



A Report on

# **Analysis of Quality Assurance Team Projects**

August 2017

Report No. 17-047



A Report on

# Analysis of Quality Assurance Team Projects

SAO Report No. 17-047  
August 2017

## Overall Conclusion

**At the request of the State's Quality Assurance Team (QAT), the State Auditor's Office assisted the QAT by performing an analysis of three major information system projects at three state agencies. The State Auditor's Office selected those three projects after consultation with the QAT, which provided input on projects that it considered to be high risk.**

It is important to note that this project was a non-audit service; therefore, the information in this report was not subject to all of the tests and confirmations that would be performed in an audit. The agencies self-reported the information in this report, and the State Auditor's Office did not independently verify that information.

### Background Information

In 1993, the 73rd Legislature established the **State's Quality Assurance Team (QAT)**. The QAT comprises representatives from the Legislative **Budget Board, the State Auditor's Office, and the Department of Information Resources**. The QAT approves and reviews major information resources projects.

**The State Auditor's Office has delegated** its voting authority to the Legislative Budget Board on any QAT decisions to approve or not approve the expenditure of appropriated funds for the major information resources projects.

Source: The QAT Web site at <http://qat.state.tx.us>.

All three projects were completed prior to June 2017. The three projects were:

- **The Department of Public Safety's (DPS) Enterprise Case Management (ECM) project.**
- The Health and Human Services **Commission's (HHSC) Protecting People in Regulated Facilities (PPRF) project.**
- The Texas Department of Transportation's (TxDOT) Pavement Analyst (PA) project.

As Table 1 and Table 2 on the next page show:

- **Two projects were completed over the original budget (DPS's ECM project and TxDOT's PA project), while one project was completed under budget (HHSC's PPRF project).**
- The state agencies submitted *Revised Business Case Workbooks* for two projects as required (**DPS's ECM project and TxDOT's PA project**). The HHSC PPRF project budget did not change.
- All three projects were completed later than originally planned.

*This project was conducted in accordance with Texas Government Code, Sections 2054.1181 and 2054.158.*

*For more information regarding this report, please contact Hillary Eckford, Audit Manager, or Lisa Collier, First Assistant State Auditor, at (512) 936-9500.*

Table 1 presents a summary of the budgeted and actual expenditures.

Table 1

| Summary of Project Budgeted and Actual Expenditures   |  |                              |                             |                             |  |                  |
|---|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------|
| Agency  | Project  | Original Budget <sup>a</sup> | Revised Budget <sup>b</sup> | Total Expended <sup>c</sup> | Total Expended Compared to Original Budget | Percent Complete |
| Department of Public Safety   | Enterprise Case Management (ECM) Project                 | \$3,720,043                  | \$10,427,727                | \$5,636,861                 | \$1,916,818                                | 100%             |
| Health and Human Services Commission  | Protecting People in Regulated Facilities (PPRF) Project | \$4,581,203                  | Not Revised                 | \$4,397,688                 | \$(183,515)                                | 100%             |
| Texas Department of Transportation  | Pavement Analyst (PA) Project                            | \$2,933,594                  | \$4,260,540                 | \$4,985,377 <sup>d</sup>    | \$2,051,783                                | 100%             |
| <p><sup>a</sup> This column lists the original project budget the agencies submitted to the QAT in (1) the <i>Business Case Workbook</i> for the Enterprise Case Management (ECM) and the Pavement Analyst (PA) projects and (2) the initial monitoring report for the Protecting People in Regulated Facilities (PPRF) project.</p> <p><sup>b</sup> This column lists the revised project budget amount that the agencies submitted to the QAT in their revised <i>Business Case Workbook</i> for the project.</p> <p><sup>c</sup> This column lists the total expenditures (paid) for the projects as of the project completion dates that the agencies reported to auditors.</p> <p><sup>d</sup> TxDOT did not track and report agency personnel expenditures for the PA Project as the QAT required. As a result, the total project cost reported may be understated.</p> |  |                              |                             |                             |  |                  |

Sources: The QAT and information the agencies provided to auditors.

Table 2 lists the original and actual completion dates.

Table 2

| Summary of Project Completion Dates  |  |  |   |                        |
|--|--|--|---|------------------------|
| Agency   | Project  | Original Scheduled Start Date <sup>a</sup> | Original Scheduled Completion Date <sup>b</sup> | Actual Completion Date |
| Department of Public Safety  | Enterprise Case Management (ECM) Project                 | September 2, 2013                          | February 28, 2015                               | February 24, 2017      |
| Health and Human Services Commission   | Protecting People in Regulated Facilities (PPRF) Project | September 1, 2013                          | August 31, 2015                                 | May 11, 2017           |
| Texas Department of Transportation   | Pavement Analyst (PA) Project                            | August 6, 2014                             | March 28, 2016                                  | April 30, 2017         |
| <p><sup>a</sup> This column lists the initial project start dates that the agencies reported in their final monitoring reports to the QAT.</p> <p><sup>b</sup> This column lists the estimated project completion dates that the agencies reported in their final monitoring reports to the QAT.</p> |  |  |   |                        |

Sources: The QAT and information the agencies provided to auditors.

In analyzing the three projects, auditors also noted the following:

- Some of the agencies did not always submit their monitoring reports to the QAT within 30 days of the end of the reporting period as the QAT expected.
- Some of the agencies reported an initial estimated project cost that was not the same as the amount that the QAT originally approved.
- Some of the agencies did not always submit accurate quarterly monitoring reports to the QAT.

### *Project Objective and Scope*

The objective of this project was to, in coordination with the Legislative Budget Board and the Department of Information Resources, review and provide an analysis of information resources projects being monitored by the QAT.

The scope of this project covered three major information resources projects that the QAT monitored during May 2017.

# Contents

## *Detailed Results*

---

Chapter 1

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>The Department of Public Safety’s Enterprise Case Management Project</b> ..... | 1 |
|---|---|

Chapter 2

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>The Health and Human Services Commission’s Protecting People in Regulated Facilities Project</b> ..... | 6 |
|---|---|

Chapter 3

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>The Texas Department of Transportation’s Pavement Analyst Project</b> ..... | 10 |
|--|----|

## *Appendix*

---

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Objective, Scope, and Methodology ..... | 14 |
|---|----|

# Detailed Results

Chapter 1

## The Department of Public Safety's Enterprise Case Management Project

---

### Project Summary

As of February 28, 2017

Original:

- End Date: February 28, 2015
- Budget: \$3,720,043

Actual:

- End Date: February 24, 2017
- Expenditures: \$5,636,861

Status: 100 percent complete.

Sources: The QAT and information that DPS provided to auditors.

### Project History / Overview

The purpose of the Enterprise Case Management project (ECM project) at the Department of Public Safety (DPS) was to implement a single system that replaced the multiple investigative, intelligence, and administrative case management systems that were in operation in various DPS divisions. DPS selected the State Police Unified Reporting System (SPURS)—a commercial, off-the-shelf system—as the centralized system for the ECM project.

According to DPS, the SPURS system also (1) provides enhanced intelligence gathering and analysis capabilities, (2) includes a mechanism to track and manage requests for information, and (3) improves searching and case-linking capabilities among DPS divisions.

DPS employees are responsible for a number of active cases, investigations, and case information requests when performing their daily duties. Prior to the ECM project, DPS handled investigations and active cases using a variety of distinct systems that made it difficult to properly share critical information, created redundant information storage, and ultimately limited intelligence analysis capabilities. DPS determined that without the replacement or update of the existing systems, its divisions would continue to struggle to efficiently track and report information and would continue to employ manual processes that were both time-consuming and error prone.

### Project Status

Table 3 on the next page lists the original and actual completion dates for the ECM project.

Table 3

| Project Completion Dates                 |                               |                                    |                        |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project                                  | Original Scheduled Start Date | Original Scheduled Completion Date | Actual Completion Date |
| Enterprise Case Management (ECM) Project | September 2, 2013             | February 28, 2015                  | February 24, 2017      |

Sources: The QAT and information that DPS provided to auditors.

The Quality Assurance Team (QAT) approved the ECM project on June 12, 2013. Due to the final project completion date being revised to February 24, 2017, the project time line was 41.9 months as compared with the originally expected time line of 18.0 months. DPS attributed the project's extended time line to the resolicitation required because of a lack of adequate responses to the initial solicitation, a delay in the process for clarifying criteria for accepting work orders, the addition of the creation of management reports to the project's scope, and DPS's decision to keep the project open until it fully resolved a data back-up issue and completed project close-out documents.

#### Project Costs

Table 4 summarizes both the budgeted and actual expenditures for the ECM project. DPS used the *Business Case Workbook* to estimate costs for this project.

Table 4

| Budgeted and Actual Expenditures for the Enterprise Case Management Project<br>As of February 28, 2017 |                    |                     |                    |  |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--|
| Budget Category  | Original Budget    | Revised Budget      | Total Expended     | Total Expended Compared to Original Budget |
| Agency Personnel Expenditures  | \$ 855,775         | \$ 2,552,643        | \$1,105,136        | \$ 249,361                                 |
| Contract/Consultant Services Expenditures  | 321,000            | 0                   | 1,146,197          | 825,197                                    |
| Other Expenditures (Hardware/Software)   | 2,502,500          | 7,801,700           | 3,385,528          | 883,028                                    |
| Project Contingency  | 40,768             | 73,384              | Not Applicable     | (40,768)                                   |
| <b>Total Project Costs</b>   | <b>\$3,720,043</b> | <b>\$10,427,727</b> | <b>\$5,636,861</b> | <b>\$1,916,818</b>                         |

Sources: The QAT and information that DPS provided to auditors.

At the conclusion of the ECM project, the actual expenditures were more than the originally approved budget. In the original *Business Case Workbook* that it submitted to the QAT on May 8, 2013, DPS initially estimated that the project would cost \$3,720,043. DPS reported that the actual amount expended for the project was \$5,636,861 as of project completion on February 24, 2017. According to the project monitoring reports that DPS submitted to the QAT, the increase in the budget was due to revisions of estimates for project costs and for full-time equivalent (FTE) positions required for the project.

### Project Benefits

According to DPS, the ECM project had the following goals and anticipated outcomes:

- Requiring less resources (for example, hardware, people, and time) to support the system.
- Improving process efficiencies. For example:
  - ♦ Analysts' administrative time will be shortened by elimination of duplicate processes and consolidation of tasks.
  - ♦ Standardized data entry and automated edit checks will improve data integrity and reduce rework and erroneous reporting.
  - ♦ The ability to securely search multiple databases with a single query will improve investigative efficiencies.
- Providing standardization of case management processes across DPS.
- Providing advanced analytic algorithms that allow DPS to discover non-obvious connections in cases, thereby increasing the value of data.
- Allowing the Intelligence and Counterterrorism Division to better manage the growing demand for intelligence-related investigations without increasing headcount.

### Project Demonstration

Auditors attended a demonstration of the SPURS system. According to DPS, the SPURS system's features and functions were operating as intended and providing the expected benefits listed in the project's *Business Case*. Some of the key application functions that DPS demonstrated included:

- The case management component, which contains information on cases, investigations, and intelligence reports.

- The confidential informant management system component, which contains confidential informant information, including criminal affiliations and payment details.
- The documents component, which contains documents and information from previous systems.
- The victim services component, which contains information pertaining to the victims of crimes that DPS investigates.

According to DPS, the SPURS system has provided more streamlined case management and victim services database interfaces, as well as improved efficiencies and standardization of the data-entry processes for the information, which have allowed DPS to reduce the number of contract personnel. The SPURS system also allows DPS to share information among divisions more easily.

In addition, the demonstration showed that the SPURS system allows users to access only the information for which they have been given permission to access, and the SPURS system protects some data and profiles from widespread searching due to certain assigned confidentiality. Every user search and activity is documented in the SPURS system so that DPS can track who is searching what and completing certain tasks within the SPURS system, which helps to ensure that only authorized personnel are performing assigned tasks.

#### Additional Information

During the course of the ECM project, DPS reported that it experienced issues with software defects, delays in user acceptance testing, and scope adjustments that caused the project's end dates to be extended.

During the review of the periodic monitoring reports that DPS submitted to the QAT, auditors noted the following:

- DPS submitted all 15 required monitoring reports to the QAT; however, it did not submit 6 (40 percent) of those 15 reports within 30 days of the end of the reporting period as the QAT expected.
- DPS was consistent in its reporting of the estimated project cost and explanations of any variances in the project cost estimates. However, the initial estimated project cost that DPS reported in its monitoring reports was not the same as the amount that the QAT originally approved.

The QAT requires the *Post-implementation Review of Business Outcomes* report to be submitted six months after a project's completion date; therefore, that final report for the ECM project is required to be submitted by August 24, 2017.

## The Health and Human Services Commission's Protecting People in Regulated Facilities Project

---

|   |
|---|
| <p>Project Summary</p> <p>As of June 16, 2017</p> <p>Original:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ End Date: August 31, 2015</li><li>▪ Budget: \$4,581,203</li></ul> <p>Actual:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ End Date: May 11, 2017</li><li>▪ Expenditures: \$4,397,688</li></ul> <p>Status: 100 percent complete.</p> <p>Sources: The QAT and information that HHSC provided to auditors.</p> |
|---|

### Project History / Overview

The purpose of the Protecting People in Regulated Facilities (PPRF) project was to consolidate and modernize internally developed regulatory services (RS) systems at the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC).<sup>1</sup> The PPRF project would eliminate risks due to expiring technology in the existing RS systems, as well as allow for consistent and reliable maintenance of critical functions.

Prior to the start of the project, the agency identified 16 internally developed systems that would be consolidated during the PPRF project. According to the agency, the intent of the project was to improve processes in the following program areas:

- Nursing, assisted living, and adult day care facilities.
- Intermediate care facilities for individuals with intellectual disabilities.
- Home and community support services agencies.
- Hospice: Home and Community-based services waivers.
- Texas Home Living services waivers.

### Project Status

Table 5 on the next page lists the original and actual completion dates for the PPRF project.

---

<sup>1</sup> The PPRF project started at the Department of Aging and Disability Services and was transferred to the Health and Human Services Commission. In accordance with Senate Bill 200 (84th Legislature), selected programs and services from the Department of Aging and Disability Services were transferred to the Health and Human Services Commission, effective September 2016. The remaining programs and services at the Department of Aging and Disability Services are scheduled to be transferred to the Health and Human Services Commission by September 1, 2017, and the Department of Aging and Disability Services will be abolished.

Table 5

| Project Completion Dates                                 |                               |                                    |                        |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project  | Original Scheduled Start Date | Original Scheduled Completion Date | Actual Completion Date |
| Protecting People in Regulated Facilities (PPRF) Project | September 1, 2013             | August 31, 2015                    | May 11, 2017           |

Sources: The QAT and information that HHSC provided to auditors.

The QAT approved the PPRF project on December 19, 2013. Due to the final project completion date being revised to May 11, 2017, the project time line was 3.4 years as compared with the originally expected time line of 2.0 years. HHSC attributed the extension of the project's time line to challenges and setbacks in the procurement process and to three contract amendments that expanded the scope of the project. In addition, during the course of the project, HHSC adjusted the project time line to more efficiently implement feedback from the end users.

#### Project Costs

Table 6 summarizes the budgeted and actual expenditures for the PPRF project at HHSC.

Table 6

| Budgeted and Actual Expenditures for the Protecting People in Regulated Facilities Project<br>As of June 16, 2017 |                 |                |                |  |
|---|-----------------|----------------|----------------|--|
| Budget Category   | Original Budget | Revised Budget | Total Expended | Total Expended Compared to Original Budget |
| Agency Personnel Expenditures   | \$1,486,220     | Not Revised    | \$ 127,400     | \$(1,358,820)                              |
| Contract/Consultant Services Expenditures   | 3,094,983       | Not Revised    | 3,831,788      | 736,805                                    |
| Other Expenditures (Hardware/Software)  | 0               | Not Revised    | 438,500        | 438,500                                    |
| Total Project Costs   | \$4,581,203     | Not Revised    | \$4,397,688    | \$(183,515)                                |

Sources: The QAT and information that HHSC provided to auditors.

At the conclusion of the PPRF project, the actual expenditures were less than the original budget. The original budgeted amount was \$4,581,203. HHSC reported that the actual amount expended was \$4,397,688 as of June 16, 2017.

## Project Benefits

According to HHSC, the consolidation of 16 systems into 1 Web-based system through the PPRF project was expected to provide a number of benefits, which included:

- Providing centralized system/database management.
- Improving data integrity.
- Eliminating duplicate data entry.
- Reducing maintenance demands on HHSC's information technology resources.
- Providing scheduled system updates (three per year).
- Improving training process.
- Improving data security and compliance with the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.
- Providing enhanced organization of records across teams.
- Providing the ability to enter and/or retrieve data based on a user's roles.

## Project Demonstration

Auditors attended a demonstration of the new system implemented during the PPRF project. According to HHSC, the system's features, functions, and programs are operating as intended. Some of the key functions that HHSC demonstrated included:

- The bed management application for Medicaid bed allocation and deallocation.
- The policy, rules, and curriculum application, including tracking notifications, milestones, proposed project changes, and a change history log.
- The unlicensed assisted living database, which tracks unlicensed homes that have been reported to the State and verified.
- The watch list homes database, which tracks people with license denials, probations, or revocations.

HHSC stated that the new system offers efficiencies in storage and record retention, in addition to increasing data integrity and reliability. HHSC

asserted that the system has greater functionality than the previous systems and can be accessed from any location with Internet access.

For the demonstration, HHSC showed that the new system can automatically draft and retain many of the form letters and reports required by different users. Every user can pull the reports necessary for his or her job function. In addition, each department has “power users” who can create ad hoc reports or new report templates as needed.

HHSC demonstrated that each user had access to information necessary for his or her job, and users could view only the appropriate applications for their roles. During the demonstration, HHSC asserted that the new dashboard streamlines approval processes and enables employees to easily access and track different program activities.

#### Additional Information

During the project, HHSC implemented a new project management approach, referred to as the Hybrid Agile approach, in which the project was broken into small, manageable phases. At the end of each phase, the end users were able to test and give feedback, with their feedback implemented in the next phase.

HHSC submitted all 13 required quarterly monitoring reports to the QAT in a timely manner. However, during the review of the monitoring reports, auditors noted that for 11 (85 percent) of the 13 monitoring reports, HHSC did not appropriately update information from a previous report as required, or it entered “N/A” in a field in which it should have entered a value.

The QAT requires the *Post-implementation Review of Business Outcomes* report to be submitted six months after a project’s completion date; therefore, that final report for the PPRF project is required to be submitted by November 11, 2017.

Project Summary  
As of June 16, 2017

Original:

- End Date: March 28, 2016
- Budget: \$2,933,594

Actual:

- End Date: April 30, 2017
- Expenditures: \$4,985,377<sup>a</sup>

Status: 100 percent complete.

<sup>a</sup> See the Project Costs section of this chapter for additional explanation.

Sources: The QAT and information that TxDOT provided to auditors.

Project History / Overview

The purpose of the Pavement Analyst (PA) project at the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) was to provide a modern pavement management system for TxDOT to optimize decisions about pavement maintenance and rehabilitation. TxDOT reported that its previous Pavement Management Information System was an in-house-developed mainframe application that was difficult to use and support. The federal Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) requires states to develop risk- and performance-based asset management plans, and the legacy system was unable to perform the required analyses.

For the project, TxDOT purchased AgileAssets, Inc.'s Pavement Analyst system (PA system), which is a vendor-hosted software package. The goal of the PA system is improved reliability and accessibility of pavement data. In addition, according to TxDOT, the PA system will allow for the innovative use of tools and automation that reduce cost and variability in reporting, as well as increase the predictability of results.

Project Status

Table 7 lists the original and actual completion dates for the PA project.

Table 7

| Project Completion Dates      |                               |                                    |                        |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project                       | Original Scheduled Start Date | Original Scheduled Completion Date | Actual Completion Date |
| Pavement Analyst (PA) Project | August 6, 2014                | March 28, 2016                     | April 30, 2017         |

Sources: The QAT and information that TxDOT provided to auditors.

The QAT approved the PA project on May 15, 2014. Due to the final project completion date being revised to April 30, 2017, the project time line was 2.7 years as compared with the originally expected time line of 1.6 years. TxDOT attributed the delay in the project's completion to overly aggressive estimates for the original time frame and the addition of functionality to the system throughout the project.

## Project Costs

Table 8 summarizes the budgeted and actual expenditures for the PA project.

Table 8

| Budgeted and Actual Expenditures for the Pavement Analyst Project<br>As of June 16, 2017 |                    |                    |                             |  |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Budget Category  | Original Budget    | Revised Budget     | Total Expended <sup>2</sup> | Total Expended Compared to Original Budget |
| Agency Personnel Expenditures  | \$ 479,594         | \$ 343,585         | Not reported by TxDOT       | \$ (479,594)                               |
| Contract/Consultant Services Expenditures  | 1,960,500          | 2,700,392          | \$3,089,834 <sup>3</sup>    | 1,129,334                                  |
| Other Expenditures (Hardware/Software)   | 493,500            | 924,655            | 1,895,543                   | 1,402,043                                  |
| Project Contingency  | 0                  | 291,908            | 0                           | 0  |
| <b>Total Project Costs</b>   | <b>\$2,933,594</b> | <b>\$4,260,540</b> | <b>\$4,985,377</b>          | <b>\$2,051,783</b>                         |

Sources: The QAT and information that TxDOT provided to auditors.

At the conclusion of the PA project, the actual expenditures were more than the originally approved budget. In the original *Business Case Workbook* that it submitted to the QAT on June 20, 2014, TxDOT initially estimated that the project would cost \$2,933,594. As of June 16, 2017, TxDOT reported to auditors that the actual amount expended for the project was \$4,985,377.<sup>2</sup> According to the project monitoring reports that TxDOT submitted to the QAT, the increases in the budget were due to (1) added scope and complexity, (2) extension of the project's time line, and (3) extension of the vendors' contracts during the testing phase.

## Project Benefits

According to TxDOT, the PA system was expected to provide a number of benefits, which included:

- Maximizing overall pavement conditions with limited funding resources.
- Improving asset inventory management and providing more accurate and comprehensive asset inventory information.

<sup>2</sup> TxDOT did not track and report agency personnel expenditures for the PA Project as the QAT required. As a result, the total project cost reported may be understated.

<sup>3</sup> This amount includes \$724,812 in non-project/operational costs for the contractor's onsite support during the pilot and rollout phases of the project; however, non-project/operational costs are typically not included in the actual project costs.

- Improving reporting capabilities, which will enable TxDOT to derive maximum return on funding allocated for highway maintenance.
- Improving data accuracy, which will reduce the chance of errors and increase data accuracy and reliability.
- Providing user-friendly, in-house reporting functions; ability to generate a four-year plan; and increased details about asphalt quality within districts.
- Bringing TxDOT into compliance with state and federal regulations. Noncompliance with federal regulations could mean a loss of federal funds.

### Project Demonstration

Auditors attended a demonstration of the PA system. According to TxDOT, the PA system's features and functions are operating effectively and as intended. The demonstration included several reporting and mapping features that previously were either unavailable or significantly more time-consuming. Specifically, the PA system allows TxDOT to:

- Instantly report on pavement quality every 1/10th of a mile.
- Report on pavement quality history for 20 years.
- Provide photos of pavement and generate color-coded maps of road quality from data.
- Generate a four-year plan using different predictions.

### Additional Information

TxDOT submitted all 12 required monitoring reports to the QAT. However, during the review of the monitoring reports, auditors noted the following:

- TxDOT did not submit 2 (17 percent) of those 12 reports within 30 days of the end of the reporting period as the QAT expected.
- The three different initial estimated project cost amounts that TxDOT reported in its monitoring reports were not the same as the amount that the QAT originally approved.
- One (8 percent) of the 12 monitoring reports was unsigned by any TxDOT project staff, and 2 additional reports included signatures but were not signed by a project manager.

- TxDOT did not consistently and accurately report the current/last estimated completion date and the current/last estimated project cost from one monitoring report to the next.

The QAT requires the *Post-implementation Review of Business Outcomes* report to be submitted six months after a project's completion date; therefore, that final report for the PA project is required to be submitted by October 30, 2017.

# Appendix

## Objective, Scope, and Methodology

---

### Objective

The objective of this project was to, in coordination with the Legislative Budget Board and the Department of Information Resources, review and provide an analysis of information resources projects being monitored by the Quality Assurance Team (QAT).

### Scope

The scope of this project covered three major information resources projects that the QAT monitored during May 2017. Those three projects were:

- The Department of Public Safety's Enterprise Case Management project.
- The Health and Human Services Commission's Protecting People in Regulated Facilities project.
- The Texas Department of Transportation's Pavement Analyst project.

### Methodology

Auditors used professional judgement, in consultation with the QAT, to select three major information resources projects that were complete or nearing completion for further review.

The agencies self-reported the project information presented in this report to auditors and the QAT. The State Auditor's Office did not independently verify the accuracy of the information that the agencies reported or perform any data reliability work.

Information collected and reviewed included the following:

- Documentation that the agencies submitted to the QAT for the selected projects, including:
  - ♦ Acquisition Plans.
  - ♦ Business Cases.
  - ♦ Business Case Workbooks.
  - ♦ Statewide Impact Analyses.

- ♦ Project Plans.
- ♦ Monitoring reports.

Procedures and tests conducted included the following:

- Conducted interviews with key personnel involved in the projects.
- Reviewed project-related, self-reported documentation that the agencies submitted to the QAT.
- Observed demonstrations of the completed major information resources systems.

Criteria used included the following:

- Texas Government Code, Chapter 2054.
- Title 1, Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 216.
- The Department of Information Resources' *Texas Project Delivery Framework*.
- General Appropriations Act (84th Legislature).

### **Project Information**

Fieldwork was conducted from May 2017 through June 2017. This project was a non-audit service; therefore, the information in this report was not subject to all of the tests and confirmations that would be performed in an audit. However, the information in this report was subject to certain quality control procedures to help ensure accuracy.

The following members of the State Auditor's staff performed the audit:

- Steven Michael Summers, CPA, CISA, CFE (Project Manager)
- Allison Fries
- Joseph Smith, MBA, MS, CISA
- Richard Wyrick, MBA
- Michelle Ann Duncan Feller, CPA, CIA (Quality Control Reviewer)
- Robert G. Kiker, CGAP (Quality Control Reviewer)
- Hillary Eckford, CIA (Audit Manager)

Copies of this report have been distributed to the following:

### **Legislative Audit Committee**

The Honorable Dan Patrick, Lieutenant Governor, Joint Chair  
The Honorable Joe Straus III, Speaker of the House, Joint Chair  
The Honorable Jane Nelson, Senate Finance Committee  
The Honorable Robert Nichols, Member, Texas Senate  
The Honorable John Zerwas, House Appropriations Committee  
The Honorable Dennis Bonnen, House Ways and Means Committee

### **Office of the Governor**

The Honorable Greg Abbott, Governor

### **Department of Public Safety**

Members of the Board of Public Safety  
Mr. Steven Mach, Chair  
Mr. Manny Flores, Jr.  
Ms. Faith Johnson  
Ms. Cynthia Leon  
Mr. Randy Watson  
Mr. Steve McCraw, Director

### **Health and Human Services Commission**

Mr. Charles Smith, Executive Commissioner

### **Texas Department of Transportation**

Members of the Texas Transportation Commission  
Mr. Tryon D. Lewis, Chair  
Mr. Jeff Austin, III  
Mr. J. Bruce Bugg, Jr.  
Ms. Laura Ryan  
Mr. Victor Vandergriff  
Mr. James Bass, Executive Director



This document is not copyrighted. Readers may make additional copies of this report as needed. In addition, most State Auditor's Office reports may be downloaded from our Web site: [www.sao.texas.gov](http://www.sao.texas.gov).

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, this document may also be requested in alternative formats. To do so, contact our report request line at (512) 936-9500 (Voice), (512) 936-9400 (FAX), 1-800-RELAY-TX (TDD), or visit the Robert E. Johnson Building, 1501 North Congress Avenue, Suite 4.224, Austin, Texas 78701.

The State Auditor's Office is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or disability in employment or in the provision of services, programs, or activities.

To report waste, fraud, or abuse in state government call the SAO Hotline: 1-800-TX-AUDIT.