



IT PROJECT MONITORING REPORT

**Kansas Department of Labor
OSCAR IT Project
Quarter Ending March 31, 2018**

CURRENT STATUS: CAUTION

**A Report to the Legislative Post Audit Committee
By the Legislative Division of Post Audit
State of Kansas
June 2018**

Legislative Division of Post Audit

The **Legislative Division of Post Audit** is the audit arm of the Kansas Legislature. Created in 1971, the division's mission is to conduct audits that provide the Legislature with accurate, unbiased information on the performance of state and local government. The division's audits typically examine whether agencies and programs are effective in carrying out their duties, efficient with their resources, or in compliance with relevant laws, regulations and other requirements.

The division's audits are performed at the direction of the **Legislative Post Audit Committee**, a bipartisan committee comprising five senators and five representatives. By law, individual legislators, legislative committees, or the Governor may request a performance audit, but the Legislative Post Audit Committee determines which audits will be conducted.

Although the Legislative Post Audit Committee determines the areas of government that will be audited, the audits themselves are conducted independently by the division's professional staff. The division's reports are issued without any input from the committee or other legislators. As a result, the findings, conclusions, and recommendations included in the division's audits do not necessarily reflect the views of the Legislative Post Audit Committee or any of its members.

The division conducts its audit work in accordance with applicable government auditing standards set forth by the U.S. Government Accountability Office. These standards pertain to the auditor's

professional qualifications, the quality of the audit, and the characteristics of professional and meaningful reports. The standards also have been endorsed by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA) and adopted by the Legislative Post Audit Committee.

LEGISLATIVE POST AUDIT COMMITTEE

Senator Rob Olson, Chair
Senator Elaine Bowers
Senator Anthony Hensley
Senator Julia Lynn
Senator Lynn Rogers

Representative Dan Hawkins, Vice-Chair
Representative John Barker
Representative Tom Burroughs
Representative Don Schroeder
Representative Ed Trimmer

LEGISLATIVE DIVISION OF POST AUDIT

800 SW Jackson
Suite 1200
Topeka, Kansas 66612-2212
Telephone: (785) 296-3792
Fax: (785) 296-4482
Website: <http://www.kslpa.org>

Justin Stowe, Legislative Post Auditor

HOW DO I REQUEST AN AUDIT?

By law, individual legislators, legislative committees, or the Governor may request an audit, but any audit work conducted by the division must be directed by the Legislative Post Audit Committee. Any legislator who would like to request an audit should contact the division directly at (785) 296-3792.

The Legislative Division of Post Audit supports full access to the services of state government for all citizens. Upon request, the division can provide its audit reports in an appropriate alternative format to accommodate persons with visual impairments. Persons with hearing or speech disabilities may reach the division through the Kansas Relay Center at 1-800-766-3777. The division's office hours are 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday.



LEGISLATURE OF KANSAS
LEGISLATIVE DIVISION OF POST AUDIT

800 SOUTHWEST JACKSON STREET, SUITE 1200
TOPEKA, KANSAS 66612-2212
TELEPHONE (785) 296-3792
FAX (785) 296-4482
WWW.KSLPA.ORG

June 20, 2018

To: Members, Legislative Post Audit Committee

This report contains the findings from our third monitoring report of the *Kansas Department of Labor OSCAR IT Project (Quarter ending March 31, 2018)*. The audit team included Alex Gard (Principal IT Auditor) and Katrin Osterhaus (IT Audit Manager).

We would be happy to discuss the findings and conclusions presented in this report with any legislative committees, individual legislators, or other state officials.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Justin Stowe". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "J" and "S".

Justin Stowe
Legislative Post Auditor

This work was conducted by Alex Gard, PMP, CISA; and Katrin Osterhaus, PMP, CISA, CISM, CIA, CGAP. If you need any additional information about the findings, please contact Alex Gard at the Division's offices.

Legislative Division of Post Audit
800 SW Jackson Street, Suite 1200
Topeka, Kansas 66612

(785) 296-3792
Website: www.kslpa.org

Overview of the OSCAR Project

The Purpose of the OSCAR Project is to Modernize the State's Workers' Compensation System

Kansas has a traditional workers' compensation program which requires employers to maintain insurance coverage for their employees in the case of workplace accidents. The Department of Labor's current core information system—Biltmore—collects and stores information about workers' compensation insurance and related claims against that insurance. The agency uses information from Biltmore to conduct fraud investigations, hold administrative hearings, and administer the workers' compensation system.

Biltmore has been in production since August 2001 and has become outdated. The system has limited audit and history capabilities, requires manual status updates, and is not integrated with some of the agency's other systems, such as its imaging system. The Department of Labor's Online System for Claims Administration and Research (OSCAR) project will replace and modernize its outdated Biltmore system.

The Current OSCAR Project Started with a Separate Planning Project Called DigiComp

The effort to update the agency's workers' compensation system was split into two parts, which were handled as two distinct projects. The planning process for the workers' compensation modernization project was carved off and handled as its own distinct project, known as DigiComp. DigiComp's overall goals were to identify the new system's requirements and to find a suitable company through the state's request for proposal (RFP) process to build it. The DigiComp project started in early 2014 and was completed in the fourth quarter of 2016 for a cost of about \$580,000. The second "OSCAR" project comprises the actual construction of the new system and is estimated to cost about \$8.3 million.

Splitting large projects into smaller ones is a common practice, and there are several reasons why an agency might do this. Smaller projects with short timelines are easier to manage than larger projects with a long timeline. If a large multi-year project does not have a dedicated funding source, splitting it up into multiple parts can allow the agency to be more agile with its finances. Finally, it can be less expensive for an agency to make changes to a project's scope or schedule when the project is smaller.

***We Selected the
OSCAR Project for
Continuous Monitoring
Due to its Criticality
and Cost***

K.S.A. 46-1135, directs our office to conduct continuous audits of ongoing information technology projects by state agencies, including systems development and implementation. Our primary objective is to identify, as early as possible, when a project is at risk of failure due to scope, schedule, cost, or quality problems, and to communicate that risk to the appropriate level of project leadership, legislative bodies, or other stakeholders to get those projects back on track. Our secondary objective is to evaluate whether monitored IT projects have adequately planned for the implementation of required security controls.

In December 2016, we selected the OSCAR project from a total of 25 planned and active projects by state agencies. We chose the OSCAR project for several reasons, including the project’s estimated cost, its criticality for the department and its stakeholders, and the failure of the department’s previous unemployment insurance modernization project—which was ultimately cancelled in 2011.

Our Monitoring Reports Evaluate the System Development and Implementation Status of the Selected Project

Authorized under K.S.A. 46-1135, our audits of ongoing information technology projects evaluate the health of the project regarding system development and implementation, and the project's adherence to relevant state statutes, Information Technology Executive Council (ITEC) policies and guidelines, Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO) templates and instructions for IT projects, and international project management standards and guidelines.

As part of our monitoring efforts, we reviewed project documentation and read relevant EPMO reports to understand and familiarize ourselves with the project. We also attended key communication meetings (e.g. kickoff, steering committee) from January 1, 2018 through March 31, 2018, and reviewed additional project documents as they became available. Lastly, we interviewed members of the project team and steering committee as necessary.

Due to their continuous nature, these audits are not conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

We provided the draft report to Department of Labor on May 1, 2018. The department's response is included as *Appendix A*.

Page Left Intentionally Blank

LPA Assessment of the OSCAR Project (as of March 31, 2018)

Overall Project Status:
CAUTION

We determined the overall project health for the OSCAR project to be in caution status. We evaluated the project across four major areas: project scope, schedule, cost, and security. Except for security, these areas also are tracked by the Enterprise Project Management Office (EPMO), which has also been referred to as the Kansas Information Technology Office (KITO). *Appendix B* contains a glossary of frequently used abbreviations in this report. The scale below describes the categories we established for our assessment:

- **Satisfactory status:** The project generally meets applicable state laws, policies and guidelines, generally complies with project management best practices, and has no material issues in scope, schedule, cost or quality.
- **Caution status:** The project does not meet several state laws, policies or guidelines, has deviations or unrealistic milestones in scope, schedule, cost, or quality, or has weak or insufficient mitigation plans for known issues which could result in project failure.
- **Unsatisfactory status:** The project is not in compliance with many state laws, policies or requirements, or has scope, schedule, cost, or quality deviations that are sufficiently material and no mitigation plans, thus causing the project to be at significant risk of failure.

Appendix C summarizes the project measurement guidelines established by the Joint Committee on Information Technology. The EPMO uses these measures in its quarterly summary reports to determine whether active projects should be considered in alert or caution status.

The table on the next page provides a summary of our findings through the end of this monitoring period.

The following sections provide more details of our assessment in each of the four major areas we evaluated.

**Kansas Department of Labor's OSCAR Project
Summary of LPA Monitoring Findings as of March 31, 2018**

Area	Summary of Assessment	Satisfactory	Caution	Unsatisfactory	Informational
Scope	During this quarter, OSCAR project staff approved three change requests which affected the project's scope.	x			
Schedule	Performance metrics for the project show work appeared to be behind schedule as of the end of the first quarter because of two outstanding deliverables.		x		
Cost	Performance metrics for the project show spending appeared to be on track as of the end of the first quarter.	x			
Security	Although officials made progress on the system's security plan during this quarter, our review identified some concerns.		x		
	KDOL did not meet its deadlines for additional security-related deliverables.		x		
	Before OSCAR can go live, the Social Security Administration must sign off that certain security requirements have been met.				x

Source: LPA review of project documents, interviews, and attendance of periodic project meetings

***SCOPE:
SATISFACTORY***

During this quarter, OSCAR project staff approved three change requests which affected the project's scope (satisfactory). Potential changes to project scope must go through an established change control process, which is an appropriate project management practice. CapTech briefs the OSCAR steering committee on potential change requests before they are submitted for approval. We reviewed each of the change request documents and verified that they appeared to adequately inform the steering committee of requested modifications to the project scope. OSCAR's approved change requests removed work segments that were originally planned and replaced them with other work segments. Replacement segments came either from work originally planned to be completed later or from a backlog of desired work which was outside the original scope. As discussed in the cost section, the scope changes made during this quarter did not affect the overall project cost.

We did not evaluate which pieces of work were being added to or removed from the project scope or whether the reasoning behind suggested or approved changes was valid. Those decisions rest with the project's steering committee and the change control process. As a result, we are not offering an opinion on those decisions.

We also observed the department's active participation in monitoring the contractor's activities and progress and noted no signs of scope issues thus far. Lastly, the project has an established process to track risks, assumptions, and issues, which helps project management staff identify necessary scope changes.

***SCHEDULE:
CAUTION***

In our report covering the previous monitoring period (ending December 31, 2017), we described an issue with OSCAR's project documentation. Agency officials were working with contractor staff to revise and resubmit its documentation to the EPMO. We verified with agency staff this issue had been resolved.

Performance metrics for the project show work appeared to be behind schedule as of the end of the first quarter because of two outstanding deliverables (caution). The fixed-price contract with CapTech, which promotes timely deliverables, accounts for more than two-thirds of the project costs. During this quarterly monitoring period, the department received and approved two of the four expected deliverables that were scheduled to get completed. The two outstanding deliverables include the project's data migration and cutover plans. Agency officials rejected the originally submitted cutover plan because it was incomplete and CapTech waited for approval on the cutover plan before submitting the data migration plan.

Because of the deliverable delays during this quarter, the project manager's performance metrics, which incorporate the main contractor's work as well as an approximate status of internal and other costs, show the project is about 7% behind schedule.

CapTech staff suggested that the primary system development has not been directly affected by delayed delivery of these two items. We confirmed the steering committee was aware of the delays. Although this issue was resolved based on KDOL accepting the two deliverables May 4, we think delayed deliverables are a risk that KDOL should continue to monitor, considering the project's approaching go live date in November 2018.

COST:
SATISFACTORY

Performance metrics for the project show spending appeared to be on track as of the end of the first quarter (satisfactory). This \$8.3 million project has several cost components, the largest of which is a \$6 million contract with CapTech. The department has made \$3 million in payments to CapTech for 15 deliverables that have been completed and accepted through the end of this monitoring period. Performance metrics show the project is about 3% over budget, which is within accepted limits. As discussed in the scope section, the scope changes during this quarter did not affect the approved cost. We do not have concerns in this area at this point.

SECURITY:
CAUTION

Project management standards include best practices for such things as product quality and management of stakeholders and project staff to help ensure projects have the best chance for success. We review those areas at the start of our monitoring activities and at a higher level throughout the monitoring period. We also specifically review whether project officials appropriately plan for implementing IT security requirements. Concerns we identify in any of these areas are reported in this section.

Although officials made progress on the system’s security plan during this quarter, our review identified some concerns (caution). Best practices recommend evaluating security risks and necessary controls as early in an IT project as possible. This ensures the system will comply with necessary security standards and avoids having to “bolt on” necessary features at the end (often resulting in higher costs).

We identified this issue originally in our previous report (R-17-017.3). In the agency’s response, officials assured us OSCAR’s security plan would be completed by mid-April 2018. The agency worked with OITS to use the state’s newly created security plan blueprint for new projects and provided us with a more than 300-page security plan tailored for OSCAR. We reviewed a draft of that security plan in early April and identified several areas of potential concern:

- **Some areas in the security plan were blank or identified by the document author as incomplete.** This included not only non-technical information like the system function or purpose, but also specific IT controls, such as audit record retention, wireless access restrictions, and authenticator management.

- **Some controls listed as implemented did not include clear descriptions or list individuals responsible for those controls.** Examples of controls without descriptions included establishing configuration settings and establishing an alternate storage site for backup information. An IT control involving remote access was shown as implemented but did not have anyone listed as responsible for the control.
- **Some listed controls appeared to be inconsistent with other sections in the security plan or other project documents.** In one example, a control involving contingency planning was marked “Implemented,” even though the detailed description of the control stated contingency plans would need to be updated to include the OSCAR system. In a second example, a control involving system audit indicated records would be reviewed for certain activities periodically but listed two different intervals for review (“weekly” and “at least monthly”).

We understand that any security plan is a working document that necessarily changes as controls are implemented and adjusted. However, we expected the plan to be in better condition (e.g. provide more explanations or notations on when missing information would be filled in or who is responsible for completing various sections), given the project’s overall schedule and the assurances we received from the agency in our last quarterly report.

Our review was limited to whether the system’s security plan appeared to have been worked through and is largely complete, rather than an assessment of the system’s established IT controls.

KDOL did not meet its deadlines for additional security-related deliverables (caution). In our previous audit report, we were concerned about the lack of progress on the security plan for OSCAR. In its response, agency officials set up several milestones related to system security, including the completion of a system risk assessment and a business impact analysis during this quarter.

Officials told us they had a rough draft of the risk assessment completed by mid-February, but did not finish the assessment until late March, essentially three weeks behind schedule. More importantly, the business impact analysis, slated for completion late March, was still outstanding as of mid-April. Officials indicated they did not meet their milestone due to difficulties in coordinating staff schedules.

Our concerns are two-fold. First, as discussed earlier, IT security should be built in as early as possible and delays of the security-related deliverables may indicate insufficient attention to these activities. Second, delays in building in security controls could lead to difficulties in meeting other project activity deadlines. This

could further compress the schedule and create risk for an on-time completion of the project.

Before OSCAR can go live, the Social Security Administration must sign off that certain security requirements have been met (informational). KDOL validates all social security numbers entered into the system through injury reports to ensure the person with the injury on file is accurate and that an injury is not attributed to the wrong person. The current system includes such validation and the OSCAR system will continue to validate all social security numbers with the federal Social Security Administration (SSA). Because of the connection to the federal program, the SSA requires that certain security requirements are met.

Agency officials are in the process of coordinating their two-stage review with SSA. The initial stage of review requires the agency to complete a detailed questionnaire and attach supporting documentation about its security controls. Agency officials told us the questionnaire can take several weeks to complete. The second stage is an onsite visit by SSA officials, and it includes more questions and walkthroughs. Agency officials are in the process of scheduling the onsite review with SSA officials in advance of the go-live date.

We will continue to monitor the project during the next quarter to ensure IT security efforts make sufficient progress.

APPENDIX A Agency Response

On May 1, 2018, we provided copies of the draft audit report to the Department of Labor. We have incorporated several suggestions or changes based on its informal response. Its formal response is included as this Appendix.

In its response, the agency did not agree with our assessment that the project is in caution status overall. The agency agreed with our assessment that its project schedule is in caution status but disagreed that the project is in caution status in terms of security. We carefully reviewed the agency's response but did not change the project's status. The department disagreed with our caution status for the security component of its project for two reasons.

- **We included concerns about its security plan in this report even though the deadline for the initial draft of the plan was outside the report review period (January 1 – March 31).** In our quarterly report ending December 31, 2017, we alerted the agency that we had not seen significant progress on its security plan. In response to our concerns, the agency assured us the security plan would be completed by April 13, 2018. In reviewing what was available in early April, we noted several issues with the plan, including incomplete, vague, and inconsistent information. We understand the agency's concern that our evaluation was based on a draft product. However, we think our concerns were legitimate even at the draft stage, and we wanted to give the agency the earliest opportunity possible to consider the issues we identified.
- **We included concerns about missed deadlines for additional security-related deliverables based on best practices instead of state requirements.** As part of its argument, agency officials stated we were holding them to deadline requirements and expectations not included in the state's IT requirements. However, we think it is reasonable to evaluate the agency against project management best practices and its own established deadlines in certain cases, and not just against the state's established IT requirements.

We respect and understand the Department's difference of opinion regarding the project's overall status at this point. The primary intent of our project monitoring efforts is to raise potential barriers to a project's success as early as possible. Although doing so may result in a project status that agency officials may consider overly severe, we hope this approach will provide timely and meaningful feedback to the agency, legislators and other stakeholders sooner rather than later.

STATE OF KANSAS

KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
DIVISION NAME
PRIMARY ADDRESS
ALTERNATE ADDRESS
TOPEKA, KS 66603-3182



PHONE: (785) 296-5000
OTHER PHONE
FAX: (785) 296-0000
EMAIL@KS.GOV
WWW.DOL.KS.GOV

GOVERNOR JEFF COLYER, M.D.
LANA GORDON, SECRETARY

May 15, 2018

Legislative Division of Post Audit
800 SW Jackson, Ste 1200
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Director Stowe,

The Kansas Department of Labor received the draft report from Legislative Post Audit on May 4, 2018 for the OSCAR project. We have reviewed the draft report and findings as well as discussed them with Post Audit staff on May 4, 2018 and May 14, 2018, this letter constitutes our official response.

The Kansas Department of Labor (KDOL) does not agree with Legislative Post Audit's (LPA) assessment that the OSCAR project should be in an overall "caution" status for the first quarter of 2018. KDOL gave both email and in-person feedback to LPA staff after the draft report was submitted disputing the overall caution determination. We will articulate that feedback given to LPA here.

KDOL does understand why a schedule caution for this monitoring period was given for the OSCAR project. The two scheduled deliverables, a data migration and cutover plan, were not completed in the first quarter. The OSCAR vendor submitted the revised migration and cutover plans in the second quarter and approved by the KDOL project Steering Committee on Friday May 4. The reason for the delay was due to lack of quality and depth in the original submissions by the vendors. KDOL was not going to accept inferior products from the OSCAR vendor in order to meet a project due date. Those two deliverables are no longer late and that should address the schedule caution status going forward.

KDOL does dispute the quality caution status for the first quarter report. First, the due date for the initial draft of the OSCAR System Security Plan was April 11, which is out of scope for the review period (January 1- March 31). Second, within the Kansas State Security Policy (7230A) there is no specific requirement for exact milestone dates to be identified in order to meet policy standards for an information system project. The transactional functionality (security related) is included within the documentation and approval of the "user stories" innate within the OSCAR application developed by KDOL and the vendor across 9 project tracks completed by the end of quarter one (e.g., KO-34 claimant lookup internal has a security determined permission already developed). Performance of application code analysis by the Kansas third party security vendor (Denim Group), which is part of the security plan, has been scheduled for late third quarter, early fourth quarter 2018. For the reasons above and others listed in the Agency Response Matrix, KDOL does not believe a quality caution status is warranted.

KDOL would like to thank the LPA and their staff for their continued participation and feedback.

Sincerely,


Lana Gordon, Secretary
Kansas Department of Labor

Itemized Response to LPA Recommendations

Audit Title: IT Project Monitoring Report - Kansas Department of Labor OSCAR IT Project Quarter Ending March 31, 2018

Agency: Kansas Department of Labor

	LPA FINDING	Agency Action Plan
1	<p>SCHEDULE - Performance metrics for the project show work appeared to be behind schedule as of the end of the first quarter because of two outstanding deliverables (caution).</p>	<p>The OSCAR vendor submitted the revised migration and cutover plans in the second quarter and approved by the KDOL project Steering Committee on Friday May 4. The reason for the delay was due to lack of quality and depth in the original submissions by the vendors. KDOL was not going to accept inferior products from the OSCAR vendor in order to meet a project due date.</p> <p>CapTech delivered the original "Cutover Plan" on 2/26/2018. KDOL reject the plan as incomplete on 3/2/2018.</p> <p>Cutover plan was delivered and approved on 4/17/2018 Data Migration Plan was delivered and approved on 5/4/2018.</p>
2	<p>SECURITY - Although officials made progress on the system's security plan during this quarter, our review identified some concerns (caution).</p>	<p>Inconsistencies and issues identified with the system security plan are being addressed by the Information Security Officer. KDOL's ISO appreciates LPA's review of the document and identification of those items. A more polished document should be available late 3rd quarter to early 4th quarter 2018.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the initial draft of the System Security Plan was not scheduled for delivery to KDOL until after reporting period in scope (January 1 - March 31). State security policy requirements were included within KDOL's request for proposal.</p> <p>As part of an earlier timeline provided to LPA, a proposed due date of 6/21 was identified for the RBAC model. The proposed date was rather aggressive and will need to be rescheduled to a later date (see milestone revisions)</p>
3	<p>SECURITY - KDOL did not meet its deadlines for additional security-related deliverables (caution).</p>	<p>A draft of the risk assessment was provided to KDOL prior to the scheduled due date. There were no changes between risks identified and assessed in the draft report provided (2/20) and the final draft provided mid-March. Significant changes between the copies were inclusion of system information.</p> <p>The Information Security Officer provided a schedule of future security testing/assessments. This schedule has been revised in order to conduct more thorough testing. The penetration test schedule for early September will be a manual code review. Dynamic code testing will be performed prior to OSCAR go live.</p> <p>Splitting the tests up into two separate assessments will allow for identification and remediation of issues earlier in the process.</p>

Milestone Revisions		
Milestone	Original	Month/Year
System Risk Assessment	3/2/2018	Already submitted
Business Impact Assessment	3/30/2018	August 2018
System Security Plan	4/13/2018	October 2018
Role Based Access Control Model	6/21/2018	September 2018
Application Code Reviews	9/7/2018	November 2018
Vulnerability Scanning	As needed	As needed
Source: KDOL and OSCAR PM officials.		

APPENDIX B

Glossary of Frequently Used Terms and Abbreviations

The following list contains various abbreviations and a definition of those terms.

- **CITO - Chief Information Technology Officer.** K.S.A 75-7205 through K.S.A. 75-7207, established a CITO for each of the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of government. The respective CITO reviews and consults with each their branch agencies regarding information technology plans, monitors compliance with all information technology policies, and coordinates implementation of new information technology, among other duties.
- **CPI – Cost Performance Index.** A measure of cost efficiency expressed as the ratio of budgeted cost of work performed to the actual cost of work performed. If the result is greater than 1, then the project is under budget, which is the best result.
- **Cutover plan.** A plan detailing the steps that need to be executed to transition a new IT project from development to production (go live). It also details the steps that will be taken to phase out the system that is being replaced. A good detailed cutover plan minimizes the risk of issues that will occur when the system goes live.
- **Data migration plan.** A plan detailing how to move data from one format, system, or location to another. Data migration plans are important to IT projects involving system replacements because they detail how data from the older, legacy system will be moved and included (mapped) in the new system.
- **Enterprise Project Management Office.** EPMO provides oversight of major IT projects. As part of its oversight role, EPMO collects quarterly summary reports to evaluate the progress of state agencies' IT projects to determine whether those projects are in good standing. EPMO and KITO are often used interchangeably.
- **ITEC - Information Technology Executive Council.** The 17-member Information Technology Executive Council is responsible for approval and maintenance of all information technology policies, IT project management procedures, the statewide technical architecture, and the state's strategic information management plan.
- **KITO - Kansas Information Technology Office.** KITO supports the statutory responsibilities of the Executive, Judicial, and Legislative Branch CITO's and the state's Chief Information Technology Architect by providing enterprise services across state government. EPMO and KITO are often used interchangeably.
- **SPI - Schedule Performance Index.** A measure of schedule efficiency expressed as the ratio of earned value (how much work has been completed by a certain date) to planned value (how much work was supposed to have been completed by that date).

- **SSA – Social Security Administration.** A branch of the federal government responsible for administering and managing Social Security payments to the aged, poor, disabled, and unemployed, as well as their dependents and survivors. Some of the better-known programs under the SSA include retirement insurance, disability insurance, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).

APPENDIX C

JCIT Project Measurement Guidelines

JCIT Policy 2, approved by the committee in 1998, establishes many specific measures to evaluate state projects in active status. The table below enumerates those measures.

JCIT Project Measurement Guidelines		
Area	JCIT threshold	Condition
Critical Path	10%-20% behind schedule	The project will be considered in a caution status
Critical Path	20% or more behind schedule	The project will be considered in a red or alert status.
Task Completion Rate	Completion rate of 80%-90%	The project will be considered in a caution status
Task Completion Rate	Completion rate of 80% or less	The project will be considered in a red or alert status.
Deliverable Completion Rate	Completion rate of 80%-90%	The project will be considered in a caution status
Deliverable Completion Rate	Completion rate of 80% or less	The project will be considered in a red or alert status.
Cost	10%-20% deviation from plan	The project will be considered in a caution status
Cost	20%-30% deviation from plan	The project will be considered in a red or alert status.
Cost	30% or more deviation from plan	If costs are 30% higher than planned, serious consideration should be given to stopping the project. JCIT should find specific approval of the agency head and approval of a rationale that strongly supports continuation of the project. JCIT should consider recommending that an independent 3rd party be obtained to conduct a project review and make recommendations to the agency head and JCIT regarding causes for the project deviation from plan, corrective actions needed, expected outcomes, and whether the project the project should be continued.
Actual vs. Planned Resources	Deficiency gap of 15%-20%	The project manager should be acting with the project sponsor to correct this condition. For some projects, the impact of this level of deficiency may be greater than indicated and be reflected in the other measures as well.
Actual vs. Planned Resources	Deficiency gap of 20%-25%	There should be a plan to show a compensatory change n resources or a plan to reduce the scope, costs and objectives for the project with approval of the agency head. For some projects, the impact of this level of deficiency may be greater than indicated and will be reflected in the other measures as well.
Actual vs. Planned Resources	Deficiency gap of 25% or more	A deficiency of this magnitude places project in jeopardy and 3rd party review should be considered if the impact is reflected in other measures. The project should not be permitted to drift awaiting a compensatory resources plan or a new reduced project scope plan. If a new project plan is developed, the new financial plan, return on investment and objectives to be achieved must recalculated and presented for review as well.

APPENDIX D
Summary Schedule and Cost Statistics For OSCAR

This table includes quarterly statistics for the OSCAR project based on our review of internal project management reports for the quarterly time periods from January 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018. The initial project cost for the project was \$8.7 million and is scheduled to be completed April 2019.

Summary Schedule and Cost Statistics					
Calendar Year Quarter ending	3/31/2017	6/30/2017	9/30/2017	12/31/2017	3/31/2018
Cost Baseline - the approved version of the project budget	\$8,678,450	\$8,661,400	\$8,256,450 (b)	\$8,256,450	\$8,256,450
Planned Value (PV) - the authorized budget assigned to scheduled work (also known as Budgeted Cost of Work Scheduled)	(a)	(a)	\$2,650,320	\$3,542,017	\$4,425,457
Earned Value (EV) - the measure of work performed expressed in terms of the budget authorized for that work (also known as Budgeted Cost of Work Performed)	(a)	(a)	\$2,749,398	\$3,575,043	\$4,128,225
Actual Cost (AC) - the realized cost incurred for the work performed on activity during a specific time period	(a)	(a)	\$2,877,006	\$3,657,808	\$4,260,342
Schedule Variance (SV) - a measure of schedule performance expressed as the difference between the Earned Value and the Planned Value	(a)	(a)	\$99,078	\$33,026	(\$297,232)
Schedule Performance Index (SPI) - a measure of schedule efficiency expressed as the ratio of Earned Value to Planned Value (a ratio of 1.0 or better is good)	(a)	(a)	1.04	1.01	0.93
Cost Variance (CV) - the amount of budget deficit or surplus at any given point in time, expressed as the difference between Earned Value and Actual Cost	(a)	(a)	(\$127,608)	(\$82,765)	(\$132,117)
Cost Performance Index (CPI) - a measure of the cost efficiency of budgeted resources expressed as the ratio of earned value to actual cost (a ratio of 1.0 or better is good)	(a)	(a)	0.96	0.98	0.97
(a) As of June 30, 2017, agency staff had not created overall statistics to track cost and schedule. We did not calculate cost or schedule metrics for the first or second quarter of 2017. (b) Cost baseline was adjusted when estimated costs for an originally planned subproject were removed. Source: LPA analysis of OSCAR project management documentation					

Page Left Intentionally Blank