



QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM

◆ Comptroller of Public Accounts ◆ Department of Information Resources ◆

◆ Legislative Budget Board ◆ State Auditor's Office ◆

TO: Governor Greg Abbott
Lt. Governor Dan Patrick
Legislative Budget Board Members
Speaker Joe Straus

FROM: Glenn Hegar, Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts
Stacey Napier, Executive Director, Department of Information Resources
Ursula Parks, Director, Legislative Budget Board
Lisa R. Collier, CPA, CFE, CIDA, First Assistant State Auditor, State Auditor's Office

DATE: December 1, 2017

SUBJECT: 2017 Quality Assurance Team Annual Report

The attached report is the Quality Assurance Team Annual Report on monitored major information resources projects at Texas state agencies. Projects are assessed to determine if they are operating on time and within budget and scope. The analysis is provided by the Quality Assurance Team (QAT) pursuant to the Texas Government Code, Section 2054.1183, and the Eighty-fifth Legislature, General Appropriations Act (House Bill 1), 2018–19 Biennium, Article IX, Section 9.01 and 9.02.

The QAT, which includes representatives of the Comptroller of Public Accounts, Department of Information Resources, Legislative Budget Board, and the State Auditor's Office (advisory member), is charged with overseeing the development of major information resources projects.

An electronic version of the report is available at qat.state.tx.us. If you have any questions, please contact Robert Wood of the Comptroller of Public Accounts at (512) 463-3973, Tom Niland of the Department of Information Resources at (512) 475-4700, Richard Corbell of the Legislative Budget Board at (512) 463-1200 or Michael Clayton of the State Auditor's Office at (512) 936-9500.

Attachments

Annual Report

OVERVIEW OF MAJOR INFORMATION RESOURCES PROJECTS REPORTED TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM

December 2016 to November 2017



Quality Assurance Team

Comptroller of Public Accounts

Department of Information Resources

Legislative Budget Board

State Auditor's Office

December 1, 2017

Table of Contents

FACTS AND FINDINGS	3
DISCUSSION	4
BACKGROUND	4
PROJECT PERFORMANCE OBSERVATIONS	5
OBSERVATIONS AND TRENDS.....	5
OBSERVATION 1: DURATION AND BUDGET OF PROJECTS	5
OBSERVATION 2: TIMEFRAME OF PROCUREMENT ACTIVITIES	5
OBSERVATION 3: CANCELED PROJECTS.....	6
QAT-MONITORED PROJECTS' STATUS.....	7
COMPARISON OF 2016 AND 2017 PROJECT PERFORMANCE.....	10
PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS DURING THE 2016–17 BIENNIUM.....	10
ADDITIONAL QAT OVERSIGHT INITIATIVES	11
BEST PRACTICES USED BY AGENCIES.....	12
CONCLUSION.....	13
APPENDIX A	14
CONTACT	20

OVERVIEW OF MAJOR INFORMATION RESOURCES

PROJECTS REPORTED TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM

The Quality Assurance Team (QAT), which as of September 1, 2017, includes representatives from the Comptroller of Public Accounts (CPA), the Department of Information Resources (DIR), the Legislative Budget Board (LBB), and the State Auditor's Office (SAO) (advisory member). The team monitored 77 major information resources projects during the December 2016 to November 2017 reporting period. Of these projects, 28 are expected to exceed their original planned duration by more than 10 percent. Nine of these 28 are expected to exceed their initial budgets by more than 10 percent. See Appendix A for additional information¹.

QAT oversees the state's technology project portfolio, which is a single view of all agency major information resources projects. The term major information resources project is statutorily defined in the Texas Government Code, Title 10, Chapter 2054 and in general includes projects with expected development costs of more than \$1.0 million. From December 2016 to November 2017, the QAT provided process improvement strategies to state entities that manage the projects in the portfolio.

FACTS AND FINDINGS

- ◆ From December 2016 to November 2017, the state's technology project portfolio included 77 projects with an estimated total cost of \$1.5 billion. Seventeen of these projects were approved and scheduled to begin on or after September 1, 2017.
- ◆ 46 of the 77 projects are currently within both original planned duration and planned costs.
- ◆ The number of projects in the portfolio and their estimated costs have remained consistent since last year's annual report.
- ◆ Four projects were canceled since last year's annual report.
- ◆ When establishing project milestones, agencies do not always allocate enough time for identifying project requirements, completing procurement activities, contract reviews and conducting user-acceptance testing.
- ◆ Projects with a shorter development schedule (less than 28 months) are meeting their initial cost and duration estimates at a higher rate relative to projects with longer durations.
- ◆ As of November 2017, 21 projects were reported to be complete or near completion. 10 of the 21 projects (48 percent) of the projects were within 10 percent of original budget and duration.

¹ Appendix A includes all projects and identifies the initial and current estimated costs and the initial and current estimated durations for these projects.

DISCUSSION

Staff from the CPA, DIR, LBB and SAO serve in a joint capacity on the QAT. CPA was added to the team effective September 1, 2017. QAT reviews and monitors state agency major information resources projects; identifies potential major information resources projects from the Biennial Operating Plans of agencies; monitors the status of major information resources projects monthly or quarterly; and provides feedback on agencies' framework deliverables. If the project includes a contract, and the value of that contract changes by more than 10 percent, QAT must approve the contract amendment for it to be valid. Also effective September 1, 2017, agencies issuing contracts for major information technology projects with an expected value greater than \$10 million must obtain prior written approval of the contract from QAT for it to be valid.

BACKGROUND

QAT functions pursuant to the Texas Government Code, Chapter 2054, and the Eighty-fifth Legislature, General Appropriations Act, 2018–19 Biennium (Senate Bill 1), Article IX, Section 9.01 and 9.02. QAT approves, monitors, and reviews major information resources projects. Since its inception, the team has published annual reports that provide the status of these projects.

Each member of the team provides staff with expertise in system development, budgeting, and contracting.

DIR's Texas Project Delivery Framework (framework) is required for use during delivery of major information resources projects as defined in the Texas Government Code, Chapter 2054, Information Resources, and for certain major contracts. DIR's framework includes the following phases:

- initiate;
- plan;
- execute;
- monitoring and control; and
- closing.

LBB staff specify procedures for the submission, review, approval, and disapproval of Biennial Operating Plans and amendments, including procedures for review or reconsideration of the LBB's disapproval of a Biennial Operating Plan or its amendments.

CPA staff review contract solicitations and project framework deliverables.

SAO recuses itself from making recommendations and participating in additional oversight initiatives related to contracting contained in this report. This is necessary to ensure that the SAO maintains its independence so that future audits of contracts and amendments overseen by QAT can be conducted in accordance with professional auditing standards.

Major Information Resources Projects

Pursuant to the Texas Government Code, Chapter 2054, a major information resources project is:

- any information resources technology project identified in a state agency's Biennial Operating Plan whose development costs exceed \$1.0 million and that:
 - requires one year or longer to reach operations status,
 - involves more than one state agency, or
 - substantially alters the work methods of state agency personnel or the delivery of services to clients; and
- any information resources technology project designated by the Legislature in the General Appropriations Act as a major information resources project.

Chapter 2054 does not apply to institutions of higher education that do not submit a Biennial Operating Plan.

Part of this work includes QAT requests for additional information from agencies to facilitate more comprehensive project analyses. For example, QAT may request an updated version of a Project Plan from an agency to better understand a project's revised scope. Additionally, QAT may require an agency to submit third-party reports, including independent verification and validation reports, when the project is reviewed. Such reports can serve as crucial sources of insight to evaluate IT project risks. Finally, QAT intends to continue its practice of requesting SAO to perform project reviews. These reviews have provided valuable input to QAT from an independent perspective.

PROJECT PERFORMANCE OBSERVATIONS

From December 2016 to November 2017, the state's technology project portfolio included 77 projects totaling \$1.5 billion. Seventeen of these projects were approved and scheduled to begin after September 1, 2017. The number of projects and estimated project costs have remained consistent since last year's annual report.

Since the 2016 QAT annual report, SAO performed project reviews involving three agencies on behalf of the QAT. QAT selected the projects for review based on risks and completion. Results of these reviews were published in SAO's report, *A Report on Analysis of Quality Assurance Team Projects* (SAO Report No. 17-047, August 2017).

OBSERVATIONS AND TRENDS

QAT observations and trends are based on self-reported information as of November 2017. Information reported for projects that are ongoing may change as their implementation progresses.

Although QAT provides oversight for major information resources projects, agencies are ultimately responsible for the successful delivery of their projects.

The following trends and statistics apply to 47 projects that were 30 percent or more complete as of November 2017. Typically, projects that exceed planned duration are more likely to exceed their budget as well, whereas projects within schedule tend to remain closer to the initial budget. (See **Figure 2.**)

Observation 1: Duration and Budget of Projects

Projects with a shorter development schedule were more likely to meet both their current cost and duration as indicated by the following:

- 32 of 47 projects (68 percent) had an initial duration of 27 months or less; two of these 32 (one percent) projects exceeded their initial cost and duration estimates by more than 10 percent; and
- 15 of 47 projects (32 percent) had an initial duration of 28 months or more; six of these 15 projects (40 percent) exceeded their initial cost and duration estimates by more than 10 percent.

Longer projects with initial estimated costs of more than \$10.0 million were less likely to be implemented within budget and duration. Seven of 47 projects (15 percent) have an initial duration of 28 months or more and are expected to cost more than \$10.0 million; seven of these projects exceeded initial cost estimates by an average of 80 percent with a range from 20 percent to 207 percent.

Observation 2: Timeframe of Procurement Activities

Using an acquisition plan can help maintain a project schedule by establishing a realistic timeframe to solicit and manage procurements, which can prevent delays because of vendor evaluation and selection. All specifications, software, hardware, training, installation, and maintenance must be addressed in contract negotiations to minimize delays in executing contracts. Some agencies have reported that the average time for completing procurement activities has exceeded initial estimates by four to five months.

Agencies should ensure that an acquisition plan contains sufficient detail regarding the overall structure of a project. Details should include milestone categories, the types of contractual relationships, and procedures for managing the

contract. Also, standards should be clearly specified for projects from the earliest stages of the planning phase. This includes identifying system components and their operating environments. Finally, agencies should consider the following factors to select the appropriate contracting vehicles:

- whether the solution can be provided by vendors or partners;
- the extent to which the work is well-defined;
- how the project risk will be shared;
- the importance of the task to the schedule; and
- the need for certainty with regards to the project cost.

Agencies should prepare the Request for Proposal (RFP) consistent with state law, the Texas Procurement Manual, and the Contract Management Guide. Generally, an RFP is recommended when factors other than price are to be considered or when objective criteria cannot be defined. Agency procurement staff should be consulted to help determine a reasonable timeline for the procurement process, keeping in mind the agency's evaluation process and executive sign-off procedures for major purchases. For contracts that are expected to exceed \$10 million in value, agencies are encouraged to notify QAT early in the process to prevent unnecessary delay in the final contract review. When evaluating vendors that bid on contracts, it is important to evaluate their past performance and current financial status. The final vendor selection should be made using the original approved selection criteria, including end user feedback.

Finally, Data Center Services (DCS) agencies should engage the DCS team before posting a solicitation to determine appropriate solicitation language; provide for better long-term network planning; and seek exemptions from the State Data Center if necessary.

Observation 3: Canceled Projects

There were four projects canceled in the state's technology project portfolio. Three projects were canceled due to a shift in agency priorities. Another project was canceled because the agency did not renew the contract beyond fiscal year 2016. These projects may be re-initiated, leveraging the infrastructure already procured or using parts of the system already developed.

- Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) canceled the Texas Data Exchange (TDEx) project. The agency awarded the contract for TDEx with a current on-site vendor. Since the agency canceled the project they also canceled the contract with the vendor. Although maintenance and support was the vendor's responsibility, Law Enforcement Support within the agency assumed oversight responsibilities and provides a Project Manager and Contract Monitor for project oversight. Before canceling the project, DPS spent approximately \$400,000 on project costs, and the project was estimated to be 40 percent complete at the time of cancellation.
- DPS canceled the DLIP Self-Service Enhancements project due to external factors and competing needs for budget within the agency. It was anticipated that DPS planned to contract with an external vendor to place self-service kiosks in driver license offices across the state. Consequently, the scope of the project and the adaptation of existing web-services such as fingerprinting, photography, signature capture, vision testing, and payment capabilities would be taxing on current agency resources. According to the agency, the project did not expend any material funding, and the agency will retain all of the project documentation in anticipation of reviving the initiative in the future.
- Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) canceled the Electronic Scheduling System for SSLCs vendor hosted Electronic Scheduling System (ESS). The agency reports the project was canceled as a directive from Assistant Commissioner for State Supported Living Centers. HHSC states the remaining funds allocated for this effort will be reallocated to ensure SSLCs have adequate direct care. Before

canceled the project, HHSC spent approximately \$77,000 on the project, and it was estimated to be 18 percent complete.


- Department of Aging and Disability Services (DADS) canceled the State Supported Living Centers (SSLC) Document Management System (DMS) project on February 23, 2017 before implementation could begin. The system was not implemented at the facilities. Therefore, there are no actual realized performance measurement results for this system. There are no specific federal or state mandates related to the creation or implementation of the SSLC DMS project. The effort was for business process improvements for resident care and support. Before canceling the project, DADS spent approximately \$38,400 on the project, and was estimated to be 11 percent complete.

QAT-MONITORED PROJECTS' STATUS

Figures 1 and 2 show the status of QAT-monitored projects that were 30 percent complete or more as of November 2016 and November 2017, respectively. Each circle on the two graphs represents a project. Fewer projects are exceeding their original estimated costs and durations (26 percent in 2016 compared to 17 percent in 2017). Projects that are less than 30 percent complete are not included in this analysis because these projects may still be in the planning phase.

Figure 1 shows the 47 projects that were reported as 30 percent or more complete as of November 2016. Observations made during project oversight are included.

FIGURE 1
STATUS OF QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM-MONITORED PROJECTS, AS OF NOVEMBER 2016




NOTES:

- (1) Each circle on the graph represents a project that was at least 30 percent complete.
- (2) 16 of the 47 projects, or 34%, are currently on or under their original estimated cost AND original estimated duration (green circles).
- (3) 19 of the 47 projects, or 40%, are currently exceeding their original estimated cost OR original estimated duration (yellow circles).
- (4) 12 of the 47 projects, or 26%, are currently exceeding their original estimated cost AND original estimated duration (red circles).

SOURCE: Agency self-reported monitoring reports.

Figure 2 shows the 47 projects that were reported as 30 percent or more complete as of November 2017. Observations made during project oversight are included.

FIGURE 2
STATUS OF QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM-MONITORED PROJECTS AS OF NOVEMBER 2017



NOTES:

- (1) Each circle on the graph represents a project that was at least 30 percent complete (47 out of 77 projects). It is assumed that a project within 10% of its budget or schedule is considered successful. If greater than 10% the dots will change color. See Appendix A for further information on each project.
- (2) 21 of the 47 projects, or 44%, are currently on or under their original estimated cost AND original estimated duration (green circles).
- (3) 18 of the 47 projects, or 39%, are currently exceeding their original estimated cost OR original estimated duration (yellow circles).
- (4) 8 of the 47 projects, or 17%, are currently exceeding their original estimated cost AND original estimated duration (red circles).

SOURCE: Agency self-reported monitoring reports.

The Texas Government Code, Section 2054.151, states that “[t]he legislature intends that state agency information resources and information resources technology projects will be successfully completed on time and within budget and that the projects will function and provide benefits in the manner the agency projected in its plans submitted to the department and in its appropriations requests submitted to the legislature.”

The position of each project in **Figures 1 and 2** is determined by comparing each project's current cost and duration to its initial cost and duration estimates. The initial cost and duration estimates were included in the agency's submission of its business case for project approval by QAT.

Figures 1 and 2 do not include other project performance criteria such as product quality, end-user experience, and the extent to which the system or project satisfies the requirements. Similar types of criteria are currently available in other documents such as the Execution Capability Assessment, Technical Architecture Assessment and the Post-Implementation Review of Business Outcomes reports.

Beginning in January of 2018, QAT will expand project measurements to include scope and quality as required by the Texas Government Code, Section 2054.159. These additional performance indicators will be established in the Texas Administrative Code by DIR after public comment and input from stakeholders.

Comparison of 2016 and 2017 Project Performance

For projects reporting 30 percent or more completion as of November 2016, 34 percent were within their original estimated cost and original estimated duration. For projects reporting 30 percent or more completion as of November 2017, 32 percent were within their original estimated cost and original estimated duration. This consistency may be attributed to the following reasons:

- agencies' allowing reasonable timeframes related to procurement activities;
- more time spent on developing initial costs, benefits, quality and scope;
- projects being managed in correlation to the agency project management office;
- waiting for further releases before incorporating new requirements an existing project;
- agencies thoroughly identifying system requirements;
- agencies breaking up large-scale system replacement projects into multiple smaller-scale projects.

QAT is beginning to monitor more projects with shorter durations. Durations of three years are becoming common for projects, as information technology often becomes obsolete after that time. Despite this trend, a new large-scale system could have a development duration of five or more years. QAT has observed these large-scale projects are the most likely to be over-budget and behind in schedule.

PROJECT HIGHLIGHTS DURING THE 2016–17 BIENNIUM

As previously mentioned, projects lasting less than 28 months were more likely to be successful (i.e., meet their cost and duration estimates). Some examples of successful projects monitored by QAT during fiscal year 2017 include:

- Texas Parks and Wildlife's Department (TPWD) Managed Lands Deer Program (MLDP) was designed to promote deer herd population stability as well as conservation and habitat management. TPWD currently administers the program through the Texas Wildlife Information Management Services online system. This project saw TPWD create a new application: 1) to conform to regulation changes affecting the program that will require more automation and customer inputs beginning with the 2017/18 hunting season; 2) to provide TPWD teams and customers with the spatial capability to describe properties; and 3) to automatically calculate permits issued based on property size and deer density. TPWD began the Managed Lands Deer Program project in fiscal year 2016. Throughout the development lifecycle, the agency monitored and exercised due diligence in performing action items related to the mitigation of risks and

Post-implementation Review of Business Outcomes

A Post-implementation Review of Business Outcomes (PIRBO) describes the expected benefits and outcomes compared to the realized benefits and outcomes of implementing a major information resources project. In that report, the agency also identifies the lessons it learned that can be used to improve agency-level or state level processes.

The agency must submit a PIRBO to QAT within six months after a project has been completed.

A second PIRBO must be submitted two years after project completion.

managing project changes as they were introduced. The initial estimated project cost was \$1,016,000. The project was successfully completed within budget and duration.

- Texas Workforce Commission modified and configured the agency's existing PeopleSoft Financials Contracts Module to provide greater efficiency, tracking, and visibility. This included incorporating necessary Health and Human Services Commission's Contract Administration and Tracking System functionality into the contracts module in PeopleSoft Financials. This project used the agency's standard risk management process. The project manager was responsible for ensuring the team identified risks and carried out risk mitigation plans. Each risk avoidance or mitigation action was incorporated into the overall project plan. The initial project start and finish dates were September 7, 2016, and September 29, 2017, respectively. The project was successfully completed within budget and duration.

Large technology projects that require longer than 27 months to complete are complex, and often require multiple components to be designed and integrated into a tailored solution. An example of this complexity includes the following:

- The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) is developing a new Pavement Management Information System (PMIS) to replace an outdated in-house mainframe application. TxDOT began the Pavement Analyst (PA) Project in fiscal year 2014. The initial estimated project cost was \$2,654,085. The initial project start and finish dates were August 6, 2014, and March 28, 2016, respectively. The project is 91 percent over cost and 57 percent over duration. The finish date for the project was extended three times, to September 30, 2016, due to the need for parallel testing with the existing system. In December 2016, the agency extended the project again to March 31, 2017 due to TxDOT activating a change request to extend Project Management oversight. Finally, in February 2017, the agency extended the completion date to April 30, 2017 due to the extension of support to maintain the Production PA system. Final project costs are estimated to be \$4,985,378. While the project was underway there were two changes to the project. The current mapping system (separate from PMIS) was determined to be at its end of life. The agency decided to replace the functionality of the old mapping system with a new solution, MapZapper. After the project was operational, several users requested unique reports from PA which extended the completion date.

ADDITIONAL QAT OVERSIGHT INITIATIVES

As of September 1, 2017, as required by Senate Bill 1910, Eighty-fifth Legislature, Regular Session, agencies must submit an execution capability assessment to determine its capability for implementing the project. The intent is to reduce agencies' financial risk, and to increase the probability of the successful project implementation. Additionally, agencies must perform a technical architecture assessment, in consultation with DIR, of the proposed technical architecture for projects to ensure that industry accepted architecture standards in planning for implementation are being utilized.

As required by the 2018–19 General Appropriations Act, Article IX, Section 9.02(b), any contract for the development of major information resources projects with an expected value greater than \$10 million must be reviewed and approved by QAT before it can be executed by an agency. QAT will review the contract to ensure it follows the best practices established in the Texas Contract Management Guide, the State of Texas Procurement Manual, and all applicable rules and regulations. QAT may provide feedback on reviewed contracts, and also reserves the right waive the contract review requirement.

Amendments that increase these contract's value by 10 percent or more require prior written approval from QAT in order to be valid. This requirement also applies if the expected total value of an element in the contract subsequent to the amendment exceeds the total value of the same element in the initial contract awarded by 10 percent or more. QAT may provide feedback on reviewed amendments, and also reserves the right to wave the amendment review requirement.

Agencies must notify QAT when they advertise a request for proposal, request for bid, or other similar process common to participation in the competitive bidding processes for a major information resources project. Additionally, agencies must notify QAT within 10 business days of awarding a contract for a major information resources project greater than or equal \$10 million for QAT review.

As part of continuous process improvement efforts, QAT and DIR are working on several developments to help agencies improve the delivery of projects. **Figure 3** shows these improvements efforts.

FIGURE 3
QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM AND DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION RESOURCES IMPROVEMENTS, AS OF
NOVEMBER 2017

- The Quality Assurance Team (QAT) and the Department of Information Resources (DIR) will emphasize bringing best practices in modern information technology project management outreach and training with agencies using a variety of methods: webinars, one-on-one training, classroom settings, and electronic delivery of content.
- QAT will coordinate information sharing with the Legislative Budget Board Contracts Oversight and Technology Team.
- QAT may require a project demonstration after project deployment.
- The Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 216, which pertains to project management practices, was revised in fiscal year 2016 to help agency project management practitioners perform their jobs more effectively.
- Introduction of the Execution Capability Assessment, which will help reduce the agency's risk in implementing the project.
- Introduction of the Technical Architecture Assessment, which will help ensure an agency is using industry accepted architecture standards in planning for implementation.

SOURCE: Quality Assurance Team.

BEST PRACTICES USED BY AGENCIES

After reviewing agency project frameworks, QAT identified the following best practices that contribute to the success of state agency information systems. To that end, agencies should:

- breaking up large projects into smaller, more manageable projects;
- allocate adequate time to identify project requirements, prepare for procurement activities with vendors, and perform user acceptance testing;
- engage the DCS team before posting a solicitation to determine appropriate solicitation language; provide for better long-term network planning; and seek exemptions if necessary;
- include security planning in the initiation phase of the project; include code review, vulnerability testing and/or scanning into the project plan;
- develop methods for quantifying major information resources project benefits;
- engage an independent verification and validation company for projects greater than \$10.0 million to help oversee complex projects (agency budgets should accommodate the estimated cost);
- retain original estimates on scope and defer new requirements and functionality to a new project or phase at a later time;
- include network performance and capacity planning as part of project scope especially when new types of data (e.g., pdf images of customer files) are being sent to field offices as a result of the project; and
- consider the use of modular contracting to reduce project risk and to incentivize contractor performance while meeting an agency's need for timely access to rapidly changing technology. Modular contracting breaks large systems into small, independent modules of work (developed by one or more vendors) that can

be combined to form a complete system. Agencies can also remediate problems with individual modules or vendors without jeopardizing the success of the entire project.

QAT identified areas for improvement that agencies should use to ensure a consistent method for project selection, control, and evaluation based on alignment with business goals and objectives. Figure 4 shows these areas for improvement.

FIGURE 4
METHOD IMPROVEMENTS FOR AGENCIES IDENTIFIED BY QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM, AS OF NOVEMBER 2017

- Provide adequate time for project procurement activities
- Consider the allowable funding in a given biennium when planning a project and contract.
- Include employee benefit costs as part of full-time-equivalent (FTE) position costs when reporting project costs in monitoring reports.
- Consider requirements and standards in the Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 213, Electronic and Information Resources (EIR) Accessibility, during analysis, design, and testing of software.
- Submit project benefits realization documents on schedule. These documents are often submitted late or are submitted with missing or inadequate information.
- Conduct a thorough analysis of resource availability before submitting a project to agency management for approval; failure to adhere to this practice can lead to unrealistic expectations.
- Submit monitoring reports for a quarter within 30 days after the end of the quarter. Monitoring reports are often submitted late or with inaccurate or inconsistent information.
- Submit a contract amendment change order when change orders or amendments increase the total contract amount by 10 percent or more.

SOURCE: Quality Assurance Team.

CONCLUSION

Throughout quality assurance review, QAT seeks to increase transparency and provide guidance to agencies executing major information resources projects. To this end, QAT provides recommendations to enhance an agency's ability to satisfy commitments made to state leadership. Projects that stay on track allow plenty of time for procurement activities, align scope with approved budgets and defer new requirements until a later phase or new project can be initiated. However, agencies retain ultimate responsibility for project management and success.

To summarize, a critical success factor for projects was the original estimated duration and original estimated cost. Projects that last less than 28 months are projected to meet the estimated cost and/or duration 68 percent of the time, whereas projects lasting more than 27 months are projected to meet the estimated cost and/or duration only 32 percent of the time. QAT will continue to work with agencies and state leadership to execute effective project oversight projects.

APPENDIX A

**MAJOR INFORMATION RESOURCES PROJECTS REPORTED TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM
ORDERED ALPHABETICALLY BY AGENCY**

(Data is self-reported by the agencies. Original budgets do not include operational costs after implementation.)

Expenditures to date are actual expenditures and do not include agency obligation costs.

Colored circles are identified for projects that are reported as 30 percent or more complete as of November 2017.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost OR original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently within 10 percent of the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration.

AGENCY	PROJECT	ORIGINAL BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	CURRENT BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	EXPENDITURES TO DATE (IN MILLIONS)	PERCENTAGE COMPLETE	ORIGINAL ESTIMATED DATES	CURRENT ESTIMATED DATES
Commission on State Emergency Communications	State-level Digital 9-1-1 Network (1)	\$14.7	\$14.7	\$11.5	28%	09/15 to 08/18	09/15 to 08/18
Commission on State Emergency Communications ●	Texas Next Generation 911 Geospatial Database	\$11.3	\$6.1	\$5.5	95%	11/13 to 08/16	11/13 to 09/17
Comptroller of Public Accounts ●	Centralized Accounting Payroll and Personnel System (CAPPS) Performance Management - Agency Deployment FY 17 Project	\$4.4	\$4.4	\$1.8	83%	11/16 to 12/17	11/16 to 12/17
Comptroller of Public Accounts ●	Centralized Accounting Payroll and Personnel System (CAPPS) Financials — Agency Deployment FY17 (2)	\$14.6	\$14.6	\$11.2	99%	09/16 to 10/17	09/16 to 10/17
Comptroller of Public Accounts	Centralized Accounting Payroll and Personnel System (CAPPS) Financials - Agency Deployment FY18	\$15.7	\$15.7	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 10/18	09/17 to 10/18
Comptroller of Public Accounts ●	Centralized Accounting Payroll and Personnel System (CAPPS) Human Resources/Payroll —Agency Deployment FY17 (2)	\$16.2	\$16.2	\$13.4	100%	09/16 to 09/17	09/16 to 09/17
Comptroller of Public Accounts	Centralized Accounting Payroll and Personnel System (CAPPS) Human Resources/Payroll - Agency Deployment FY18	\$17.2	\$17.2	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 09/18	09/17 to 09/18
Comptroller of Public Accounts ●	Enterprise Content Management System OnPrem Implementation	\$4.0	\$4.0	\$3.2	92%	01/16 to 11/17	01/16 to 11/17
Comptroller of Public Accounts	Property Tax System Replacement	\$5.6	\$5.6	\$0.0	0%	01/18 to 11/18	01/18 to 11/18
Comptroller of Public Accounts ●	Unclaimed Property System Replacement	\$5.7	\$3.1	\$0.8	75%	09/15 to 12/17	09/15 to 03/18
Department of Family and Protective Services	Child Care Licensing (CCL) Online Fees and Enforcement Team Conference (ETC)	\$1.1	\$0.8	\$0.0	0%	06/16 to 08/17	06/16 to 11/18

MAJOR INFORMATION RESOURCES PROJECTS REPORTED TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM**ORDERED ALPHABETICALLY BY AGENCY**

(Data is self-reported by the agencies. Original budgets do not include operational costs after implementation.)

Expenditures to date are actual expenditures and do not include agency obligation costs.

Colored circles are identified for projects that are reported as 30 percent or more complete as of November 2017.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost OR original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently within 10 percent of the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration.

AGENCY	PROJECT	ORIGINAL BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	CURRENT BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	EXPENDITURES TO DATE (IN MILLIONS)	PERCENTAGE COMPLETE	ORIGINAL ESTIMATED DATES	CURRENT ESTIMATED DATES
Department of Family and Protective Services ●	Child Care Licensing Automated Support System (CLASS) Child Care Development Project	\$6.0	\$5.3	\$2.9	62%	06/16 to 08/17	06/16 to 01/18
Department of Family and Protective Services	Child Care Licensing Automation Support System (CLASS) Renewal	\$1.7	\$1.4	\$0.3	24%	06/16 to 08/17	06/16 to 04/18
Department of Family and Protective Services ●	Child Protective Services Transformation	\$23.1	\$23.1	\$1.3	30%	10/15 to 02/18	10/15 to 02/18
Department of Family and Protective Services ●	Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) National Rap Back (Record of Arrests and Prosecutions Background) project	\$2.3	\$2.0	\$0.1	42%	06/16 to 08/17	11/16 to 01/18
Department of Family and Protective Services	Information Management Protecting Adults and Children in Texas (IMPACT) System Modernization	\$44.6	\$44.6	\$32.3	27%	09/13 to 02/18	09/13 to 09/18
Department of Family and Protective Services ●	Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act	\$6.2	\$6.2	\$0.02	30%	09/15 to 02/18	09/15 to 09/18
Department of Family and Protective Services ●	Prevention and Early Intervention Replacement (2)	\$4.0	\$3.3	\$2.8	100%	02/16 to 08/17	02/16 to 09/17
Department of Motor Vehicles ●	Application Migration and Server Infrastructure Transformation (AMSIT) Project (2)	\$7.4	\$7.4	\$2.3	100%	01/16 to 08/17	01/16 to 08/17
Department of Motor Vehicles ●	Licensing, Administration, Consumer Affairs and Enforcement Replacement Project	\$6.7	\$11.2	\$11.2	100%	01/13 to 02/16	02/13 to 03/17
Department of Motor Vehicles ●	Registration and Titling System (RTS) Refactoring Project	\$28.2	\$71.6	\$57.0	91%	05/12 to 12/18	05/12 to 12/18
Department of Motor Vehicles ●	WebDealer eTitles Project	\$14.0	\$9.0	\$6.2	92%	09/12 to 06/15	09/12 to 04/18
Department of Motor Vehicles	webLIEN Project	\$3.3	\$3.3	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 08/19	09/17 to 08/19

MAJOR INFORMATION RESOURCES PROJECTS REPORTED TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM**ORDERED ALPHABETICALLY BY AGENCY**

(Data is self-reported by the agencies. Original budgets do not include operational costs after implementation.)

Expenditures to date are actual expenditures and do not include agency obligation costs.

Colored circles are identified for projects that are reported as 30 percent or more complete as of November 2017.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost OR original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently within 10 percent of the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration.

AGENCY	PROJECT	ORIGINAL BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	CURRENT BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	EXPENDITURES TO DATE (IN MILLIONS)	PERCENTAGE COMPLETE	ORIGINAL ESTIMATED DATES	CURRENT ESTIMATED DATES
Department of Public Safety	Advanced Analytics Project	\$2.9	\$7.9	\$0.0	15%	03/17 to 02/19	03/17 to 02/19
Department of Public Safety	Texas Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (TLETS) (3)	\$5.6	\$0.6	\$0.05	25%	06/14 to 05/16	06/14 to 05/18
Department of State Health Services	Emergency Medical Services and Trauma Registry Project	\$1.8	\$1.8	\$0.0	0%	10/17 to 09/19	10/17 to 09/19
Department of State Health Services	HIV2000, Real-time Education and Counseling Network, AIDS Regional Information Evaluation System (HRAR) Implementation Project	\$10.7	\$10.7	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 02/20	09/17 to 02/20
Department of State Health Services ●	Texas Electronic Vital Events Registrar Implementation Project	\$16.6	\$21.1	\$6.6	46%	09/15 to 07/18	09/15 to 07/19
Department of State Health Services	Tuberculosis Human Immunodeficiency Virus Sexually Transmitted Diseases Integrated System (THISIS) Enhancements Project	\$3.7	\$3.7	\$0.0	0%	01/18 to 09/19	01/18 to 09/19
General Land Office	Royalty Reporting and Control 2.0 Project	\$2.5	\$2.5	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 08/19	09/17 to 08/19
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Automate Comprehensive Assessment — Individuals with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (IDD) Project (2)	\$2.0	\$1.6	\$0.9	100%	03/16 to 08/17	04/16 to 08/17
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Clinical Management for Behavioral Health Services (CMBHS) Complete Roadmap Project (2)	\$1.9	\$1.9	\$1.7	100%	12/15 to 08/17	01/16 to 08/17
Health and Human Services Commission	Clinical Management for Behavioral Health Services (CMBHS) Complete Roadmap Phase II Project	\$1.9	\$1.9	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 08/19	09/17 to 08/19
Health and Human Services Commission ●	CMBHS <i>Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders</i> , Fifth Edition (DSM- 5) Modifications	\$2.2	\$2.2	\$1.1	95%	12/15 to 08/17	12/15 to 08/18

MAJOR INFORMATION RESOURCES PROJECTS REPORTED TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM**ORDERED ALPHABETICALLY BY AGENCY**

(Data is self-reported by the agencies. Original budgets do not include operational costs after implementation.)

Expenditures to date are actual expenditures and do not include agency obligation costs.

Colored circles are identified for projects that are reported as 30 percent or more complete as of November 2017.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost OR original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently within 10 percent of the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration.

AGENCY	PROJECT	ORIGINAL BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	CURRENT BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	EXPENDITURES TO DATE (IN MILLIONS)	PERCENTAGE COMPLETE	ORIGINAL ESTIMATED DATES	CURRENT ESTIMATED DATES
Health and Human Services Commission	Clinical Management for Behavioral Health Services (CMBHS) Source Integration Project	\$2.1	\$2.1	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 08/19	09/17 to 08/19
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Cybersecurity Advancement	\$7.0	\$5.8	\$4.1	88%	11/15 to 09/17	11/15 to 03/18
Health and Human Services Commission	Cyber Security Advancement (Transfer from Department of State Health Services)	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$2.2	20%	03/17 to 03/18	03/17 to 03/18
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Department of State Health Services Application Remediation for Data Center Consolidation (DCC) (2)	\$0.7	\$0.7	\$0.4	100%	12/15 to 08/16	12/15 to 08/17
Health and Human Services Commission	Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) and Enterprise Data Governance (4)	\$100.0	\$129.9	\$47.7	28%	04/08 to 04/17	04/08 to 01/22
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Health and Human Services Administrative System for Financials (HHSAS) to CAPPs Financials Upgrade and Enhancement Project	\$14.2	\$11.8	\$7.9	80%	09/15 to 10/17	09/15 to 10/17
Health and Human Services Commission ●	ImmTrac (Immunization Tracking Registry) Replacement Project (2)	\$4.3	\$7.9	\$7.2	100%	06/12 to 03/15	06/12 to 08/17
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Implement Information Security Improvements and Application Provisioning Enhancements 2 (2)	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$1.4	100%	12/15 to 08/17	09/15 to 08/17
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Linking Data for Health Information Quality	\$2.1	\$2.1	\$1.3	74%	10/15 to 09/17	10/15 to 09/17
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Long-term Services and Supports (LTSS) Electronic Interfaces Project (2)	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$0.5	100%	12/15 to 08/17	04/16 to 08/17
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Mental Health CMBHS Youth Empowerment Services (YES) Waiver Batch / Home and Community Based Services—Adult Mental Health (HCBS—AMH)	\$1.8	\$1.9	\$0.7	51%	07/16 to 03/18	09/16 to 03/18
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Mental Health Integration Project (5)	\$7.0	\$7.0	\$3.4	55%	10/15 to 08/17	10/15 to 08/17

MAJOR INFORMATION RESOURCES PROJECTS REPORTED TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM**ORDERED ALPHABETICALLY BY AGENCY**

(Data is self-reported by the agencies. Original budgets do not include operational costs after implementation.)

Expenditures to date are actual expenditures and do not include agency obligation costs.

Colored circles are identified for projects that are reported as 30 percent or more complete as of November 2017.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost OR original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently within 10 percent of the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration.

AGENCY	PROJECT	ORIGINAL BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	CURRENT BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	EXPENDITURES TO DATE (IN MILLIONS)	PERCENTAGE COMPLETE	ORIGINAL ESTIMATED DATES	CURRENT ESTIMATED DATES
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Nursing Facility Specialized Services Tracking System (SSTS) (2)	\$4.6	\$4.6	\$4.3	100%	12/15 to 03/17	12/15 to 08/17
Health and Human Services Commission	Protecting People in Regulated Facilities (PPRF) Regulatory Services Systems Modernization (RSSM) Phase III	\$4.3	\$4.3	\$0.0	0%	08/17 to 10/18	08/17 to 10/18
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Purchased Health Services Unit (PHSU) & Title V Maternal Child Health (MCH) Fee-For-Service Consolidated System Implementation — IBIS (2)	\$3.7	\$8.7	\$8.2	100%	06/12 to 08/14	06/12 to 08/16
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Tuberculosis, HIV, and STD Integrated Systems Improvement Implementation	\$5.0	\$6.9	\$4.5	82%	02/14 to 06/16	02/14 to 04/18
Health and Human Services Commission ●	Women Infants and Children (WIC), WIC Information Network (WIN)	\$24.9	\$76.4	\$63.8	91%	07/06 to 06/10	07/06 to 04/18
Office of Attorney General	Crime Victims' Compensation (CVC) Web Portal Project	\$3.7	\$3.7	\$1.2	24%	06/16 to 10/18	01/17 to 10/18
Office of Attorney General ●	Texas Child Support Enforcement System (TXCSES) Initiative	\$223.6	\$419.6	\$307.5	60%	09/08 to 12/17	09/08 to 12/18
Office of Court Administration	Statewide eCitation System	\$4.8	\$4.8	\$0.3	15%	02/16 to 09/19	02/16 to 09/19
State Office of Administrative Hearings	Integrated Case Management, Case Filing, and Timekeeping System (6)	\$2.1	\$2.1	\$0.0	0%	01/16 to 09/18	01/16 to 09/18
Teacher Retirement System ●	TRS Enterprise Application Modernization	\$96.1	\$114.9	\$104.5	70%	09/11 to 03/17	09/11 to 08/19
Texas Department of Agriculture ●	Menu Analysis and Planning System Project (2)	\$2.5	\$2.6	\$2.6	100%	09/14 to 09/16	09/14 to 08/17
Texas Department of Insurance ●	Document Management System	\$4.0	\$2.4	\$0.1	46%	12/15 to 08/18	12/15 to 08/18
Texas Department of Transportation ●	Bridge Inspection System (2)	\$2.3	\$2.1	\$1.7	100%	06/15 to 11/16	07/15 to 08/17

MAJOR INFORMATION RESOURCES PROJECTS REPORTED TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM**ORDERED ALPHABETICALLY BY AGENCY**

(Data is self-reported by the agencies. Original budgets do not include operational costs after implementation.)

Expenditures to date are actual expenditures and do not include agency obligation costs.

Colored circles are identified for projects that are reported as 30 percent or more complete as of November 2017.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost OR original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently within 10 percent of the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration.

AGENCY	PROJECT	ORIGINAL BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	CURRENT BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	EXPENDITURES TO DATE (IN MILLIONS)	PERCENTAGE COMPLETE	ORIGINAL ESTIMATED DATES	CURRENT ESTIMATED DATES
Texas Department of Transportation ●	Crossroads Replacement Project	\$1.0	\$1.1	\$0.7	60%	01/17 to 04/18	01/17 to 07/18
Texas Department of Transportation ●	Enterprise Content Management	\$18.2	\$5.7	\$3.1	68%	11/15 to 08/18	01/17 to 10/17
Texas Department of Transportation	Enterprise Information Management Project	\$44.9	\$44.9	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 08/19	09/17 to 08/19
Texas Department of Transportation ●	Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) Conversion to Geographic Information System (GIS) (2)	\$6.2	\$5.1	\$4.7	100%	10/10 to 08/12	08/10 to 09/16
Texas Department of Transportation ●	Materials Acceptance Testing (MATS) Project	\$1.2	\$1.2	\$0.9	85%	06/16 to 02/18	08/16 to 02/18
Texas Department of Transportation	Modernize Project and Portfolio Management (MPPM) II Phase 1a, 1b and 2 (7)	\$125.4	\$125.4	\$14.6	13%	08/16 to 08/19	08/16 to 08/19
Texas Department of Transportation ●	Pavement Analyst Project (2)	\$2.7	\$5.0	\$5.0	100%	08/14 to 03/16	09/14 to 03/17
Texas Department of Transportation ●	Texas Environmental Compliance Oversight System (TxECOS) Enhancement II	\$3.8	\$4.1	\$1.5	50%	02/15 to 08/17	02/15 to 07/18
Texas Department of Transportation	TxTag Customer Service Systems and Operations Project	\$80.1	\$80.1	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 09/20	09/17 to 09/20
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department ●	New Managed Land Deer Program Application (2)	\$1.0	\$1.1	\$0.6	100%	09/15 to 08/17	09/15 to 08/17
Texas Railroad Commission	Inspection/Enforcement Tracking and Reporting System Project	\$6.0	\$6.0	\$0.0	0%	12/18 to 09/19	12/18 to 09/19
Texas Workforce Commission ●	Enterprise Contracting System Phase I (2)	\$2.2	\$1.1	\$0.9	99%	09/16 to 09/17	09/16 to 09/17
Texas Workforce Commission	Enterprise Contracting System Phase II	\$1.7	\$1.7	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 08/18	09/17 to 08/18
Texas Workforce Commission	Enterprise Data Warehouse (EDW) Project	\$4.6	\$4.6	\$0.0	0%	12/17 to 11/19	12/17 to 11/19

MAJOR INFORMATION RESOURCES PROJECTS REPORTED TO THE QUALITY ASSURANCE TEAM**ORDERED ALPHABETICALLY BY AGENCY**

(Data is self-reported by the agencies. Original budgets do not include operational costs after implementation.)

Expenditures to date are actual expenditures and do not include agency obligation costs.

Colored circles are identified for projects that are reported as 30 percent or more complete as of November 2017.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently exceeding the original estimated cost OR original estimated duration by more than 10 percent.

● Indicates the project is currently within 10 percent of the original estimated cost AND original estimated duration.

AGENCY	PROJECT	ORIGINAL BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	CURRENT BUDGET (IN MILLIONS)	EXPENDITURES TO DATE (IN MILLIONS)	PERCENTAGE COMPLETE	ORIGINAL ESTIMATED DATES	CURRENT ESTIMATED DATES
Texas Workforce Commission	Short Time Compensation (Shared Work) Portal Project	\$3.0	\$3.0	\$0.0	0%	12/18 to 02/20	12/18 to 02/20
Texas Workforce Commission ●	Treasury Offset Program Benefits (TOP) Project (2)	\$1.8	\$1.8	\$1.1	100%	03/15 to 03/17	03/15 to 03/17
Texas Workforce Commission ●	UI IT Improvement Strategy — Tax Electronic Correspondence (2)	\$1.5	\$1.3	\$1.0	100%	10/13 to 06/15	01/14 to 04/17
Texas Workforce Commission	WorkInTexas (WIT) Project	\$18.4	\$18.4	\$0.0	0%	09/17 to 08/19	09/17 to 08/19
Total Current Project Costs			\$1,487				

NOTES:

- (1) In August 2016, CSEC communicated to QAT that Phase 2 was vastly under estimated regarding the scope. The agency altered Phase 2 to stay within the budget and duration and modified the scope to stay within the fiscal year 2016–17 budget. The modification to Phase 2 has re-purposed the plan for Phase 3 (ESInet Project), and will commence when phase 2 is complete.
- (2) A Post-implementation Review of Business Outcomes report is due within six months of project completion and close-out.
- (3) Current project cost estimates do not meet the threshold to qualify as a major information resources project.
- (4) On September 5, 2014, HHSC announced the cancellation of EDW procurement 529-13-0018. The EDW portion was canceled by the agency and QAT will continue to monitor the EDG portion. The agency has not re-submitted the required Framework for the EDG project.
- (5) The agency determined that the remaining Client Assignment and Registration and Enrollment System (CARE) mainframe functions are ineligible for enhanced federal financial participation. HHSC completed the first phase of the project, Release 1, and moved NorthSTAR clients from the CARE system to the Clinical Management for Behavioral Health System (CMBHS) to comply with the legislatively mandated retirement of the NorthSTAR system.
- (6) The agency placed the project on hold in June 2016 due to staff changes and workload issues. SOAH recently hired a manager to oversee the project and to help prepare a Request for Proposal. The agency plans to begin the project before the end of fiscal year 2017.
- (7) TxDOT terminated the original MPPM project due to the discovery of increased scope and complexity. MPPM II was initiated and is leveraging lessons learned, discovery, and design activities that occurred during MPPM initiative.

SOURCE: Quality Assurance Team information from agency monitoring reports. Original costs and schedule derived from agency business case submission at time of project approval.

CONTACT

An electronic version of the report is available at qat.state.tx.us. If you have any questions, please contact Robert Wood of the Comptroller of Public Accounts at (512) 463-3973, Tom Niland of the Department of Information Resources at (512) 475-4700, Richard Corbell of the Legislative Budget Board at (512) 463-1200, or Michael Clayton of the State Auditor's Office at (512) 936-9500.