action on all deficiencies pertaining to the Federal award provided to the subrecipient from the PTE detected through audits, on-site reviews, and other means.
3. Issuing a management decision for audit findings pertaining to the Federal award provided to the subrecipient from the PTE as required by [2 CFR section 200.521](2CFR200.521.pdf).

* *Ensure Accountability of For-Profit Subrecipients* – Some Federal awards may be passed through to for-profit entities. For-profit subrecipients are accountable to the PTE for the use of the Federal funds provided. Because 2 CFR part 200 does not make subpart F applicable to for-profit subrecipients, the PTE is responsible for establishing requirements, as necessary, to ensure compliance by for-profit subrecipients for the subaward. The agreement with the for-profit subrecipient must describe applicable compliance requirements and the for-profit subrecipient's compliance responsibility. Methods to ensure compliance for Federal awards made to for-profit subrecipients may include pre-award audits, monitoring during the agreement, and post-award audits ([2 CFR section 200.501(h)](2CFR200.501(h).pdf)).

**Source of Governing Requirements**

The requirements for subrecipient monitoring for the subaward are contained in 31 USC 7502(f)(2) (Single Audit Act Amendments of 1996 (Pub. L. No. 104-156)), [2 CFR sections 200.331](2CFR200.331.pdf), [.332](2CFR200.332.pdf), and .[501(h)](2CFR200.501(h).pdf); Federal awarding agency regulations; and the terms and conditions of the award.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Agency Codification Adjustments/Exceptions:**

* HHS made additions and edits to part 501 (subpart F). The most recent compilation of agency additions and exceptions is provided on the CFO website here <https://www.cfo.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Agency-Exceptions.pdf>. However, this list is only updated through 12/2014. AOS evaluated agency exceptions through August 2019. For further evaluation of exceptions, AOS auditors only will need to reference our internal AOS evaluation process [at the following link](https://ohauditor.sharepoint.com/sites/Intranet/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx?FolderCTID=0x0120002FFBFB1F4A3C3F47AE37C7A44E1C1EDE&id=%2Fsites%2FIntranet%2FShared%20Documents%2FAudit%5FResources%2FFederal%2FOther%20Federal%20Resources&viewid=68cb3ab2%2D567e%2D456a%2D975c%2Da88f3e9c3727).
* USDA, HUD, DOL, DOT, and EPA have not made any adjustments or exceptions that directly impact references within this compliance requirement.

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

There are no Program Specific requirements for this compliance requirement.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**ODJFS Compliance Requirements**

Per ODJFS, the Food Assistance eligibility process cannot be contracted out to subrecipients; however, work and training services can be contracted out to subrecipients. Auditors should review contracts entered into by the County JFS for services to determine if a subrecipient relationship exists. Auditors should also look for reoccurring expenditures to determine if such a subrecipient relationship exists without entering into a formal agreement.

ODJFS has a mandated process for subrecipient monitoring in [OAC 5101:9-1-88](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter01/5101-9-1-88.stm). Subrecipient annual risk assessment review and subrecipient monitoring process. This rule was rescinded 08/10/2020 and replaced with [5101:9-4-88](https://emanuals.jfs.ohio.gov/LocalAdmin/FAPM/Chapter04/5101-9-4-88.stm).

*(Source: ODJFS)*

### Audit Objectives and Control Testing

[**See here for the OMB Supplement Audit Objectives and Compliance Requirements**](Subrecipient_Monitoring_Auditobjectives.pdf)

|  |
| --- |
| **What Control Procedures Address the Compliance Requirement (reference/link to documentation or where the testing was performed):** |
| **Basis for the control** (reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors):  **Control Procedure** (description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct or detect errors):  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** (title):  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** (i.e. sampling unit):  **Here are some questions that can help in documenting the above control requirements**  Does the County have procedures in place to perform an annual risk assessment review, considering the following:   * + Extent and frequency of the review;   + Type of subrecipient organization;   + Subrecipient’s prior experience;   + Subrecipient’s prior monitoring results;   + Complexity of the program requirements;   + Subrecipient’s organizational stability; and   + Subrecipient’s reporting history   Are there risk assessment review mechanisms to identify the following:   * + When unallowable activities or costs could be charged to a federal program and be undetected or misappropriated, or improper disposition of property acquired with federal funds;   + Changes to eligibility determination systems;   + Accuracy of underlying report source data and the validity of the reports;   + Level of management commitment and understanding of federal requirements and regulatory changes;   + Various internal changes that may affect performance such as financial problems, loss of personnel and rapid growth; and   + If required to be audited as required by 45 CFR part 75, subpart F (2 CFR part 200, subpart F), that they met that requirement.   The County/District JFS policies should document controls for meeting compliance requirements. Auditors should review the information provided by the County/District JFS to gain an understanding of the procedures in place. |

### Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance

|  |
| --- |
| **Suggested Audit Procedures – Compliance (Substantive Tests)**  **(Reference / link to documentation where testing was performed testing):** |
| **Note**: The auditor may consider coordinating the tests related to subrecipients performed as part of C., “Cash Management” (tests of cash reporting submitted by subrecipients); E., “Eligibility” (tests that subawards were made only to eligible subrecipients); I., “Procurement and Suspension and Debarment” (tests of ensuring that a subrecipient is not suspended or debarred), and L, “Reporting (tests of performance data reported to funding sources) with the testing of “Subrecipient Monitoring.”  **Consider the results of the testing of internal control in assessing the risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.** |
| 1. Review the PTE’s subrecipient monitoring policies and procedures to gain an understanding of the PTE’s process to identify subawards, evaluate risk of noncompliance, and perform monitoring procedures based upon identified risks.   2. Review subaward documents including the terms and conditions of the subaward to ascertain if, at the time of subaward (or subsequent subaward modification), the PTE made the subrecipient aware of the award information required by [2 CFR section 200.332(a)](2CFR200.332(a).pdf) sufficient for the PTE to comply with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the award.  3. Review the PTE’s documentation of monitoring the subaward and consider if the PTE’s monitoring provided reasonable assurance that the subrecipient used the subaward for authorized purposes in compliance with Federal statutes, regulations, and the terms and conditions of the subaward.  4. Ascertain if the PTE verified that subrecipients expected to be audited as required by [2 CFR part 200, subpart F](2CFR200_subpart_F.pdf), met this requirement [(2 CFR section 200.332(f)](2CFR200.332(f).pdf)). This verification may be performed as part of the required monitoring under [2 CFR section 200.332(d)(2)](2CFR200.332(d)(2).pdf) to ensure that the subrecipient takes timely and appropriate action on deficiencies detected though audits. |

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| **Audit Implications (adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies / material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments)** |
| 1. **Results of Test of Controls: (including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies and management letter items)** 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive Test) including Sample Size:** 4. **Results of Compliance (Substantive Tests) Tests:** 5. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** |

## N. SPECIAL TESTS AND PROVISIONS – ADP System for SNAP – Not Applicable

This OMB Special Test and Provision will be tested by the State Region.

Per ODJFS, there are no additional OMB Special Tests and Provisions for SNAP at the County level for ADP System for SNAP.

## N. SPECIAL TESTS AND PROVISIONS – EBT Reconciliation and EBT Card Security

### OMB Compliance Requirements

The specific requirements for Special Tests and Provisions are unique to each Federal program and are found in the statutes, regulations, and the provisions of contract or grant agreements pertaining to the program. For programs listed in this Supplement, the compliance requirements, audit objectives, and suggested audit procedures for Special Tests and Provisions are in Part 4, “Agency Program Requirements.” or Part 5. “Clusters of Programs.” For programs not included in this Supplement, the auditor must review the program’s contract and grant agreements and referenced statutes and regulations to identify the compliance requirements and develop the audit objectives and audit procedures for Special Tests and Provisions which could have a direct and material effect on a major program. The auditor should also inquire of the non-Federal entity to help identify and understand any Special Tests and Provisions.

Additionally, both for programs included and not included in this Supplement, the auditor must identify any additional compliance requirements which are not based in statute or regulation (e.g., were agreed to as part of audit resolution of prior audit findings) which could be material to a major program. Reasonable procedures to identify such compliance requirements would be inquiry of non-Federal entity management and review of the contract and grant agreements pertaining to the program. Any such requirements which may have a direct and material effect on compliance with the requirements of that major program shall be included in the audit.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

**Part 4 OMB Program Specific Requirements**

**EBT Reconciliation**

CFAE Note: This OMB Special Test and Provision will be tested at by the State Region.

States must have systems in place to reconcile all of the funds entering into, exiting from, and remaining in the system each day with the state’s benefit account with Treasury and EBT contractor records. This includes a reconciliation of the state’s issuance files of postings to recipient accounts with the EBT contractor.

States (generally through the EBT contractor that operates the EBT system) must also have systems in place to reconcile retailer credit activity as reported into the banking system to client transactions maintained by the processor and to the funds drawn down from the EBT benefit account with Treasury. States’ EBT system processors should maintain audit trails that document the cycle of client transactions from posting to point-of-sale transactions at retailers through settlement of retailer credits. The financial and management data that comes from the EBT processor is reconciled by the state to the SNAP issuance files and settlement data to ensure that benefits are authorized by the state and funds have been properly drawn down. States may only draw federal funds for authorized transactions (e.g., electronic point-of-sale purchases supported by entry of a valid personal identification number (PIN) or purchases using manual vouchers with telephone verification supported by a client signature and an EBT contractor authorization number) (7 CFR sections 274.3(a)(1) and 274.4(a)).

**EBT Card Security**

CFAE Note: This OMB Special Test and Provision will be tested at by the State Region.

The state is required to maintain adequate security over, and documentation/records for, EBT cards, to prevent their theft, embezzlement, loss, damage, destruction, unauthorized transfer, negotiation, or use (7 CFR section 274.8(b)(3)).

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

### Additional Program Specific Information

**EBT Reconciliation:**

Per ODJFS, there are no rules that require counties to take certain actions on returned cards.

However, the County should have controls in place should they receive returned cards. See the FAQ question following. If auditors note that the County has received returned cards, determine if they have established written procedures.

EBT County JFS FAQ Question #17 (per ODJFS innerweb) addresses the procedure for returned cards. This procedure states: Each county needs to establish written procedures for this issue. This is an individual agency decision as to how they wish to track this, however it is highly recommended that each card be logged as it comes in, the client is contacted, and clients show identification and sign for their card when they pick them up. It also recommended that if a client does not pick up a card within 30 days, it would be appropriate to return that card to ACS for destruction. If the client comes in after 30 days, they can call and get a replacement. Agencies must secure any OHIO DIRECTION cards in their possession, and have written procedures in place to receive, log and track those cards. Under no circumstances should mail or UPS delivery envelopes containing EBT cards be opened by the agency.

**EBT Card Security:**

Per ODJFS, EBT cards are issued and secured by the vendor. The counties would only issue cards in the event of a level III disaster. The card issuance security controls would be kept at the State level. Therefore, there are no County level requirements to be tested.

*(Source: ODJFS)*

### Audit Objectives and Control Testing

Obtain an understanding of internal control, assess risk, and test internal control as required by [2 CFR section 200.514(c)](2CFR200.514(c).pdf) and using the guidance provided in the following:

* [Part 6](OMB_Compliance_Supplement_Part_6.pdf) of the OMB Compliance Supplement, Internal Control
* [2013 COSO](https://www.coso.org/Documents/990025P-Executive-Summary-final-may20.pdf)
* GAO’s 2014 Green Book (<http://www.gao.gov/assets/670/665712.pdf>).

Consider the results of the testing of internal control in assessing the remaining risk of noncompliance. Use this as the basis for determining the nature, timing, and extent (e.g., number of transactions to be selected) of substantive tests of compliance.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement Part 3)*

Determine whether the state reconciles retailer credit activity to client transactions, to its issuance files of postings to recipient accounts with the EBT contractor, and to postings to and drawdown activity from the state’s benefit account with Treasury.

Determine whether the state maintains security over EBT cards.

*(Source: 2021 OMB Compliance Supplement, Part 4, Department of Agriculture, SNAP Cluster)*

|  |
| --- |
| **What Control Procedures Address the Compliance Requirement (reference/link to documentation or where the testing was performed):** |
| **Basis for the control** (reports, resources, etc. providing information needed to understand requirements and prevent or identify and correct errors):  **Control Procedure** (description of how auditee uses the “Basis” to prevent, or identify and correct or detect errors):  **Person(s) responsible for performing the control procedure** (title):  **Description of evidence documenting the control was applied** (i.e. sampling unit):  Per ODJFS, there are no rules that require counties to take certain actions on returned cards.  However, the County/district should have controls in place should they receive returned cards. See the FAQ question following. If auditors note that the County/district has received returned cards, determine if they have established written procedures.  EBT County/district JFS FAQ Question #17 (per ODJFS innerweb) addresses the procedure for returned cards. This procedure states: Each county needs to establish written procedures for this issue. This is an individual agency decision as to how they wish to track this, however it is highly recommended that each card be logged as it comes in, the client is contacted, and clients show identification and sign for their card when they pick them up. It also recommended that if a client does not pick up a card within 30 days, it would be appropriate to return that card to ACS for destruction. If the client comes in after 30 days, they can call and get a replacement. Agencies must secure any OHIO DIRECTION cards in their possession, and have written procedures in place to receive, log and track those cards. Under no circumstances should mail or UPS delivery envelopes containing EBT cards be opened by the agency.  *(Source: ODJFS)* |

### Audit Implications Summary

|  |
| --- |
| **Audit Implications (adequacy of the system and controls, and the effect on sample size, significant deficiencies / material weaknesses, material non-compliance and management letter comments)** |
| 1. **Results of Test of Controls: (including material weaknesses, significant deficiencies and management letter items)** 2. **Assessment of Control Risk:** 3. **Effect on the Nature, Timing, and Extent of Compliance (Substantive Test) including Sample Size:**   **Not applicable – Tested at the state level.**   1. **Results of Compliance (Substantive Tests) Tests:**   **Not applicable – Tested at the state level.**   1. **Questioned Costs: Actual \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Projected \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**   **Not applicable – Tested at the state level.** |

## Program Testing Conclusion

We have performed procedures sufficient to provide reasonable assurance for federal award program compliance requirements (to support our opinions). The procedures performed, relevant evidence obtained, and our conclusions are adequately documented. (If you are unable to conclude, prepare a memo documenting your reason and the implications for the engagement, including the audit reports.)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Conclusion** | | |
| **The opinion on this major program should be:** | |  |
| **Unmodified:** |  | |
| **Qualified (describe):** |  | |
| **Adverse (describe):** |  | |
| **Disclaimer (describe):** |  | |

Per paragraph 13.39 of the **AICPA Audit Guide, *Government Auditing Standards and Single Audits*,** **[Permalink to here](https://checkpoint.riag.com/app/view/docPermaLink?DocID=iAICPAIGS:767.2440&docTid=T0AICPAIGS:767.2440-1&feature=ttoc&lastCpReqId=97899&tlltype=AICPAIGS:767.2668)**, the **following are required to be reported** as audit findings in the federal awards section of the schedule of findings and questioned costs **(**[**see 2CFR200 section 516**](2CFR200.516.pdf)**):**

* Significant deficiencies and material weaknesses in internal control over major programs
* Material noncompliance with the federal statues, regulations, or the terms and conditions of federal awards related to major programs
* Known questioned costs that are greater than $25,000 for a type of compliance requirement for a major program. The auditor also must report (in the schedule of findings and questioned costs) known questioned costs when likely questioned costs are greater than $25,000 for a type of compliance requirement for a major program.
* Known questioned costs that are greater than $25,000 for programs that are not audited as major.
* The circumstances concerning why the opinion in the auditor's report on compliance for major programs is other than an unmodified opinion, unless such circumstances are otherwise reported as audit findings in the schedule of findings and questioned costs for federal awards (for example, a scope limitation that is not otherwise reported as a finding).
* Known or likely fraud affecting a federal award, unless such fraud is otherwise reported as an audit finding in the schedule of findings and questioned costs for federal awards.
* Significant instances of abuse relating to major programs
* Instances in which the results of audit follow-up procedures disclosed that the summary schedule\* of prior audit findings prepared by the auditee in accordance with [Section 200.511(b)](2CFR200.511(b).pdf) of the Uniform Guidance, materially misrepresents the status of any prior audit finding.

[Appendix I](OMB_Compliance_Supplement_APP_I.pdf) lists block grants and other programs excluded from the requirements of specified portions of 2 CFR part 200.

[Appendix II](OMB_Compliance_Supplement_APP_II.pdf) provides regulatory citations for Federal agencies’ codification of the OMB guidance on “Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements” (in 2 CFR part 200).

All departments and agencies other than the following have OMB-approved exceptions as part of their adoption/implementation: Departments of Commerce, Homeland Security, Housing and Urban Development, and Veterans Affairs; Gulf Coast Restoration Council; Institute of Museum and Library Services; National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities; Office of National Drug Control Policy; and Social Security Administration. The complete list of exceptions is available at <https://www.cfo.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Agency-Exceptions.pdf> and Appendix II of the OMB Compliance Supplement.

|  |
| --- |
| **Cross-reference to internal control matters (significant deficiencies or material weaknesses), if any, documented in the FACCR:** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Cross-reference to questioned costs and matter of noncompliance, if any, documented in this FACCR:** |
|  |

**Per paragraph 13.50 of the AICPA Audit Guide, *Government Auditing Standards and Single Audits*,** the schedule of findings and questioned costs must include all audit findings required to be reported under the Uniform Guidance. A separate written communication (such as a communication sometimes referred to as a management letter) may not be used to communicate such matters to the auditee in lieu of reporting them as audit findings in accordance with the Uniform Guidance. See the discussion beginning at paragraph 13.34 for information on Uniform Guidance requirements for the schedule of findings and questioned costs. If there are other matters that do not meet the Uniform Guidance requirements for reporting but, in the auditor's judgment, warrant the attention those charged with governance, they should be communicated in writing or orally. If such a communication is provided in writing to the auditee, there is no requirement for that communication to be referenced in the Uniform Guidance compliance report. Per table 13-2 **a matter must meet the following in order to be communicated in the management letter:**

* Other deficiencies in internal control over compliance that are not significant deficiencies or material weaknesses required to be reported but, in the auditor's judgment, are of sufficient importance to be communicated to management.
* Noncompliance with federal statutes, regulations or terms and conditions of federal awards related to a major program that does not meet the criteria for reporting under the Uniform Guidance but, in the auditor's judgment, is of sufficient importance to communicate to management or those charged with governance.
* Other findings or issues arising from the compliance audit that are not otherwise required to be reported but are, in the auditor's professional judgment, significant and relevant to those charged with governance.

|  |
| --- |
| **Cross-reference to any Management Letter items and explain why not included in the Single Audit Compliance Report:** |
|  |