

# **THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA**

**Fund 88 Review  
May 2016**

**MOSS ADAMS LLP**

**Moss Adams Advisory Services, Business Risk Services**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE.....	2
DETAILED PROCEDURES, RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	4
APPENDIX A – LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED .....	10
APPENDIX B – LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED .....	11
APPENDIX C – PROPOSED REALLOCATIONS .....	12
APPENDIX D – JOURNAL ENTRY WITH MISSING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION .....	13
APPENDIX E – JOURNAL ENTRY BATCH FILES – UNABLE TO LOCATE.....	14
APPENDIX F – STATE BAR SECTIONS ROYALTY ADJUSTMENT 2013-2015 .....	15
APPENDIX G – STATE BAR RECEIVABLES TO CASH RECEIVED RECONCILIATION .....	16
APPENDIX H – GIFT CARD RECEIVABLE CALCULATION DISCREPANCY .....	17
APPENDIX I – PROPOSED SECTIONS CLE REVENUE SHARE RECLASSIFICATION ENTRY FOR Q4 2014 .....	18
APPENDIX J – ONE HOUR MINIMUM CHARGE DISCREPANCY .....	19
APPENDIX K – BANK PROCESSING FEE DISCREPANCY.....	20
APPENDIX L – INREACH REVENUE SHARE PERCENTAGE DISCREPANCY.....	21
APPENDIX M – PROPOSED STATE BAR SECTIONS ROYALTY ADJUSTMENT 2001-2008.....	22
APPENDIX N – TOTAL OF ALL PROPOSED STATE BAR SECTIONS ROYALTY ADJUSTMENT 2001-2015 .....	23
APPENDIX O – SUMMARY OF SBC ROYALTY REPORTS FROM 2002-2015 .....	24

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Moss Adams, LLP (Moss Adams) was engaged by The State Bar of California (SBC) to perform consulting services related to SBC's Fund 88 of the Sections Program Fund. The objective of this engagement was to assist SBC in determining the nature of the transactions that were recorded to Fund 88 from January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2015, and identify the amount that may need to be reclassified from Fund 88 to the other Sections/Funds. This engagement includes the review of revenue and expense transactions to verify the validity and accuracy of reported transaction and verification of the completeness and accuracy of the InReach reports used to record revenue for Fund 88. This report summarizes the results of the evaluation performed and the observations noted in our review of the Fund 88 transactions and InReach reports.

Based on our review, we identified transactions that need to be reclassified out of Fund 88. We also identified several transactions that are either missing or not adequately supported by appropriate documentation. Additionally, we identified errors in the InReach Royalty Reports and inconsistencies in the SBC Royalty Reports. Finally, our review determined that there was a lack of available information that would allow SBC's Management (Management) to reallocate the InReach Continuing Legal Education (CLE) out of Fund 88 into other section funds. In previous years, InReach only tracked one category per course that determined where the CLE revenues were allocated. Consequently, the courses that were not assigned a category belonging to a section fund were not allocated out of Fund 88. We have provided detailed recommendations and follow-up activities for Management to address these issues in our review.

The following pages contain the procedures performed, results of procedures, and our recommendations. Management has reviewed this report and our recommendations and is in agreement, unless otherwise noted in the body of the report.

## **BACKGROUND, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE**

The State Bar of California (SBC) is a public corporation created within the judicial branch of government serving as an arm of the California Supreme Court in all matters pertaining to the admission, discipline and regulation of California lawyers. SBC is a Business-Type-Activity (BTA) reporting government. Moss Adams, LLP (Moss Adams) was engaged by SBC to perform consulting services related to SBC's Fund 88 of the Sections Program Fund.

The Sections Program Fund accounts for the activities of 16 sections, which consists of specific practice areas or areas of professional interest and provides members with a vehicle for communicating with each other, educating themselves, and commenting on relevant legislation. Resources are provided through assessments of the sections' membership and revenue from seminar and workshops. Fund 88's primary activity is the administration of the InReach Continuing Legal Education (CLE) online program. On a quarterly basis, InReach provides Management with summarized reporting of transaction details of courses purchased through the InReach online platform. Management used these reports to prepare the SBC Royalty Reports used to calculate the reallocation of revenue to the various sixteen sections. Payments are received by SBC on a monthly basis.

The objective of the Fund 88 review project was to assist SBC in determining the nature of the transactions that were recorded to Fund 88 from January 1, 2001, through December 31, 2015, and identify the amount that may need to be reclassified from Fund 88 to the other Funds/Sections.

The following procedures were performed:

- Interviewed employees from the Finance and Operations Departments to understand significant policies, practices and internal controls over the budgeting process. (See Appendix A – List of People Interviewed.)
- Reviewed Fund 88 transactions and other documentation provided. (See Appendix B – List of Documents Reviewed.)
- Vouched 100 percent of Fund 88 transactions for the calendar years 2013, 2014 and 2015. For each transaction, determined if the revenues or expenses should be reclassified to other Funds/Sections.
- Haphazardly selected a sample of 25 Fund 88 transactions for each of the calendar years 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012. For the selected transactions, we determined if the revenues or expenses should be reclassified to other Funds/Sections.
- Tested the accuracy of the InReach report for the years 2013, 2014, and 2015. For each year, haphazardly selected a sample of 25 transactions from the report to verify if the revenues or expenses were accurately presented in the report.

- Using the information gathered from 2009-2015, we estimated the amount to propose for reclassification to other Funds/Sections for the years 2001 through 2008 through extrapolation.
- Provided Management with proposed amounts to be reclassified from Fund 88 to the other Funds/Sections.

Assessment findings are based on interviews, review of documentation, observation of personnel and the testing as indicated above.

This review was performed in accordance with Standards for Consulting Services established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). Accordingly, we provide no opinion, attestation or other form of assurance with respect to our work or the information upon which our work is based. This report was developed based on information from our interviews and analyses of sample documentation provided. The procedures we performed do not constitute an examination in accordance with AICPA rules.

## **DETAILED PROCEDURES, RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The table below details the procedures performed and the results of those procedures. Also included are our recommendations to address the exceptions noted and Management's response.

No.	Procedure	Results	Recommendations	Management Response
1	Vouched 100 percent of Fund 88 transactions for the calendar years 2013, 2014 and 2015. For each transaction, determined if the revenues or expenses should be reclassified to other Funds/Sections.	<p>In the review of the Fund 88 transactions from 2013 through 2015, we identified the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There were two transactions that were recorded to the wrong general ledger code and to the wrong State Bar Fund. The transactions pertained to cash receipts from Arch Insurance for prepaid CLE courses from 2014 and 2015 totaling \$240,000. These transactions were recorded as Net Revenue Share. These cash receipts are then used by SBC to fund gift cards issued as a rebate for members who gets their insurance through SBC. Total payments from Arch Insurance to fund gift cards totaled \$430,000 from 2012 to 2015. As the payments from Arch Insurance are related to the SBC sponsored insurance program, the gift card revenues that should be reallocated to the General Fund. For transaction details, please refer to <i>Appendix C</i>.</li> <li>• There were four transactions that were not reallocated to the Section Funds. The transactions pertained to cash receipts from Mosaic and Documation for event management rebates from 2013 and 2015 totaling \$69,186.85. These transactions were recorded as Miscellaneous Revenue in Fund 88 and were not reallocated to the various Section Funds that sponsored the events. Total payments from Mosaic and Documation for</li> </ul>	<p>Management should evaluate if prior period adjustments are necessary to correct the classification of the transactions identified.</p> <p>Moreover, Management should evaluate if the payments from Arch Insurance for prepaid CLE courses should be reclassified to a liability (i.e., deferred revenue) account, and if an adjustment to the financial records is needed.</p> <p>Moving forward, Management should strengthen the review procedures around journal entries to help ensure that transactions recorded are valid, accurate, and adequately supported by appropriate documentation.</p> <p>In addition, Management should develop and formalize a policy that outlines the methodology for the allocation of the various types of Fund 88 revenue to the Section Funds. A formalized policy and methodology promotes transparency, provides guidance and reduces bias on the revenue allocation process.</p>	<p>Action Owner:</p> <p>Action Plan:</p> <p>Due Date:</p>

No.	Procedure	Results	Recommendations	Management Response
		<p>event management rebates totaled \$260,642.59 from 2004 to 2015. According to the Senior Director of Office Education, the event management rebates are used to pay for expenses that benefit across all various SBC funds (e.g. marketing database upgrade). For transaction details, please refer to <i>Appendix C</i>.</p>		
2	<p>Haphazardly selected a sample of 25 Fund 88 transactions for each of the calendar years 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012. For the selected transactions, determined if the revenues or expenses should be reclassified in other Funds/Sections.</p>	<p>In the review of Fund 88 transactions from 2009 through 2012 we identified the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out of 25 journal batches tested for 2009, there were 7 journal entry batches that could not be located by SBC. The journal entries represented approximately 16 percent of the revenue transactions (\$197.7K of \$1,264K) and 36 percent of expense transactions (\$35.3K of \$97.7K) tested for that period. For transaction details, please refer to <i>Appendix E</i>.</li> <li>• There was one transaction that was not adequately supported by the appropriate documentation (e.g., supporting schedule, approvals, etc.). Consequently, we were not able to verify the validity and appropriateness of the transactions. For transaction details, please refer to <i>Appendix D</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>Management should strengthen the review procedures around journal entries to help ensure that transactions recorded are valid, accurate, and adequately supported by appropriate documentation.</p> <p>In addition, we recommend that Management institute procedures over the safeguarding of documents to prevent their misplacement and/or mishandling.</p>	<p>Action Owner:</p> <p>Action Plan:</p> <p>Due Date:</p>

No.	Procedure	Results	Recommendations	Management Response
3	Tested the accuracy of the InReach report for the years 2013, 2014, and 2015. For each year, haphazardly selected a sample of 25 transactions from the report to verify if the revenues or expenses were accurately presented in the report following the procedures below:	In the review of the InReach report from 2013 through 2015, we identified several exceptions as discussed in the subsequent subsections below:	Please refer to the recommendations discussed in the subsequent subsections below.	
	3a: Reconciled the InReach Report, SBC Royalty Report, and SBC receivables from 2013 through 2015.	The InReach reports were not prepared in a consistent manner. For Q1 2013, Q2 2013, Q1 2015, Q2 2015 and Q3 2015, the Producer Revenue (i.e., courses produced by other State Bars) shown in the InReach Report was included in the SBC Royalty Report sections reallocation calculation and therefore, was inappropriately reallocated out of Fund 88 to other section funds. This resulted in an over-allocation of Section Funds revenue totaling \$5,257.82. For details, please refer to <i>Appendix F</i> .	Management should determine if adjustments are needed to the financial statements to correct the over-allocation of the Sections Funds Revenue.  Moreover, Management should implement an independent review of SBC's Royalty Report that would verify the accuracy and completeness of SBC's Royalty Report.	Action Owner:  Action Plan:  Due Date:
	3b: Reconciled the quarterly interoffice memos against the InReach Royalty Report and SBC journal entries from 2013 through 2015.	No Exceptions Noted	Not Applicable.	



No.	Procedure	Results	Recommendations	Management Response
	3c: Reconciled the actual cash received from 2013 through 2015 against the SBC receivables per InReach reports.	There were discrepancies between the amounts of revenues to be collected as shown in the InReach report against the actual cash received. For details, please refer to <i>Appendix G</i> .	Management should investigate and resolve the differences noted between the SBC receivables and the actual cash received. Moreover, Management should consider performing periodic InReach cash receipt reconciliation to identify and resolve discrepancies between the reported receivables and actual cash receipts.	Action Owner:  Action Plan:  Due Date:

No.	Procedure	Results	Recommendations	Management Response
	3d: Haphazardly selected 25 samples and verified accuracy of data used by InReach in calculating SBC revenue.	<p>There were formula errors identified in the InReach reports tested. We identified the following exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The wrong formula was used in calculating the Q4 2014 SBC Revenue Share for gift card payments. In calculating the receivables, InReach inadvertently credited revenue to SBC and charged a bank processing fee. However, according to InReach, this formula error did not cause overpayment to SBC as the erroneous formula was not used to calculate the final amount due to SBC. (<i>See Appendix H.</i>) Nonetheless, this error resulted in an over-allocation of Section Funds for Q4 2014 totaling \$25,432.80. For details, please refer to <i>Appendix I.</i></li> <li>• The wrong rate was used in calculating the one hour minimum InReach revenue share for Q4 2015. As confirmed with InReach, they erroneously used a minimum one hour rate of \$79.95 instead of the \$7.95 per the licensing agreement. This error resulted in an overcharge and underpayment of \$6,336.00 by InReach. (<i>See Appendix J.</i>)</li> <li>• The wrong bank processing fee rate was used to calculate SBC's receivable for Q4 2013. As confirmed with InReach, they erroneously used a bank processing fee rate of 4 percent instead of 4.75 percent per the licensing agreement. This error resulted in an undercharge and overpayment of approximately \$4,000, which InReach decided not to retroactively collect. (<i>See Appendix K.</i>)</li> </ul>	<p>Management should consider exercising the right to audit InReach to identify any additional errors that could have resulted in underpayment of the amount due to SBC. Management should also consider pursuing to collect the amounts due to SBC as a result of the errors noted during the review.</p> <p>Management should determine if adjustments are needed to the financial statements to correct the over-allocation of the Section Funds Revenue.</p> <p>Finally, we Management should strengthen the review procedures around the reports submitted by InReach. The review procedures should include steps to verify the accuracy and completeness of the data submitted by InReach to SBC.</p>	<p>Action Owner:</p> <p>Action Plan:</p> <p>Due Date:</p>

No.	Procedure	Results	Recommendations	Management Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wrong revenue share percentage was used for 1 out of 25 revenue transactions selected for testing. As confirmed with InReach, they erroneously used 30 percent InReach revenue share, instead of 24 percent as per the licensing agreement. This error resulted in an underpayment of \$1.75 by InReach. (See <i>Appendix L.</i>)</li> </ul>		
4	Using the information gathered from 2009-2015, we estimated the amount to propose for reclassification to other Funds/Sections for the years 2001 through 2008 through extrapolation.	<p>Based on the information gathered from the review of the 2009 – 2015 Fund 88 transactions, we have identified proposed reclassifications to the financial statements for the years 2002 through 2008 through extrapolation of the adjustments identified due to the incorrect preparation of the SBC Royalty Reports for Q1 2013, Q2 2013, Q1 2015, Q2 2015 and Q3 2015. (See <i>Procedure 3a.</i>)</p> <p>Management was not able to provide us with the 2001 SBC Royalty Report. Consequently, we could not perform extrapolation adjustment calculation for 2001. For details, please refer to <i>Appendix M.</i></p> <p>For the total of all proposed reclassifications to financial statements for years 2001 through 2015, please refer to <i>Appendix N.</i></p> <p>For the summary of all SBC Royalty Reports for years 2002 through 2015, please refer to <i>Appendix O.</i></p>	<p>Management should analyze the impact of the proposed reclassification and assess whether adjustments to the financial statements will be needed.</p> <p>Moreover, Management should consider performing a periodic review of course codes to ensure that they are assigned to the correct sections. This review should also include the CLE sections that are not coded to specific SBC section funds.</p> <p>Finally, Management should develop and formalize a policy that outlines the methodology for the allocation of revenues and related expenses to the various section funds. A formalized policy and methodology promotes transparency, provides guidance and reduces bias on the revenue allocation process.</p>	<p>Action Owner:</p> <p>Action Plan:</p> <p>Due Date:</p>

**APPENDIX A – LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED**

The individuals interviewed for this assessment are listed below with their respective titles.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
Christine Wong	Financial Director, State Bar of California
Donita Douglas	Executive Vice President of Client Success, InReach
Lauren Peranton	Senior Client Success Manager, InReach
Neil Ashizawa	CEO, InReach
Pam Wilson	Senior Director of Office Education, State Bar of California
Stephanie Marshall	Staff Accountant, InReach
Tricia Horan	Director of Office Education, State Bar of California

## **APPENDIX B – LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

Documents reviewed for this assessment are listed below.

- Interoffice memo of selected transactions – Q1 through Q4 2013, 2014, 2015
- InReach report of selected transactions – Q1 through Q4, 2013, 2014, 2015
- 2012 Sample Service Trade Agreement Between State Bar of California and InReach
- Schedule C of 2012 Sample Service Trade Agreement Between State Bar of California and InReach
- Sample expense report of selected transactions – Q1 through Q4 2013, 2014, 2015
- Sample invoice and purchase orders of selected transactions – Q1 through Q4 2013, 2014, 2015
- Sample journal entries of selected transactions – Q1 through Q4 2013, 2014, 2015
- Sample deposit receipts of selected transactions – Q1 through Q4 2013, 2014, 2015
- Sample trial balance of selected transactions – Q1 through Q4 2013, 2014, 2015

## **APPENDIX C – PROPOSED REALLOCATIONS**

The proposed reallocations identified during this assessment are listed below.

2013											
Batch Number	Document Type	Document #	G/L Date	Account Number	Obj Acct	Account Description	Amount	LT 1 Debit	LT 1 Credit	Explanation	Reallocation Acct
62072	JE	253972	1/30/2013	88001.38300	38300	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ (26,148.83)		\$ (26,148.83)	2012 Royalty fr Documentation LLP	Various Sections - 38300

  

2014											
Batch Number	Document Type	Document #	G/L Date	Account Number	Obj Acct	Account Description	Amount	LT 1 Debit	LT 1 Credit	Explanation	Reallocation Acct
66381	JE	285917	10/29/2014	88001.39550	39550	Net revenue sharing	\$(120,000.00)		\$(120,000.00)	Online CLE Benif Rendered Pymt	General Fund - 38300
64794	JE	274526	3/25/2014	88001.38300	38300	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ (23,356.20)		\$ (23,356.20)	Mosaic Event Mngmnt Rebate2013	Various Sections - 38300
64794	JE	274526	3/25/2014	88001.38300	38300	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ (10,703.10)		\$ (10,703.10)	Mosaic Event Mngmnt Rebate2013	Various Sections - 38300

  

2015											
Batch Number	Document Type	Document #	G/L Date	Account Number	Obj Acct	Account Description	Amount	LT 1 Debit	LT 1 Credit	Explanation	Reallocation Acct
69610	JE	305189	11/24/2015	88001.39550	39550	Net revenue sharing	\$(120,000.00)		\$(120,000.00)	2nd & 3rd Pymnt to SB Ed, CLE benef 11/24 Deposit	General Fund - 38300
70326	JE	308457	12/30/2015	88001.38300	38300	Miscellaneous Revenue	\$ (8,978.72)		\$ (8,978.72)	Mosaic 2014/2015 Commissions	Various Sections - 38300

## **APPENDIX D – JOURNAL ENTRY WITH MISSING SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

The journal entry with missing supporting documentation identified during this assessment is listed below.

2010									
Batch Number	Document Type	Document Number	G/L Date	Account Number	Amount	LT 1 Debit	LT 1 Credit	Explanation	Comments
57069	JE	218286	12/29/2010	88001.39550	\$(16,054.00)		\$(16,054.00)	Reclass YTD Sections OnlineDep;	Missing Support in Batch File

## **APPENDIX E – JOURNAL ENTRY BATCH FILES – UNABLE TO LOCATE**

The missing journal entry batch files identified during this assessment are listed below.

2009								
Batch Number	Document Type	Document Number	G/L Date	Account Number	Amount	LT 1 Debit	LT 1 Credit	Explanation
52948	JE	192560	6/30/2009	88001.39550	\$ 41,309.10	\$ 41,309.10	\$ (41,309.10)	09-Q2 LegalSpan Royalty 09-Q2 LegalSpan Royalty
52048	JE	186500	2/2/2009	88001.43510	\$ 7,700.00	\$ 7,700.00		CC or acc corr Documation invc Posted to 87001 in error
53195	JE	194287	8/26/2009	88001.41010	\$ (27,682.50)	\$ 27,682.50	\$ (27,682.50)	08/26 Deposit Opening a law office
53194	JE	194257	8/21/2009	88001.38300	\$ (37,465.94)		\$ (37,465.94)	08/21 Deposit July 2009 legal span
52020	JE	185120	3/25/2009	88001.38300	\$ (38,815.39)		\$ (38,815.39)	03/25 Dep. 02/2009 Legal Span
52956	JE	192806	7/21/2009	88001.38300	\$ (38,879.55)		\$ (38,879.55)	07/21 Deposit June 2009 Legal Span
53673	JE	197500	10/19/2009	88001.38300	\$ (41,229.25)		\$ (41,229.25)	10/19 Dep. Legal Span,09/ 2009 Sept. 2009 Legal Span



## **APPENDIX F – STATE BAR SECTIONS ROYALTY ADJUSTMENT 2013-2015**

The proposed Sections royalty adjustments due to the incorrectly prepared SBC Royalty Reports are listed below.

<b>Cost Center</b>	<b>Account</b>	<b>Over Allocation</b>	<b>Under Allocation</b>
72403- Business Law	39950	\$ 258.02	
73403- Criminal Law	39950	\$ 272.78	
76403- Family Law	39950	\$ 1,022.29	
77403- Intellectual Property Law	39950	\$ 194.27	
78403- International Law	39950	\$ 17.34	
79403- Labor and Employment	39950	\$ 7.00	
80403- Law Practice Management	39950	\$ 42.10	
81403- Litigation	39950	\$ 708.57	
82403- Public Law	39950	\$ 132.74	
83403- Real Property Law	39950	\$ 36.58	
84403- Solo & Small Firm	39950	\$ 2,526.49	
85403- Taxation	39950	\$ 24.52	
86403- Workers Compensation Law	39950	\$ 15.13	
88001- Fund 88	38300		\$ 5,257.83
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 5,257.83</b>	<b>\$ 5,257.83</b>

## APPENDIX G – STATE BAR RECEIVABLES TO CASH RECEIVED RECONCILIATION

The variances between the InReach calculated SBC receivable and the actual cashed received are listed below.

Period	State Bar Receivable	Cash Received	(Underpayment) / Overpayment
Q1-13	\$410,808.88	\$410,808.88	\$0.00
Q2-13	\$139,140.80	\$136,624.47	(\$2,516.33)
Q3-13	\$100,961.51	\$100,961.51	\$0.00
Q4-13	\$216,675.51	\$216,298.01	(\$377.50)
Q1-14	\$445,287.75	\$445,287.75	\$0.00
Q2-14	\$104,968.85	\$113,523.85	\$8,555.00
Q3-14	\$125,954.81	\$125,794.92	(\$159.89)
Q4-14	\$201,374.31	\$194,758.75	(\$6,615.56)
Q1-15	\$379,498.83	\$379,019.13	(\$479.70)
Q2-15	\$127,388.88	\$126,909.14	(\$479.74)
Q3-15	\$118,380.94	\$117,901.22	(\$479.72)
Q4-15	\$278,515.43	\$278,021.44	(\$493.99)
<b>Total (Net)</b>	<b>\$2,648,956.50</b>	<b>\$2,645,909.07</b>	<b>(\$3,047.43)</b>

## APPENDIX H – GIFT CARD RECEIVABLE CALCULATION DISCREPANCY

The gift card receivable calculation discrepancy is detailed below.

Q4 2014

Z2		fx =[@Total]-[@[bk proc]]-[@[inreach rev]]															
	J	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG
1	Payment Method	Sale Price	Discount	Net Total	Tax	Total	Extension	bk proc	calbar rev	rec	inreach rev	sol	ref	net	hrs	hrly	type
2	giftcard	52.50	0.00	52.50	0.00	52.50	No	0	39.375	39.375	13.125	1		1	1.533333333	12.19	Revenue Share

Q1 2015

Z2		fx =-[@[inreach rev]]															
	J	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG
1	Payment Method	Sale Price	Discount	Net Total	Tax	Total	Extension	bk proc	calbar rev	rec	inreach rev	sol	re	net	hrs	hrly	type
2	giftcard	30.00	0.00	30.00	0.00	30.00	No	0	21	-9	9	1		1	1		Revenue Share

## **APPENDIX I – PROPOSED SECTIONS CLE REVENUE SHARE RECLASSIFICATION ENTRY FOR Q4 2014**

The proposed Sections royalty adjustments due to the incorrect Q4 2014 gift card receivable calculation error are listed below.

<b>Cost Center</b>	<b>Account</b>	<b>Over Allocation</b>	<b>Under Allocation</b>
71403- Antitrust & Unfair Competition Law	39550	\$ 412.50	
72403- Business Law	39550	\$ 2,813.12	
73403- Criminal Law	39550	\$ 1,230.00	
74403- Environmental Law	39550	\$ 419.75	
76403- Family Law	39550	\$ 3,000.00	
77403- Intellectual Property Law	39550	\$ 1,763.43	
78403- International Law	39550	\$ 957.50	
79403- Labor and Employment	39550	\$ 1,996.25	
80403- Law Practice Management	39550	\$ 155.00	
81403- Litigation	39550	\$ 1,362.50	
82403- Public Law	39550	\$ 581.25	
83403- Real Property Law	39550	\$ 2,929.26	
84403- Solo & Small Firm	39550	\$ 862.64	
85403- Taxation	39550	\$ 1,802.25	
75403- Trusts & Estates	39550	\$ 4,201.37	
86403- Workers Compensation Law	39550	\$ 946.00	
88001- Fund 88	38300		\$ 25,432.82
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 25,432.82</b>	<b>\$ 25,432.82</b>

## APPENDIX J – ONE HOUR MINIMUM CHARGE DISCREPANCY

The one hour minimum charge discrepancy is detailed below.

AA2		=IF(AND(ABS(V2)*0.25<7.95,P2/60*7.95<7.95,79.95,F(ABS(V2)*0.25>P2/60*7.95,ABS(V2)*0.25,IF(P2/60*7.95>ABS(V2)*0.25,P2/60*7.95))*IF(															
	J	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG
1	Payment Method	Sale Price	Discount	Net Total	Tax	Total	Extension	bk proc	calbar rev	rec	inreach rev	sol	ref	net	hrs	hrly	type
2	giftcard	52.50	0.00	52.50	0.00	52.50	No	0	39.375	39.375	13.125	1		1	1.533333333	12.19	Revenue Share

## APPENDIX K – BANK PROCESSING FEE DISCREPANCY

The bank processing fee discrepancy is detailed below.

V2		fx		=U2*0.04													
	E	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z						
1	Payment Method	Sale Price	Discount	Net Total	Tax	Total	bpf	hrs	hrly	revshr	inreachrev						
2	creditcard	15.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	15.00000	0.6	1	7.95	3.75	1.95						

## APPENDIX L – INREACH REVENUE SHARE PERCENTAGE DISCREPANCY

The InReach Revenue Share percentage discrepancy is detailed below.

AA2		fx =[@Total]*0.3															
	J	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG
1	Payment Method	Sale Price	Discount	Net Total	Tax	Total	Extension	bk proc	calbar rev	rec	inreach rev	sol	re	net	hrs	hrly	type
2	giftcard	30.00	0.00	30.00	0.00	30.00	No	0	21	-9	9	1		1	1		Revenue Share

## **APPENDIX M – PROPOSED STATE BAR SECTIONS ROYALTY ADJUSTMENT 2001-2008**

The proposed 2001-2008 Sections Royalty adjustments based on extrapolation of the error of the incorrectly prepared SBC Royalty Reports are listed below.

<b>Cost Center</b>	<b>Account</b>	<b>Over Allocation</b>	<b>Under Allocation</b>
72403- Business Law	39950	\$ 54.17	
73403- Criminal Law	39950	\$ 74.75	
76403- Family Law	39950	\$ 227.76	
77403- Intellectual Property Law	39950	\$ 61.36	
78403- International Law	39950	\$ 5.31	
79403- Labor and Employment	39950	\$ 1.57	
80403- Law Practice Management	39950	\$ 8.49	
81403- Litigation	39950	\$ 214.23	
82403- Public Law	39950	\$ 32.74	
83403- Real Property Law	39950	\$ 12.11	
84403- Solo & Small Firm	39950	\$ 1,179.03	
85403- Taxation	39950	\$ 6.56	
86403- Workers Compensation Law	39950	\$ 2.77	
88001- Fund 88	38300		\$ 1,880.85
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 1,880.85</b>	<b>\$ 1,880.85</b>



## **APPENDIX N – TOTAL OF ALL PROPOSED STATE BAR SECTIONS ROYALTY ADJUSTMENT 2001-2015**

The total of all proposed State Bar Sections Royalty Adjustments for 2001-2015 are listed below.

<b>Cost Center</b>	<b>Account</b>	<b>Over Allocation</b>	<b>Under Allocation</b>
71403- Antitrust & Unfair Competition Law	39550	\$ 412.50	
72403- Business Law	39550	\$ 3,125.31	
73403- Criminal Law	39550	\$ 1,557.53	
74403- Environmental Law	39550	\$ 4 19.75	
76403- Family Law	39550	\$ 4,250.05	
77403- Intellectual Property Law	39550	\$ 2,019.06	
78403- International Law	39550	\$ 980.15	
79403- Labor and Employment	39550	\$ 2,004.82	
80403- Law Practice Management	39550	\$ 2 05.59	
81403- Litigation	39550	\$ 2,285.30	
82403- Public Law	39550	\$ 746.73	
83403- Real Property Law	39550	\$ 2,977.95	
84403- Solo & Small Firm	39550	\$ 4,568.16	
85403- Taxation	39550	\$ 1,833.33	
75403- Trusts & Estates	39550	\$ 4,201.37	
86403- Workers Compensation Law	39550	\$ 963.90	
88001- Fund 88	38300		\$ 32,571.50
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 32,571.50</b>	<b>\$ 32,571.50</b>

**APPENDIX O – SUMMARY OF SBC ROYALTY REPORTS FROM 2002-2015**

<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Section/Category</b>	<b>Allocation Amount</b>	<b>Total</b>
Fund 88 – (Unallocated)	2004 Annual Meeting	\$ 44,393.98	
	2005 Annual Meeting	\$ 4,027.86	
	2006 Annual Meeting	\$ 13,882.07	
	2007 Annual Meeting	\$ 4,773.60	
	2009 Annual Meeting	\$ 20,217.60	
	2010 Annual Meeting	\$ 33,967.80	
	2010 Cyber Institute	\$ 34,144.55	
	2011 Annual Meeting	\$ 17,040.61	
	2011 Cyber Institute	\$ 97,930.01	
	2012 Annual Meeting	\$ 8,632.50	
	2013 Annual Meeting	\$ 827.29	
	2014 Annual Meeting	\$ 22,713.15	
	2015 Annual Meeting	\$ 28,869.47	
	Alternative Dispute Resolution	\$ 77,821.15	
	Appellate Law	\$ 50,735.87	
	California Solo & Small Firm Summit	\$ 31,815.53	
	Closed Captioned Courses	\$ 3,448.99	
	Constitutional Law	\$ 17,663.77	
	CYLA	\$ 36,493.50	
	Detection/Prevention of Substance Abuse	\$ 282,313.36	
	Elimination of Bias in the Legal Profession	\$ 114,107.09	
	Ethics	\$ 496,567.29	
	Georgetown Law CLE	\$ 3,211.06	
	Health Law	\$ 3,401.29	
	Lawyering Skills (+ Banking & Health)	\$ 263,324.80	\$ 1,712,324.19
Section Funds	71 - Antitrust & Unfair Competition Law	\$ 89,761.12	
	72 - Business Law	\$ 496,977.53	
	73 - Criminal Law	\$ 347,433.47	
	74 - Environmental Law	\$ 106,666.95	
	76 - Family Law	\$ 454,815.67	
	77 - Intellectual Property Law	\$ 564,163.27	
	78 - International Law (+ Immigration)	\$ 274,857.32	
	79 - Labor and Employment	\$ 628,473.32	
	80 - Law Practice Mgmt & Technology	\$ 258,047.63	
	81 - Litigation	\$ 363,199.93	
	82 - Public Law	\$ 187,388.75	
	83 - Real Property Law	\$ 396,993.93	
	84 - Solo & Small Firm	\$ 407,142.35	
	85 - Taxation	\$ 205,826.69	
	75 - Trusts & Estates	\$ 486,482.19	
	86 - Workers Compensation Law	\$ 269,589.86	\$ 5,537,819.98
	Grand Total		\$ 7,250,144.17

**APPENDIX P – NET FUND 88 BALANCE RECONCILIATION**

<b>2001 - 2015 Fund 88 Revenue &amp; Expense - Summary</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>Unallocated InReach Revenue - Refer to Appendix O for Details</b>		<b>\$ (1,712,324.19)</b>
<b>Other Fund 88 Revenue</b>		<b>\$ (1,549,962.24)</b>
88001.33620 Sections Associate Membership	\$ (75.00)	
88001.34510 Investment Income	\$ (186,138.11)	
88001.35020 Miscellaneous Convention Income (Gross of corrected allocation)	\$ (508,407.91)	
88001.36010 Grant Revenue	\$ 9,365.00	
88001.36020 Corporate Sponsorship Revenue	\$ (23,437.50)	
88001.37010 Seminar and Workshop Revenue	\$ (126,522.89)	
88001.38300 All Other Miscellaneous		
Arch Insurance	\$ (430,000.00)	
Mosaic/Documation Royalty	\$ (369,788.75)	
Other Misc - (Section Mc/Visa, Check payments, etc)	\$ (57,856.19)	
Teacan.com Royalty	\$ 14,980.46	
88001.39520 Sales of Pamphlets	\$ (25,827.79)	
88001.39540 Ticketed revenues	\$ 16.89	
88001.39550 Net revenue sharing - Other Sections Reclass	\$ 82,605.85	
88001.39710 Interfund Transaction-Revenue	\$ 71,123.70	
<b>Unsupported Deposits Recorded to Miscellaneous Revenue (2001 - 2008)</b>		<b>\$ (485,185.43)</b>
<b>Unreconciled Difference between GL and InReach Royalty Reports</b>		<b>\$ 27,638.31</b>
<b>Revenue (33620 - 39710) Total:</b>		<b>\$ (3,719,833.55)</b>
<b>Expenses (40110 - 49710)</b>		
<b>Expenses (40110 - 49710) Total:</b>		<b>\$ 809,845.31</b>
		<b><u>\$ (2,909,988.24)</u></b>