



**Audit Recommendations  
Follow-Up Report  
For the Period April 1, 2012  
Through June 30, 2012**

**Project # 12-24**

**Prepared by  
Office of Inspector General**

**J. Timothy Beirnes, CPA, Inspector General  
Ann E. Haga, Executive Assistant**



# SOUTH FLORIDA WATER MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

## Memorandum

**To:** Governing Board Members

**From:** J. Timothy Beirnes, CPA, Inspector General  
Office of Inspector General

**Date:** September 5, 2012

**Subject:** Audit Recommendations Follow-Up Report -  
For the Period April 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012  
Project No. 12-24

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "JTB", is located to the right of the "From:" field.

---

This audit was performed pursuant to the Inspector General's authority set forth in Section 20.055, F.S. Enclosed is the subject report that was conducted to assess the progress made in implementing audit recommendations.

In our efforts to continue to improve the audit process we utilize an audit recommendations tracking database as an integral part of monitoring the implementation status of audit recommendations. This database contains the basic audit information and recommendations. This system provides us with a vehicle to communicate and gather feedback on the status of the audit recommendations with the Governing Board, District management, and the audited organizational units.

Should you have any questions concerning the enclosed report, please feel free to call me at (561) 682-6398.

C: Melissa Meeker  
Robert Brown  
Deena Reppen  
Carolyn Ansay

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>EXHIBIT 1: Summary of Recommendations Status .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>EXHIBIT 2: Reports With Implementation of Recommendations in Progress .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>EXHIBIT 3: Detail of In-Process and Partially Implemented Audit Recommendations .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>EXHIBIT 4: Status of Recommendations Not Fully Implemented.....</b>	<b>12</b>

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Audit recommendations target the economy and efficiency of District operations and compliance with our policies and statutory responsibilities. Our recommendations also focus on providing District management with suggestions that facilitate their achievement of program goals and objectives. To be effective, audit recommendations must be implemented. Additionally, *Government Auditing Standards* require following up on audit recommendations in previously issued audit reports. Accordingly, the Office of Inspector General has performed follow-up audit work since the office was established in 1996. Every quarter our office surveys departments to determine the implementation status of recommendations and to encourage their completion. This information is maintained in the Inspector General's audit recommendation tracking database. The system allows each audit staff member to update the recommendation's "status" after reviewing information provided by the departments and offices.

This report on the implementation status of audit recommendations is for the period April 1, 2012 through June 30, 2012 (the "Reporting Period"). As shown in Exhibit 1, as of April 1, 2012 there were six (6) recommendations that were not yet Fully Implemented, consisting of four (4) that were In-Process and two (2) that were Partially Implemented. Since then, one (1) of the recommendations has been fully implemented and three (3) have been Partially Implemented.

During the Reporting Period, nine (9) recommendations were added from three (3) newly issued reports. As of June 30, 2012, four (4) of these recommendations have been Fully Implemented. In total from all reports, there are currently 10 recommendations that are In-Process of being implemented or have been Partially Implemented as of June 30, 2012.

---

There were no recommendations changed to the “No Longer Applicable” status during the current Reporting Period. The “No Longer Applicable” category includes items where conditions have changed subsequent to issuance of the audit report that rendered the recommendation no longer relevant, such as:

- Alternative compensating controls have been put in place.
- A decision was made to implement a new system that will address the issue making it impractical to retrofit the existing system.
- The policy, statute, or rule has changed.
- Change in strategic direction.

No recommendations fell into the “Not Implemented” category for the current and the previous report.

Following is a brief description of the attached exhibits:

- **Exhibit 1:** This Exhibit displays a summary of recommendation statuses for all audit reports with recommendations in process of implementation. Exhibit 1 also shows the changes in the status of recommendations from the beginning of the period to the end of the period.
- **Exhibit 2:** This Exhibit shows a summary of the changes in the status of recommendations by each audit report. Exhibit 2 shows only those audit reports that contained one or more recommendations that had not been fully implemented at the beginning of the reporting period.
- **Exhibit 3:** This exhibit displays detail information regarding the status of each audit recommendation. This includes the status of the recommendation for the prior reporting period and the status at the end of the current period. The comment column provides narrative information regarding implementation progress.
- **Exhibit 4:** This exhibit is a report printed directly from our Access database that contains additional information.

# EXHIBIT 1

## Summary of Recommendations Status

As of June 30, 2012

	In	Partially	
<b>Prior Period Reports</b>	<b>Process</b>	<b>Implemented</b>	<b>Total</b>
Status Prior Period (March 31, 2011)	4	2	6
Implemented or Partially Implemented During Period	(4)	3	(1)
Remaining Recommendations to be Fully Implemented	-	5	5
<b>Reports Issued During Current Period</b>			
New Recommendations*	9	-	9
Implemented or Partially Implemented	(4)	-	(4)
Remaining Recommendations to be Fully Implemented	5	-	5
<b>Current Status</b>			
<b>Remaining Recommendations to be Fully Implemented</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>

\* Initial Status is set as "In-Process"

**EXHIBIT 2**  
**Audit Reports With Implementation of Recommendations in Progress**  
**As of June 30, 2012**

Audit No.	Audit Title	No. of Recs		In Process	Partially Implemented	No Longer Applicable	Implemented	
	<b>Recommendations - Prior Period Reports</b>							
08-09	Review of Internal Controls Over Fuel Inventory	5	Initial Status	0	1	0	4	Open
			Change in Status	0	0	0	0	
			Current Period Status	0	1	0	4	
09-23	Audit of the SAP Solutions Center	15	Initial Status	3	1	0	11	Open
			Change in Status	-3	2	0	1	
			Current Period Status	0	3	0	12	
10-07	Audit of the RECOVER Program	4	Prior Period Status	1	0	0	3	Open
			Change in Status	-1	1	0	0	
			Current Period Status	0	1	0	3	
	<b>Recommendations - Report Issued During Current Period</b>							
11-05	Audit of the Disaster Recovery Plan	7	Initial Status	7	0	0	0	Open
			Change in Status	-4	0	0	4	
			Current Period Status	3	0	0	4	
11-09	Audit of the Water Quality Program	1	Initial Status	1	0	0	0	Open
			Change in Status	0	0	0	0	
			Current Period Status	1	0	0	0	
11-19	Post Implementation Review of the District's ePermitting System	1	Initial Status	1	0	0	0	Open
			Change in Status	0	0	0	0	
			Current Period Status	1	0	0	0	
	<b>Recommendations - All Reports</b>							
	<b>TOTAL</b>	33	Prior/Initial Status	13	2	0	18	
			Change in Status	-8	3	0	5	
			Status Current Period	5	5	0	23	
	<b>Number of Recommendations Remaining to Be Fully Implemented</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>			

Prior Period = As of March 31, 2012

**EXHIBIT 3**  
**Detail of In-Process and Partially Implemented Audit Recommendations**  
As of June 30, 2012

Audit No.	Rec No.	Audit Title	Status Prior Report	Status Current Report	Due Date		Recommendation	Management Response	Current Period Comments Regarding Status
					Original	Revised			
08-09	2	Review of Internal Controls Over Fuel Inventory	Partially Implemented	Partially Implemented	9/30/2009	3/30/2014	Implement physical security measures that were identified by Emergency/Security Management.	Fencing repairs will be done in FY2010. New fences will be deferred to future years due to FY2010 budget constraints. For security systems, we will coordinate with Security Management to have them budget for these systems in future years.	The fencing for the north shore pump station (i.e. 127, 129, 131, 133, and 193) has been added to the trash rake projects at each of the site and all construction will be completed by the end of FY14. If the schedule for the North Shore pump station projects extends beyond FY14, the Okeechobee FS will separately install fencing to provide the physical security for the fuel tanks at these stations. Due to funding constraints, estimated completion date is now 3/30/2014.
09-23	3	Audit of the SAP Solutions Center	Partially Implemented	Implemented	12/31/2010	6/30/2012	Develop a three year SAP Strategic Plan for maintenance that flows logically into the District Business Strategic Plan.	Management agrees.	An SAP Solutions Center Strategic Plan has been completed. As a separate effort, as a part of the IT Bureau Strategic Planning process, critical elements of the SAP Solution's strategic plan will be incorporated into the IT Bureau Strategic Plan.
09-23	4	Audit of the SAP Solutions Center	In Process	Partially Implemented	9/30/2013	9/30/2013	Use benchmarking and industry standards to determine appropriate staffing levels and expenditures. This should include partnering with Information Technology for knowledge transfer and additional FTE's.	Management agrees.	Six contractors have been eliminated with an additional 3 scheduled to roll off at the end of August, 2012. This will leave a total of 7 contractors on the SAP Solutions Center for the 2013 fiscal year. All open positions for full time employees (FTEs) have been filled - there are no vacancies in the SAP Solutions Center as of this date.



Audit No.	Rec No.	Audit Title	Status Prior Report	Status Current Report	Due Date		Recommendation	Management Response	Current Period Comments Regarding Status
					Original	Revised			
09-23	11	Audit of the SAP Solutions Center	In Process	Partially Implemented	9/30/2013	9/30/2013	Plan for all contractors within the SAP Solutions Center to shadow a full time employee and to roll off after a maximum of two years of service.	Management concurs with the spirit of this recommendation. Converting contract support to FTEs where appropriate and cost effective will be pursued. For certain specialized functions, or short term needs contractual support will likely continue to be needed into the future.	Six contractors have been eliminated with an additional 3 scheduled to roll off at the end of August, 2012. This will leave a total of 7 contractors in the SAP Solutions Center for the 2013 fiscal year. All open positions for full time employees (FTEs) have been filled. There are no vacancies in the SAP Solutions Center as of this date. The development of a training plan, that includes knowledge, transfer from contractors will be completed by August 15 and implemented before the end of the current fiscal year. The workload plan for FY13 for SAP Solutions Center staff will include a percentage of all staff time to be allocated to training and knowledge transfer activities.
09-23	12	Audit of the SAP Solutions Center	In Process	Partially Implemented	9/30/2013	9/30/2013	Roll the existing contractors off based on the current five year SAP contract and use the IT Department's Project Management Office (PMO) for project management instead of contractors. Bring the total resources down to between 5 to 9 consultants within a 9 month window.	Management again concurs with the spirit of this recommendation. Converting contract support to FTEs where appropriate and cost effective will be pursued. For certain specialized functions, or short term needs contractual support will likely continue to be needed into the future.	Six contractors have been eliminated with an additional 3 scheduled to roll off at the end of August, 2012. This will leave a total of 7 contractors in the SAP Solutions Center for the 2013 fiscal year. All open positions for full time employees (FTEs) have been filled- there are no vacancies in the SAP Solutions Center as of this date.
10-07	1	Audit of the RECOVER Program	In Process	Partially Implemented	10/31/2011	2/28/2013	Develop jointly with the USACE an updated RECOVER Program Management Plan as required by the CERP Master Program	Agree. A draft PMP update has been submitted and circulated with the expectation that the Design Coordination Team (a partnership with the Corps) will review in May. Following comments, it is expected that the PMP will be finalized by October 2011.	District staff made our last edits to the RECOVER PMPs and sent them back to the USACE on April 26. Since that time the USACE has reorganized their RECOVER group and the finalization of the PMPs are tied up until they finish reassigning staff.

Audit No.	Rec No.	Audit Title	Status Prior Report	Status Current Report	Due Date		Recommendation	Management Response	Current Period Comments Regarding Status
					Original	Revised			
11-05	1	Audit of the Disaster Recovery Plan	In Process	Implemented	6/1/2012	6/1/2012	Consider replacing the alternate data center at the Network Access Point of the Americas in Miami, the Backup Control Center at the Fort Lauderdale Service Center, and the Backup Emergency Operation Center at the Okeechobee Service Center with one location. Consider a location 105 miles away from District Headquarters and the feasibility of using other Water Management District's facilities in a reciprocity type arrangement.	Concur. The Information Technology Bureau will consider replacing the current alternate data center at the Network Access Point in Miami with a multi-purpose facility located at least 105 miles away from the District Headquarters. To accomplish this, we will write a Business Case that will summarize the attributes of each option to allow the business to make the selection decision. Upon completion, this information will be forwarded to District senior management for funding consideration. Completion of the Business Case will be completed by June 1, 2012. In addition to funding, a multi-purpose facility concept must have agreement between Information Technology, Emergency Management and Operations Control for the purpose and use of such a facility. Emergency Management has been in contact with the Emergency Management Director for the Department of Environmental Management (DEP) regarding meeting with the other water management districts on a variety of emergency management issues. We will place this item on the agenda for discussion during the upcoming meeting. This meeting will be completed by June 1, 2012	The Information Technology Bureau has completed the Business Case and concluded that the other water management districts have limited infrastructure resources to support the District's requirements. In addition, it would be costly to retrofit these facilities to work as a secondary Data Center. In addition, Emergency Management already has adequate alternate EOC facilities located at the St. Cloud Service Center and the new Okeechobee Service Center, and therefore, has determined that there is no additional requirement for a combined EOC/Data Center location.
11-05	2	Audit of the Disaster Recovery Plan	In Process	Implemented	6/1/2012	6/1/2012	Continue using primary and secondary Information Technology employees to execute the Disaster Recovery Plan. Consider requiring internal customers to create the business requirements and test the functionality.	Concur. The Information Technology (IT) Bureau will continue to use primary and secondary Information Technology employees to execute the Disaster Recovery plan where there is sufficient staff and skill set available. We will request the involvement of the business community in the disaster testing process at an early stage and during the Disaster Recovery test to ensure their specific needs are addressed and tested, and to increase our resilience to a disaster's impact. We will also request that internal customers create the business requirements. Information Technology is planning an IT-only Disaster Recovery test involving our remote site by February 4th 2012, and a more comprehensive test involving our remote site plus relevant IT customers by June 1st 2012.	Disaster Recovery Test completed using primary and secondary personnel as well as some users for testing SAP.

Audit No.	Rec No.	Audit Title	Status Prior Report	Status Current Report	Due Date		Recommendation	Management Response	Current Period Comments Regarding Status
					Original	Revised			
11-05	3	Audit of the Disaster Recovery Plan	In Process	Implemented	6/10/2012	6/10/2012	Consider integrating all disaster tests to a single Disaster Recovery Strategic Plan.	Concur. The Emergency Management Section is responsible for District-wide emergency management planning activities using an "all hazards" approach. The two primary planning documents related to this recommendation are the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) and the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP). Each of these plans have a specific language to address disaster recovery strategic planning activities. To better ensure the importance of emergency procedures associated with the alternate data center, Emergency Management will add specific language related to this topic to both the COOP and CEMP. This information will be added by June 1, 2012. Each year during the Hurricane Freddy Exercise the Emergency Management Services Section designs the exercise scenario to test and validate identified plans, procedures and activities. We have in the past and will continue to build in exercise goals and objectives related to this recommendation. The Hurricane Freddy Exercise is scheduled for June 5th and 6th in 2012. Prior to the exercise we will test the Network Access Point data transfer capabilities and the results will be included in the Freddy After Action Report.	A full disaster recovery failover and failback test was conducted June 15th through June 16th. This was an overall very successful disaster recovery exercise. As mentioned previously, the results will be included in the Hurricane Freddy After-Action Report.
11-05	4	Audit of the Disaster Recovery Plan	In Process	In Process	5/31/2014	5/31/2014	Consider assigning the responsibility of coordinating a single Disaster Recovery Plan to an appropriate District Project Manager outside of the Information Technology Bureau.	Concur. Emergency Management has this responsibility currently. Plans are developed in the Emergency Management Section that has District-wide application. However, each Bureau/Section within the District is responsible for developing operational procedures that will explain "how" these plans will be executed. Each of these groups has Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) Coordinators that work very closely with Emergency Management to ensure conformity and applicability with umbrella District-wide plans. Emergency Management reviews procedures and meets with the SOP Coordinators periodically. Emergency Management will continue to work with the IT Bureau to ensure applicable emergency plans and procedures are updated and tested.	Emergency Management has this responsibility and is in the process of updating the Disaster Recovery Plan. When completed, the Plan will be distributed for the development of all Bureau's Suggested Operating Procedures (SOPs).

Audit No.	Rec No.	Audit Title	Status Prior Report	Status Current Report	Due Date		Recommendation	Management Response	Current Period Comments Regarding Status
					Original	Revised			
11-05	5	Audit of the Disaster Recovery Plan	In Process	Implemented	3/30/2012	3/30/2012	Consider incorporating the single Disaster Recovery Plan into the Business Continuity Plan.	Concur. As required by Florida Statutes, Chapter 282: Communications and Data Process is an Annex to the District's Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP). The IT Bureau will provide the Information Technology Disaster Recovery Plan to Emergency Management for review. Emergency Management will review this Annex to determine what additional information should be included to strengthen the COOP.	Information Technology has provided Emergency Management the Disaster Recovery Plan.
11-05	6	Audit of the Disaster Recovery Plan	In Process	In Process	7/27/2012	9/15/2012	Consider creating a Disaster Recovery Risk Management Oversight Team that defines critical business systems on an annual basis. The District's risk tolerance should be determined to establish what functions are mission critical to resume District operations.	Concur. The Information Technology Bureau will champion this activity to the leadership team as part of other Information Technology Steering Committee matters to be considered. We will recommend that this body address the subject of Disaster Recovery prioritization at least once per year. The District's Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (CEMP) allows the Director of Emergency Management to appoint an Emergency Management Advisory Committee. Emergency Management is in the process of assembling this Committee. As part of the committee structure we will add representative(s) from the IT Bureau to ensure these recommendations are addressed. The Committee will be assembled and meet by April 15, 2012. The committee will review the information and make recommendations to the IT Bureau Chief and Emergency Management Director by July 27, 2012.	Emergency Management's Advisory Committee, which includes representation from the Executive Team, Information Technology, Water Operations, Legal as well as Bureau Chiefs met on Wednesday, August 22, to review and prioritize all Bureau's critical business systems. Systems were identified from information gathered from Organizations' Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP) which identified critical and/or mission essential functions and the systems/data needed to support these functions. Additionally, the Advisory Committee will identify the acceptable Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and the Recovery Point Objective (RPO) before causing impacts and/or consequences to District operations. If additional funding is required to implement the Committee's recommendations, Information Technology will present the costs to the District's Senior Management for resolution. The final recommendations from the Committee and/or Senior Management will then be updated in the District's COOP Plan and disseminated through SOP Coordinators to the various Bureaus.

Audit No.	Rec No.	Audit Title	Status Prior Report	Status Current Report	Due Date		Recommendation	Management Response	Current Period Comments Regarding Status
					Original	Revised			
11-05	7	Audit of the Disaster Recovery Plan	In Process	In Process	9/30/2012	9/30/2012	Determine an updated, accepted Recovery Time Objective and a Recovery Point Objective for the single Disaster Recovery Plan.	Concur. The Information Technology Bureau will provide definitions of Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and Recovery Point Objective (RPO) to the Emergency Management Advisory Committee (see recommendation 6) and ask that defining acceptable measures for the District's business recovery be assigned. In general, RTO is the duration of time and a service level within which a business process must be restored after a disaster in order to avoid unacceptable consequences, or the acceptable amount of time to restore the function. The RPO is the maximum tolerable period in which data might be lost from an IT service due to a major incident. The business leadership team will ultimately set the RTO and RPO metrics to fit within the available resources. The RPO time period and the RTO time duration will be completed and included along with Audit Recommendation #4 and #6. When recommended by the IT Bureau, Emergency Management will provide the information to the Emergency Management Advisory Committee for final approval. Once approved, the information will be provided to the Emergency Management Director for inclusion in appropriate planning documents	The Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and the Recovery Point Objective (RPO) recommendations were established by the Emergency Management Advisory Committee on August 22nd. Information Technology will review these recommendations and evaluate whether or not they are feasible based on available resources. If feasible, recommendations will be included in the appropriate emergency management planning documents. If not feasible, Information Technology will present recommendations and their consequences to Senior Management for resolution.

Audit No.	Rec No.	Audit Title	Status Prior Report	Status Current Report	Due Date		Recommendation	Management Response	Current Period Comments Regarding Status
					Original	Revised			
11-09	1	Audit of the Water Quality Program	In Process	In Process	6/30/2012	6/30/2012	Resolve Compliance Monitoring Tracking (CMT) Database issues and ensure implementation in a timely manner.	The Compliance Monitoring Tracking (CMT) database is currently in operation and is used to track water quality monitoring sites, mandates, monitoring parameters and generate reports. It is also ultimately intended to be used to track hydrologic and meteorological monitoring sites and stations, responsible stakeholders & programs, mandates, and generate reports. Functionality issues have been identified which need resolution in order for the CMT to better meet the needs of the Permit Acquisition & Compliance, Water Quality Monitoring and Hydro Data Management Sections. Since the original user requirements were developed for the CMT in 2005, the complexity and volume and volume of permits, permit modifications and compliance issues has increased. A CMT user group will be convened to revisit the user requirements and work with the Information Technology Department to prioritize system refinements, subject to available staff and budget resources.	A CMT User's group was convened including members from the Permit Acquisition and Compliance, Water Quality, Hydro Data Management Sections, and IT Bureau. Several meetings have been held defining and prioritizing the multiple user requirements. The system is currently being populated, reports are being generated, and outstanding open issues are under consideration by the User's Group.
11-19	1	Post Implementation Review of the District's ePermitting System	In Process	In Process	5/31/2014	5/31/2014	Determine whether the existing contract worker's skill set will be needed on a permanent on-going basis, and if so, consider replacing the contract worker with a District staff.	The Information Technology Bureau agrees that the contract worker's skill set will be needed on a permanent on-going basis. As a mandated (FS Ch 288.109) application that is public facing there will be a need to maintain the application, implement software updates, and develop potential enhancements. The application was created using contract workers with specific programming skills. These skill-sets are in the process of being developed among District staff through redirection of vacancies and recruitment of the necessary level of skills.	Vacant FTE positions have been reclassified as Principle IT Developers to allow recruitment of the needed skill levels to maintain this application on an ongoing basis. The positions are posted, candidates are in the process of being phone screened and interviews are pending. Corresponding contractors were removed from the annual recurring IT budget and will only be funded as needed for knowledge transfer during part of FY13.

## Exhibit 4

### Status of Recommendations Not Fully Implemented

Audit No.	Audit Name		
Recommendation	Current Status		Auditor's Comment
<b>08-09</b>	<b>Review of Internal Controls Over Fuel Inventory</b>		
# 2	Implement physical security measures that were identified by Emergency/Security Management.	<b>Partially Implemented</b>	The fencing for the north shore pump station (i.e. 127, 129, 131, 133, and 193) has been added to the trash rake projects at each of the site and all construction will be completed by the end of FY14. If the schedule for the North Shore pump station projects extends beyond FY14, the Okeechobee FS will separately install fencing to provide the physical security for the fuel tanks at these stations. Due to funding constraints, estimated completion date is now 3/30/2014.
	Original Due Date: 9/30/2009		Auditor Update: 9/5/2012
	Revised Due Date: 9/30/2014		
<b>09-23</b>	<b>Audit of the SAP Solutions Center</b>		
# 4	Use benchmarking and industry standards to determine appropriate staffing levels and expenditures. This should include partnering with Information Technology for knowledge transfer and additional FTE's.	<b>Partially Implemented</b>	Six contractors have been eliminated with an additional 3 scheduled to roll off at the end of August, 2012. This will leave a total of 7 contractors on the SAP Solutions Center for the 2013 fiscal year. All open positions for full time employees (FTEs) have been filled - there are no vacancies in the SAP Solutions Center as of this date.
	Original Due Date: 9/30/2013		Auditor Update: 9/5/2012
	Revised Due Date: 9/30/2013		
# 11	Plan for all contractors within the SAP Solutions Center to shadow a full time employee and to roll off after a maximum of two years of service.	<b>Partially Implemented</b>	Six contractors have been eliminated with an additional 3 scheduled to roll off at the end of August, 2012. This will leave a total of 7 contractors in the SAP Solutions Center for the 2013 fiscal year. All open positions for full time employees (FTEs) have been filled. There are no vacancies in the SAP Solutions Center as of this date. The development of a training plan, that includes knowledge, transfer from contractors will be completed by August 15 and implemented before the end of the current fiscal year. The workload plan for FY13 for SAP Solutions Center staff will include a percentage of all staff time to be allocated to training and knowledge transfer activities.
	Original Due Date: 9/30/2013		Auditor Update: 9/5/2012
	Revised Due Date: 9/30/2013		

<b>Audit No.</b>	<b>Audit Name</b>
------------------	-------------------

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Auditor's Comment</b>
<b># 12</b> Roll the existing contractors off based on the current five year SAP contract and use the IT Department's Project Management Office (PMO) for project management instead of contractors. Bring the total resources down to between 5 to 9 consultants within a 9 month window.  Original Due Date: 9/30/2013 Revised Due Date: 9/30/2013	<b>Partially Implemented</b>	Six contractors have been eliminated with an additional 3 scheduled to roll off at the end of August, 2012. This will leave a total of 7 contractors in the SAP Solutions Center for the 2013 fiscal year. All open positions for full time employees (FTEs) have been filled- there are no vacancies in the SAP Solutions Center as of this date.  Auditor Update: 9/5/2012

<b>10-07</b>	<b>Audit of the RECOVER Program</b>
--------------	-------------------------------------

<b># 1</b> Develop jointly with the USACE an updated RECOVER Program Management Plan as required by the CERP Master Program Management Plan.  Original Due Date: 10/31/2011 Revised Due Date: 2/28/2013	<b>Partially Implemented</b>	District staff made our last edits to the RECOVER PMPs and sent them back to the USACE on April 26. Since that time the USACE has reorganized their RECOVER group and the finalization of the PMPs are tied up until they finish reassigning staff.  Auditor Update: 9/5/2012
--	------------------------------	---

<b>11-05</b>	<b>Audit of the Disaster Recovery Plan</b>
--------------	--

<b># 4</b> Consider assigning the responsibility of coordinating a single Disaster Recovery Plan to an appropriate District Project Manager outside of the Information Technology Bureau.  Original Due Date: 4/12/2012 Revised Due Date: 5/31/2014	<b>In Process</b>	Emergency Management has this responsibility and is in the process of updating the Disaster Recovery Plan. When completed, the Plan will be distributed for the development of all Bureau's Suggested Operating Procedures (SOPs).  Auditor Update: 9/5/2012
<b># 6</b> Consider creating a Disaster Recovery Risk Management Oversight Team that defines critical business systems on an annual basis. The District's risk tolerance should be determined to establish what functions are mission critical to resume District operations.	<b>In Process</b>	Emergency Management's Advisory Committee, which includes representation from the Executive Team, Information Technology, Water Operations, Legal as well as Bureau Chiefs met on Wednesday, August 22, to review and prioritize all Bureau's critical business systems. Systems were identified from information gathered from Organizations' Continuity of Operations Plans (COOP) which identified critical and/or mission essential functions and the systems/data needed to support these functions. Additionally, the Advisory Committee will identify the acceptable Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and the Recovery Point Objective (RPO) before causing impacts and/or consequences to District operations. If additional funding is required to implement the Committee's recommendations, Information Technology will present the costs to the District's Senior Management for resolution. The final recommendations from the



Audit No.	Audit Name		
Recommendation	Current Status	Auditor's Comment	
<p>Original Due Date: 7/27/2012</p> <p>Revised Due Date: 9/15/2012</p>		<p>Committee and/or Senior Management will then be updated in the District's COOP Plan and disseminated through SOP Coordinators to the various Bureaus.</p> <p>Auditor Update: 9/5/2012</p>	
<p><b># 7</b> Determine an updated, acceptable Recovery Time Objective and a Recovery Point Objective for the single Disaster Recovery Plan.</p>	<b>In Process</b>	<p>The Recovery Time Objective (RTO) and the Recovery Point Objective (RPO) recommendations were established by the Emergency Management Advisory Committee on August 22nd. Information Technology will review these recommendations and evaluate whether or not they are feasible based on available resources. If feasible, recommendations will be included in the appropriate emergency management planning documents. If not feasible, Information Technology will present recommendations and their consequences to Senior Management for resolution.</p>	
<p>Original Due Date: 9/30/2012</p> <p>Revised Due Date: 9/30/2012</p>		<p>Auditor Update: 9/5/2012</p>	
<b>11-09</b>	<b>Audit of the Water Quality Program</b>		
<p><b># 1</b> Resolve Compliance Monitoring Tracking (CMT) Database issues and ensure implementation in a timely manner.</p>	<b>In Process</b>	<p>A CMT User's group was convened including members from the Permit Acquisition and Compliance, Water Quality, Hydro Data Management Sections, and IT Bureau. Several meetings have been held defining and prioritizing the multiple user requirements. The system is currently being populated, reports are being generated, and outstanding open issues are under consideration by the User's Group.</p>	
<p>Original Due Date: 6/30/2012</p> <p>Revised Due Date: 6/30/2012</p>		<p>Auditor Update: 9/5/2012</p>	
<b>11-19</b>	<b>Post Implementation Review of the District's ePermitting System</b>		
<p><b># 1</b> Determine whether the existing contract worker's skill set will be needed on a permanent on-going basis, and if so, consider replacing the contract worker with a District staff.</p>	<b>In Process</b>	<p>Vacant FTE positions have been reclassified as Principle IT Developers to allow recruitment of the needed skill levels to maintain this application on an ongoing basis. The positions are posted, candidates are in the process of being phone screened and interviews are pending. Corresponding contractors were removed from the annual recurring IT budget and will only be funded as needed for knowledge transfer during part of FY13.</p>	
<p>Original Due Date: 5/31/2014</p> <p>Revised Due Date: 5/31/2014</p>		<p>Auditor Update: 9/5/2012</p>	