

**Technology Planning, Policy, & Governance Division  
Chief Administrative Office**

# **Statewide Project Delivery Audit**

## **Internal Audit Report 12-102**

Internal Audit Director, Andrew Dimas, CGFM, CFE, CIA  
Internal Auditor, Sharon Blythe, CPA, CGAP

March 2013



Texas Department of Information Resources  
Austin, Texas

# Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	3
Introduction .....	4
Objective, Scope, and Methodology of Work .....	5
Background .....	6
<b><u>Section 1: Policies and Procedures</u></b>	
Issue 1.1 Program Policies and Procedures .....	8
Issue 1.2 Correspondence Log .....	8
<b><u>Section 2: Statewide Project Delivery Compliance with Statutes</u></b>	
Issue 2.1 DIR Oversight of Major IR Projects .....	11
Issue 2.2 Statewide Impact Analysis .....	13
Issue 2.3 Individual Email Accounts used to store data .....	13
<b><u>Section 3: DIR Internal IT Special Projects Compliance with TAC</u></b>	
Issue 3.1 Agency-wide Approach for Project Management Practices .....	16
Issue 3.2 DIR-A Use of Project Management Practices .....	17
Issue 3.3 Strategic Plan Outlines uses of Project Management Practices .....	18
<b><u>Section 4: Texas Project Delivery Framework</u></b>	
Issue 4.1 DIR Website Conform to Government Code §2054.307 .....	19
Issue 4.2 DIR Website Framework Examples .....	20
Issue 4.3 Training on the Texas Project Delivery Framework .....	21
Attachment 1 .....	22
Attachment 2 .....	23
Attachment 3 .....	25
Attachment 4 .....	26

## Executive Summary

---

This report provides the details of the review of the Statewide Project Delivery Program (SPD) in the Technology, Planning, Policy and Governance division of the Chief Administrative Office. This audit was part of the Fiscal Year 2012 Internal Audit Plan approved by the Department of Information Resources Board. The purpose of the review was to examine activities performed by the SPD and the DIR eGovernment division's project management processes to confirm their compliance with the Texas Government Code (GC) and the Texas Administrative Code (TAC) relating to Information Resources project delivery. The DIR SPD is one of three members of the statewide Quality Assurance Team (QAT). The Team reviews state agency information resource projects costing over \$1 million. The QAT is comprised of one member each from the State Auditor's Office, the Legislative Budget Board, and the DIR SPD. As a member of the QAT, the DIR SPD may give guidance to state agencies on the use of the Texas Project Delivery Framework (Framework) and give advice on project management practices. The SPD also chairs the Change Advisory Board (CAB) that is responsible for reviewing the Framework that are tools used by state agencies to prepare deliverables reviewed by the QAT. After changes to the Framework are reviewed by the CAB and approved by DIR<sup>1</sup>, the SPD publishes the Framework on the DIR website.

The scope of the audit was the DIR SPD (DIR-Enterprise) and eGovernment division project management team's (DIR-Agency) compliance with the applicable GC and TAC for Information Resources project oversight and the development of the Texas Project Delivery Framework (Framework) during fiscal year 2012 from September 1, 2011 to August 31, 2012.

The objectives of the audit were to determine if the SPD has internal policies and procedures to define what employees are tasked to do regarding the program's responsibilities, and also determine if the DIR-Enterprise (SPD program) and DIR-Agency (eGovernment) are adhering to the requirements of the applicable GC and TAC. The audit also examined whether the Framework developed<sup>2</sup> and published by DIR in collaboration with the CAB complies with the applicable GC.

We conducted this audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

During our audit fieldwork, we examined the Texas Project Delivery Framework that is published on the DIR website. The Framework was easy to understand and well organized into review deliverables so that state agencies can be consistent in the selection, control, and evaluation of Information Resource (IR) projects that align with their business goals.

---

<sup>1</sup> Change Advisory Form

<http://www.dir.texas.gov/management/projectdelivery/projectframework/pages/changeadvisory.aspx>

<sup>2</sup> Texas Government Code §2054.302

The SPD document called the Maintenance and Operations Plan (Plan), does not mention the SPD program responsibilities for Project Management Practices as defined in the Texas Administrative Code. It incorporates, at a high level, information concerning Framework and Educational Series Materials including change control, configuration management, Framework operations, Framework Change Advisory Process, and the Quality Assurance Team (QAT) Maintenance and Operations.

The Framework provides online guidance to help state agencies develop their Information Resources projects costing over \$1 million dollars. The Framework details process steps along with documentation that agencies must accomplish and have approved by the agency's Executive Director among others before the documentation is sent to the QAT for review and approval. We noted a number of areas where DIR could enhance its processes and made the following recommendations:

- The SPD include in the policies and procedures detailed steps for employees to accomplish their duties.
- The SPD document all inquiries from entities concerning the Framework or Project Management in a correspondence log.
- DIR establish standards and procedures to ensure that if Information Resource projects are referred to it from the Quality Assurance Team they are overseen effectively in accordance with Texas Government Code.
- In accordance with the Government Code, DIR determine the Statewide Impact of Information Resources projects sent to the QAT.
- The SPD organize and archive its email communications on a shared drive.
- The DIR eGovernment division finalize its procedure for project management practices.
- The DIR eGovernment division establish a policy that addresses the requirement of project management for all of its projects and train its staff on project management practices. Also, the DIR eGovernment division should establish a policy where all project management documents are stored on a shared drive where they are accessible to those needing that information.
- The DIR eGovernment division should demonstrate in its strategic plan the extent to which the agency uses project management practices.
- The SPD program Framework documents reference the appropriate statute and guidance for document submission.
- Publish Framework examples on the DIR website.
- Continue to train agencies on how to use the Framework.

## Introduction

---

An internal audit of the Statewide Project Delivery program (SPD) was included in the 2012 audit plan that was approved by the DIR Board of Directors. This program has statewide impact because DIR is a member of the Quality Assurance Team which is comprised of representatives from the Texas State Auditor's Office, Legislative Budget Board and the DIR SPD. The Texas State Auditor's Office recently completed a review of the "Statewide Processes Intended to Assist State Entities in Developing Major Information Resources Projects". During this review the State Auditor surveyed some state agencies for their perceptions of the Texas Project Delivery Framework which is a major responsibility for the SPD at

DIR. The survey indicated that some agencies were not trained on the Framework, examples of deliverables were not provided, and instructions were not clear. The DIR SPD has several responsibilities for the Texas Project Delivery Framework and also information resources project management outlined in the Texas Government Code and the Texas Administrative Code. Our audit examined compliance with these Codes.

We wish to thank the Statewide Project Delivery and the eGovernment IT Special Projects teams for their time and cooperation during this audit.

## Objective, Scope, and Methodology of Work

---

The objectives of the audit were to:

- Determine if the SPD has internal policies and procedures to define what employees are tasked to do regarding this program.
- Determine if the Statewide Project Delivery program (DIR-E) is adhering to the Texas Government Code §2054.151 to §2054.158-Project Management Practices, Texas Government Code §2054.1181- Oversight of Major Information Resources Projects, Texas Government Code §2054.301 to §2054.307-Texas Project Delivery Framework.
- Determine if DIR as an agency (DIR-A) is following the requirements of the Texas Administrative Code §216.10 to §216.12- project management standards, procedures and utilization, and also requirements of the Texas Government Code §2054.156-state agency duties for project management.
- Determine if the Texas Project Delivery Framework published by DIR adheres to Texas Government Code §2054.301 to §2054.307.

The scope of the audit covered fiscal year 2012 activities and responsibilities of the DIR-E (SPD) and DIR-A's (eGovernment) activities for internal project management and their compliance with the applicable sections of the Government Code §2054 and the TAC §216. The audit methodology consisted of reviewing the Quality Assurance Team Maintenance and Operations Plan; reviewing prior State Auditor's Office reports concerning assistance in Information Resources Project Development to state agencies; analyzing various documents provided by the SPD and eGovernment including pilot training manuals, emails, correspondence logs and online materials. In addition we reviewed and analyzed the Texas Government Code and the Texas Administrative Code for applicable provisions, and created a compliance matrix to test compliance with the Codes; we reviewed DIR responses on the 2009 and 2011 Information Resources Deployment Review; and researched the DIR latest Strategic Plan; we reviewed a draft of the DIR eGovernment Division Project Management policy; and reviewed the online Texas Project Delivery Framework. We interviewed the staff of the SPD program, DIR Policy, and eGovernment divisions to ask questions concerning what information DIR receives from agencies that are required in the Texas Government Code. We asked about project plans that agencies must submit and if there have been any issues with information that agencies submitted to DIR. We also asked about the SPD's roles on the Quality Assurance Team and the SPD technical assistance to state agencies including the training of agency heads on project management practices. The results of these questions are contained within this report.

## Background

---

In 1993, the Texas Legislature created the Information Resources Management Act<sup>3</sup> that replaced an earlier bill that created DIR in 1989. This statute states that “It is the policy of this state to coordinate and direct the use of information resources technologies by state agencies and to provide as soon as possible the most cost-effective and useful retrieval and exchange of information within and among the various agencies and branches of state government and from the agencies and branches of state government to the residents of this state and their elected representatives. The Department of Information Resources exists for these purposes.” According to the DIR website, the Statewide Project Delivery program of DIR is a “clearinghouse and single point of reference for all practices specifically required for technology projects within Texas State Government” as mandated by the Legislature.

In 2000 DIR established the Internal Quality Assurance Guidelines for state agencies to use for the development of their internal quality assurance procedures for project management practices. These guidelines were repealed during the 80<sup>th</sup> Legislature by House Bill 1789. In response to House Bill 1789, DIR adopted TAC 216 in 2007 which states that agencies are to develop policies and procedures and use them for the management of all information resources projects regardless of size. The SPD is responsible for training state agencies on project management practices.

In 2005 Government Code §2054 was amended to include Subchapter J which established the Texas Project Delivery Framework to be used by all state agencies when they propose to develop a major information resource project costing greater than \$1 million. In 2007 Subchapter G was added to the Texas Government Code §2054 establishing that “The legislature intends that state agency information resources and information resources technologies 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. In addition, the legislature finds that to ensure the successful completion of all information resources projects, all projects must be managed using project management practices.” The Texas Project Delivery Framework (Framework) is a set of tools that establish a consistent, statewide method for project selection, control, and evaluation aligned with business goals and objectives. It shifts focus from technology details to prioritized business goals and outcomes. It requires involvement of agency heads and other executive leaders. The Framework ensures a process to justify, plan, outsource, implement, and access a project.

DIR management established the Statewide Project Delivery program (SPD) to coordinate and oversee the Framework development and amendments with assistance from the Change Advisory Board (CAB). The CAB meets twice annually to review, classify, and prioritize non-emergency change requests to the Framework. The CAB is made up of nine state agency representatives who review the recommended changes for inclusion into the Framework (Attachment 3). The SPD chairs the CAB. After changes to the Framework are reviewed by the CAB and approved by DIR, the SPD sees that the Framework is published on the DIR website.

---

<sup>3</sup> Texas Government Code §2054

The SPD is one of three members of the statewide Quality Assurance Team (QAT) that reviews and approves state agency information resource projects costing over \$1 million dollars after they are identified from the agency Biennial Operating Plan. The QAT is comprised of one member each from the State Auditor's Office, the Legislative Budget Board, and the DIR SPD. The QAT monitors the status of some major information resources projects monthly or quarterly, depending on the perceived risk of the project. The QAT also meets with agencies to discuss their major information resources projects and the details of their submitted Texas Project Delivery Framework deliverables. Framework deliverables such as the Business Case submitted by agencies to the QAT are reviewed by them to determine if information resources projects should move ahead into development by state agencies. As a member of the QAT, the SPD may give guidance and be a resource to state agencies on the use of the Texas Project Delivery Framework (Framework) and give advice on project management practices. Also, the SPD participates as a member of the QAT in coordinating, monitoring and evaluating Framework review gate deliverables from agencies. Other roles of the SPD coordinator are to sit as a technical advisor to the QAT on Framework deliverables submitted by state agencies; to coordinate the revisions to the Texas Project Delivery Framework through the Change Advisory Board; to see that the Framework is published on the DIR website; and to train state agency heads on the use of Project Management Practices.

The SPD had two employees until October 2011 when one employee resigned from DIR. That employee was responsible for the training of state agency heads and other agency employees on their Framework responsibilities and sat on the QAT. During 2012 the SPD had one employee who took over all the responsibilities of the SPD including the QAT responsibilities and the training of agencies. The SPD also develops and implements DIR policies and standards in conjunction with development of the Framework that involves research, evaluation and agency planning and systems development best practices.

## **Section 1: Policies and Procedures**

---

We gained an understanding of information resources projects statewide, and the SPD specifically in regards to the program's internal policies and procedures. During the interviews we were informed that the program created a Statewide Project Delivery Maintenance and Operations Plan v 2.0 (Plan v 2.0) document that comprises a high level view of the outward facing responsibilities of the Statewide Project Delivery program that are external to DIR. The Plan v 2.0 incorporates, at a high level, information concerning the Framework and Educational Series Materials including change control, configuration management, Framework operations, Framework Change Advisory Process, and the Quality Assurance Team Maintenance and Operations Manual which addresses maintenance and operations activities that are the responsibility of DIR in sustaining the mission of the QAT. The SPD maintains the QAT Charter and maintains the QAT Policy and Procedures Manual based on the QAT review of the Manual. The SPD uses the Plan v 2.0 for documenting version control of processes and for identifying document repository locations; however, it is too high level to be able to guide daily operations of the SPD program. The Maintenance and Operations Plan v 2.0 also calls for the SPD to create and maintain a correspondence log when state entities contact the SPD program.

### **Issue 1.1- Program Policies and Procedures**

Policies and procedures provide employees with guidance in performing their tasks accurately and consistently. The Statewide Project Delivery Maintenance and Operations Plan v 2.0 (Plan v 2.0) was created by the SPD as their internal procedures; however it is too high level to be able to guide employees on how to perform the daily operations of the program. The Plan v 2.0 is incomplete and does not substitute for the program's internal policies and procedures. It does not include Project Management Practices responsibilities which are an important part of the SPD program defined in the Texas Administrative Code §216<sup>4</sup>. After our analysis of the Plan v 2.0, we interviewed the SPD coordinator again, and she said that the program has not developed its own internal policies and procedures to guide the program in performing its duties on a daily basis. The lack of detailed and current procedures can lead to inaccurate and inconsistent program performance.

#### **Recommendation 1.1:**

We recommend that SPD enhance its policies and procedures to include detailed steps for current and new employees to accomplish the program's duties. These steps should include the purpose for the step, detailed procedures to perform the step, the documentation that is involved, and where that documentation can be located. These steps should be able to be followed by new employees. Also, SPD should update the procedures whenever a change in the program occurs.

#### **Management Response:**

Management concurs. While the current Maintenance and Operations Plan is a good start, it lacks detail and is limited to document configuration management procedures, which is only one aspect of the program. Standard Operating Procedures covering all daily program functions would be beneficial. The SPD program has one staff member whose primary responsibility is to provide customer support, review deliverables submitted to the QAT, and implement improvements to the Framework toolkit. Staff time will be dedicated as priorities allow to document internal procedures.

**Estimated Completion Date:** May 31, 2014.

**Person responsible for implementation:** Director, Technology Planning, Policy & Governance

### **Issue 1.2 – Correspondence Log**

The Maintenance and Operations Plan v 2.0 requires a SPD Correspondence Log be kept by SPD to record informational inquiries from State agencies concerning Statewide Project Delivery. The logs purpose is to track inquiries and to develop management and program reports that provide information regarding the nature and frequency of the inquiries. This log is an Excel Spreadsheet that captures requests for additional information and provides comments regarding the Framework and Framework extensions. The log was not maintained after the fall of 2011 when the SPD Program Lead left the agency.

---

<sup>4</sup> Texas Administrative Code, Title 1, Part 10, Chapter 216

### Recommendation 1.2:

We recommend that the Correspondence Log be kept current with entries so DIR management and the program can obtain statistical and historical information. This will allow the program to use the current and complete information to create reports, document the frequency of the inquiries, and determine whether follow-up is needed.

#### **Management Response:**

Management concurs. The program is working toward a more efficient and technologically enhanced platform through the "Salesforce" system. Recently, the program has maintained an email folder of customer correspondence, and from November 2011 to January 2013, approximately 70 inquiries were received. The new tool also will allow the program to more efficiently track correspondence as it includes a method to attach documentation shared in response to the inquiry.

**Estimated Completion Date:** The new system is expected to be fully operational by July 31, 2013.

**Person responsible for implementation:** Director, Technology Planning, Policy & Governance

## **Section 2: Statewide Project Delivery Compliance with Statutes**

---

The DIR Statewide Project Delivery (SPD) Program is comprised of a single employee who reports to the Technology Planning, Policy and Governance Division of the Chief Administrative Office. As stated on the DIR website, the SPD Program works with state agencies, higher education institutions, the Legislative Budget Board, the Quality Assurance Team (QAT), and other stakeholders to provide:

- Guidance, best practices, and tools to optimize technology project performance in areas such as risk and maturity assessments; systems development methodologies; and project and portfolio management, governance, and reporting
- Coordination and support to QAT and Contract Advisory Team, including project approval and review, solicitation information review, and development of policy and guidance
- A clearinghouse and single point of reference for all practices specifically required for technology projects within Texas state government
- Services (briefings, consultation, Web resources to assist agencies and institutions of higher learning with project delivery)

The SPD program's required responsibilities are in sections of the Texas Government Code §2054. Those sections are Project Management Practices (§2054.151-158), Oversight of Major Information Resources Projects (§2054.1181) and the Texas Project Delivery Framework (§2054.301-307).

On a statewide level the DIR employee in the SPD program is a member of the QAT along with representatives from the State Auditor's Office and the Legislative Budget Board. The QAT is responsible for review and approval for all requests for IR projects and IR contracts costing over \$1 million that also require one year or longer to reach operation status, involves more than one state agency, or substantially alters the work methods of state agency personnel or the delivery of services to clients.

The SPD program helps the QAT with technical assistance and project management. As stated on the QAT website <sup>5</sup> “the Quality Assurance Team (QAT) implements a consistent and repeatable approach for quality assurance review of technology projects within Texas. Projects are continually assessed to help reduce the likelihood that a project will not deliver a quality solution based on the schedule, budget, and scope commitments made to state leadership”. Between 2008 and 2012, the QAT assisted with 241 projects totaling over a billion dollars per year.

Year	# Projects	\$ Billions
2008	42	1.04
2009	46	1.04
2010	48	1.05
2011	52	1.31
2012	53	1.50

Source: Data compiled from QAT Publications/Annual Reports website

The QAT reviews documents submitted by agencies that are called Texas Project Delivery Framework (Framework) review gate deliverables for propriety to determine if the project should move forward to development and implementation. The DIR SPD program is responsible for coordinating any amendments to the Framework requirements and sees that they are published on the DIR website.

The Texas Government Code states that the Quality Assurance Team (QAT) may recommend major information resources projects to the department (DIR) for oversight <sup>6</sup>. If projects are referred to DIR, the department shall provide risk assessment, quality assurance services, independent project monitoring and project management. In performing its duties under this section, DIR shall:

- Develop policies for the oversight of projects;
- Implement project management standards,
- Use effective risk management strategies,
- Establish standards that promote the ability of information resource systems to operate with each other; and
- Use industry best practices and process reengineering when feasible.

Based on our audit work, the SPD has established a thorough and understandable Texas Project Delivery Framework that is required by the Texas Government Code<sup>7</sup>. This Framework guides state agencies in the development of documents for their major information resources projects to send to the QAT for their review, comment and approval. This code is applicable to major information resources projects that cost over \$1 million and major contracts for outsourced functions or processes costing over \$1

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://qat.state.tx.us>

<sup>6</sup> Texas Government Code §2054.1181

<sup>7</sup> Texas Government Code §2054, subchapter J, sections 301 through 307

million as defined in the Statewide Contract Management Guide<sup>8</sup>. The SPD program oversaw the creation of the Framework and coordinates any revisions with the Change Advisory Board (CAB). The CAB is made up of nine state agency representatives who review the recommended changes for inclusion into the Framework. The Framework is posted on the DIR website and is kept up-to-date with changes that are suggested by agencies and approved by DIR in association with the CAB.

The Texas Government Code<sup>9</sup> requires that the DIR review the Statewide Impact Analysis submitted by agencies to the QAT when the agency files its legislative appropriations request. The LBB will distribute the Statewide Impact Analysis to the members of the QAT. The purpose of the review is to ensure that services, components, and modules of proposed projects or major contracts do not unnecessarily duplicate existing statewide information resources technology. According to the DIR website, the Texas Project Delivery Framework Statewide Impact Analysis version 1.5 dated November 18, 2011 says that “use of the Statewide Impact Analysis will enable the DIR to: qualitatively measure rates of collaboration and reuse on major projects, identify business/technical assets that may result from the project and be reusable elsewhere, and develop a collaboration and reuse program that will reduce costs and improve efficiency and interoperability by making information about what other agencies are working on centrally available, facilitating identification of opportunities for reuse and collaboration”.<sup>10</sup>

Another statute in the Texas Government Code<sup>11</sup> requires that the DIR SPD establish a comprehensive technical assistance program to aid state agencies in developing and implementing their own Project Management Practices (PMP). All IR projects, regardless of the dollar amount, must use Project Management Practices in their agency’s Information Resources departments. The SPD has been providing PMP training and is developing new training to meet customer needs.

### **Issue 2.1 - DIR oversight of major information resources projects**

Texas Government Code §2054.1181 states that “(a) The quality assurance team, in coordination with the governor, may recommend major information resources projects to the department for oversight. As part of this oversight, the department shall provide risk management, quality assurance services, independent project monitoring, and project management. A state agency with a project selected for oversight shall pay for oversight by the department and quality assurance team based on a funding model developed by the department. (b) In performing its duties under this section, the department shall:

- (1) develop policies for the oversight of projects;
- (2) implement project management standards;
- (3) use effective risk management strategies;
- (4) establish standards that promote the ability of information resources systems to operate with each other; and

---

<sup>8</sup> Texas Government Code §2262.001

<sup>9</sup> Texas Government Code §2054, subchapter J, section 303

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.dir.texas.gov/management/projectdelivery/projectframework/justification/Pages/StatewideliImpactAnalysis.aspx>

<sup>11</sup> Texas Government Code §2054.154

(5) use industry best practices and process reengineering when feasible.”

According to discussions with staff in the SPD and DIR eGovernment , neither the DIR Statewide Project Delivery program (SPD) nor the DIR eGovernment division are in a position to oversee the State’s Information Resources (IR) projects if they were referred to them from the QAT. There was no evidence that policies for the oversight of projects in accordance with the statute have been developed. Neither the SPD program nor DIR eGovernment have established standards which promote the ability for State information resource systems to operate with each other and there appears to be no clear line of authority or established responsibilities within DIR to oversee information resource projects. To date the QAT has not referred any projects to DIR for oversight; however in the event that the QAT did refer to DIR a project for oversight, DIR may not be prepared to immediately oversee information resources (IR) projects since the statute addresses setting the funding model, standards, policies, strategies, and using process re-engineering before oversight can take place.

Recommendation 2.1:

We recommend that DIR establish standards, policies, and strategies for DIR to be prepared to oversee projects. Also, clear lines of authority should be established between the SPD program and the DIR eGovernment division to ensure that if and when information resources projects are referred to DIR from the QAT that DIR oversees them effectively and in accordance with Texas Government Code §2054.1181.

**Management Response:**

Management concurs. Because an oversight task has not recently been assigned to DIR, materials related to this issue have not been updated. In order to achieve statutory compliance, DIR, in coordination with DIR’s eGovernment division and the QAT, will:

- employ recent material from DIR’s PPMO (project planning and management office) to develop a funding model for reimbursement for project oversight in response to QAT referral, and
- update policies for the oversight of those projects

Due to the unlikely nature of a project referral, it would be inefficient to maintain staff resources to perform this service. As a result, DIR would contract with outside providers if needed to fulfill this function.

**Estimated Completion Date:** August 31, 2014.

**Person responsible for implementation:** Director, Technology Planning, Policy & Governance

## **Issue 2.2 – Statewide Impact Analysis**

The Government Code §2054.303 states “(a) for each proposed major information resources project or major contract, a state agency must prepare: (2) a statewide impact analysis of the project’s or contract’s effect on the state’s common information resources infrastructure, including the possibility of reusing code or other resources.” Government Code §2054.303 (c) states, “The department shall use the analysis to ensure that the proposed project or major contract does not unnecessarily duplicate existing statewide information resources technology.

The statewide impact of IR projects are not analyzed by DIR in accordance with Texas Government 2054.303 (c). Currently SPD is unable to “qualitatively measure rates of collaboration and reuse on major projects; identify business/technical assets that may result from the project and be reusable elsewhere; and develop a collaboration and reuse program that will reduce costs and improve efficiency and interoperability by making information about what other agencies are working on centrally available; and facilitating identification of opportunities for reuse and collaboration.”<sup>12</sup> An analysis of the Statewide Impact of these projects will help satisfy the objective of the statute and could allow agencies to leverage existing resources.

### **Recommendation 2.2:**

We recommend that DIR establish procedures for capturing the data and develop methods to determine the statewide impact of major IR projects sent to the QAT that would be assessable to other agencies.

### **Management Response:**

Management concurs. We will work with the QAT to make an appropriate assessment to determine the value of this data, efficient methods of data extraction including hiring contractors on a biennial basis, and statutory repeal or modification. However, as a self-funded state agency, DIR does not currently have the resources or authority to do this in an efficient manner. DIR does not control either the data or the process, and the state’s current data system presents challenges for data analysis.

**Estimated Completion Date:** September 30, 2013.

**Person responsible for implementation:** Director, Technology Planning, Policy & Governance

## **Issue 2.3 – Individual Email Accounts used to store data**

The SPD program maintains its email correspondence within individual email folders rather than a shared drive, which makes sharing work product with other team members more difficult. This causes concern that institutional knowledge maybe lost when the SPD program has employee turnover. According to the SPD, emails are used to track activities and communication between the program, the QAT and state agencies. DIR has system in place to retain email correspondence upon employee turnover, ensuring that historical information is readily available according to business need. This

---

<sup>12</sup> DIR website Texas Project Delivery Framework v. 1.6, Statewide Impact Analysis

historical information is important since it details requests and outcomes of program communications, but it is accessible only by the SPD employee and is not readily accessible by others who might need that information or monitor the program. While much of the SPD information is proprietary and sensitive, some is appropriate for general use. Within DIR, there has not been an emphasis on keeping historical information on shared drives or archiving information included in the agencies business emails.

### Recommendation 2.3

We recommend that the SPD program should store and categorize its email related to the SPD communications with agencies, the QAT and SPD on a shared drive so that information is available for review.

#### **Management Response:**

Management concurs. Certain program information agency wide should be stored on shared drives, such as the shared “S” drive that is currently used. Emails and related program correspondence can be sensitive and therefore will either be maintained in the “Salesforce” system (as described in Management Response 1.2) or will be archived in a shared folder on the program drive. Any data requests including other agency reports or summarized information can be requested through the program administrator.

**Estimated Completion Date:** August 31, 2013.

**Person responsible for implementation:** Director, Technology Planning, Policy & Governance

## **Section 3: DIR eGovernment Special Projects Compliance with TAC**

---

The DIR Data Center Services and eGovernment division comprises two sections, Data Center Services and eGovernment. The eGovernment section contains the IT Special Projects team (DIR-A) that handles project management duties for the eGovernment division according to the eGovernment Director. During the audit our work consisted of reading the Texas Administrative Code (TAC)<sup>13</sup> on project management relating to the duties of the DIR-A. After our review of the TAC, we created a compliance testing matrix of DIR-A responsibilities for managing IR projects. We interviewed applicable personnel for their insight concerning their responsibilities by asking questions on the matrix, and examined their available work product that would document the project management performed by DIR-A for compliance with the applicable TAC rules. During our research we learned that every two years, DIR-A answers survey questions on the statewide Information Resources Deployment Review (IRDR) which are asked of all state agencies by the DIR Policy section. The IRDR is required by Legislation to align individual agencies IR investments with the State Strategic IR plans. We reviewed the DIR-A submission of its IRDR in 2009 and 2011 and tested the reliability of information on that survey. We reviewed information in emails sent by the DIR-A’s manager of Enterprise Application Services to understand more fully the DIR-A’s project management activities. We reviewed a draft of the DIR eGovernment

---

<sup>13</sup> Texas Administrative Code, Title 1, Part 10, Chapter 216

Division Project Management Methodology (PMP) dated February 2011. Also we reviewed the Texas Government Code §2054.156 which is the statute that defines that each state agency shall manage IR projects based on project management practices consistent with DIR's guidelines. Also, it requires that an agency's IR manager demonstrate in the agency strategic plan the extent to which the agency uses its project management practices, and also researched applicable sections of the DIR Strategic Plan 2013-2017.

According to the SPD staff and GC §2054.151 (b), all state agencies must adhere to TAC provisions for project management regardless of size of the project within the agency. TAC §216.10 states the project management policy of the state is that "each state agency shall institute, approve, and publish an operating procedure that communicates an agency-wide approach for project management practices. At a minimum, an agency would identify components and general use of project management practices and cite sources of reusable components adopted from another agency or institution of higher education that satisfy requirements specified under TAC §216.11 of this subchapter; and be approved by the agency head or designee". TAC §216.11 defines that each state agency shall manage IR projects based on project management practices, and TAC §216.12 requires that each agency shall adopt a standard basis for project management practices.

DIR-A must accomplish all the requirements for project management defined in the various TAC and Government Codes referenced. These project management activities are not limited to only major IR projects. During our view of DIR-A activities, we obtained a rough draft of PMP policy crafted by DIR-A personnel which was reviewed in 2011 by the Statewide Project Delivery program who made suggestions on the draft and returned it to DIR-A personnel.

To learn more about possible project management practices performed by DIR-A personnel, we asked for examples of PMP documents. We were informed that all projects had separate folders in the DIR shared drive. The folders mentioned by DIR-A were Enterprise Applications Services folder and the CTS folder. We examined these folders for evidence of project management practices performed by DIR-A; however none of the folders contained completed tasks for all the requirements of TAC §216.11 and §216.12. After we could not locate the documents on the shared drive, we spoke with the DIR-A employee concerning this, and were informed that all his project management documentation are stored in his individual email account. This storage medium would not satisfy the requirements of TAC §216.11 because the TAC is specific to what documents must be prepared. This TAC states that, each state agency shall manage information resources projects based on project management practices that meet the eight specific criteria in Attachment 1 of this report.

To complete our review of project management practices, we reviewed Texas Government Code §2054.156 that requires that the DIR information resources manager demonstrate in its strategic plan the extent to which the DIR uses PMP. We examined the DIR Strategic Plan 2013-2017 that is published on the DIR website. In the Plan, project management is referred to but most of the references were that staff needs training on project management. PMP are required for all IR projects undertaken by DIR; however DIR has not placed PMP as a priority within all IR projects. Project management is the process of guiding projects from beginning to the end. Project Management encompasses three phases:

- **Planning**
  1. Specifying the results to be achieved

2. Determining the schedules
  3. Estimating the resources required
- **Organizing**
    1. Defining people's roles and responsibilities
  - **Controlling**
    2. Reconfirming people's expected performance
    3. Monitoring actions taken and results achieved
    4. Addressing problems encountered
    5. Sharing information with interested people

### **Issue 3.1 –Agency-wide Approach for Project Management Practices**

The DIR has not completed an agency wide project management policy that must also be signed by the DIR Executive Director as required under TAC §216.10. The Texas Administrative Code §216.10 states “that each State agency shall institute, approve, and publish an operating procedure that communicates an agency-wide approach for project management practices. At a minimum, the operating procedure will (1) identify components and general use of project management practices, citing sources of reusable components adopted from another agency or institution of higher education that satisfy requirements specified under TAC§216.11 of this subchapter; and (2)be approved by the agency head or designee”. This TAC must be implemented by all State agencies including the Texas Department of Information Resources. During our review, several discussions were held with the DIR's Statewide Project Delivery program employee (DIR-E) and personnel in the eGovernment division (DIR-A). During those discussions information was provided to us that DIR-A is not in compliance with TAC §216.10 because DIR does not have a finalized operating procedure for project management. As explained to us other priorities by staff prevented the procedure from being finalized. We also examined the DIR Policy division's results of a bi-annual statewide Information Resources Deployment Review (IRDR) for 2009 and 2011. The DIR 2009 IRDR submittal indicated that the agency was not in compliance with the requirement of publishing an operating procedure that communicates an agency-wide approach for project management practices. As a result of this non-compliance, the DIR Policy division wrote the DIR a corrective action plan. The DIR 2011 IRDR submittal indicated that the agency was in compliance with the requirement of a project management practices policy. However, we could not locate a finalized and published policy. The DIR should lead State agencies by example by complying with the TAC. Without this leadership, the State information resources could develop in a manner that might lead to State IR projects taking longer than expected and using more resources than planned.

#### **Recommendation 3.1:**

We recommend that the DIR-A finalize the procedure for an agency-wide approach for project management practices and ensure that it is published on the DIR website after the Executive Director approves it.

**Management Response:**

DIR Information Resources Manager concurs with this finding and will take the steps necessary to finalize the existing draft procedure, arrange for Executive Director's approval and publish the policy.

**Estimated Completion Date:** June 30, 2013

**Person responsible for implementation:** The eGovernment Manager of Enterprise Application Services with the Director of the Program and Portfolio Management Office (PPMO) as a contributing member

**Issue 3.2 – DIR-A use of Project Management Practices**

The TAC §216.11 states that “each state agency shall manage information resources projects based on project management practices that meet criteria established in the TAC”. TAC §216.11 is to be used for all IR projects, not just the major development projects. Each criteria for TAC §216.11 and §216.12 are to be implemented and adhered to by agencies that are involved with IR projects. The review of the PMP documentation provided to us would not satisfy all requirements within the TAC sections. PMP documents are stored in a personal email account that would not allow for easy retrieval of documents if the employee left the agency. Without structured project management practices, DIR projects might take longer to accomplish and be over budget.

**Recommendation 3.2:**

We recommend that DIR-A use and formally document Project Management Practices for all their IR projects and store any project management documents including emails in an organized way on a shared drive.

**Management Response:**

The DIR Information Resources Manager concurs with this finding and will implement a non-distributed solution for memorializing IR projects and supporting documentation. The solution may or may not entail use of the share drive as the solution may be better managed within an application such as Sales Force.Com or SharePoint. In addition, the DIR Information Resources Manager will ensure that Project Management Practices for all IR projects utilize either the Texas Project Delivery Framework (for major development projects), or a scaled-down “mini” Project Delivery Framework to be developed and implemented by the DIR PPMO.

**Estimated Completion Date:** August 31, 2013

**Person responsible for implementation:** The Director of the Program and Portfolio Management Office (PPMO) with the eGovernment Manager of Enterprise Application Services as a contributing member

### **Issue 3.3 – Strategic Plan Outlines uses of Project Management Practices**

The Texas Government Code §2054.156 requires that the DIR information resources manager demonstrate in its strategic plan the extent to which the DIR uses project management practices. In the DIR 2012-2017 strategic plan, published on the DIR website, project management is mentioned in the context of critical functions, expected workforce changes, and future workforce skills needed. However, the extent to which the DIR uses project management practices was not mentioned in the strategic plan. The DIR-A has not established PMP that can be demonstrated effectively in the Strategic Plan. Without the use of formal PMP, DIR internal projects may not achieve the business objectives and cause delays.

#### **Recommendation 3.3:**

We recommend that DIR-A staff use PMP for all DIR-A IR projects. After PMP use is established, the IR Manager should demonstrate in the DIR strategic plan to what extent project management practices are used within DIR.

#### **Management Response:**

The DIR Information Resources Manager generally concurs with this finding that PMP practices should and shall be used for those activities deemed as Projects in nature. Any activities that are entered into DIR's Change Control and Trouble Ticketing systems will not be considered candidates for Project level documentation. The DIR Information Manager also concurs with the recommendation to reflect project management practices in the DIR Strategic Plan.

**Estimated Completion Date:** August 31, 2013

**Person responsible for implementation:** eGovernment Manager of Enterprise Application Services

## **Section 4: Texas Project Delivery Framework**

---

The Texas Government Code §2054.301 to §2054.307 subchapter J-Texas Project Delivery Framework mandates that state agencies apply the Texas Project Delivery Framework (Framework) to any major information resources project and any major contract costing over \$1 million. These statutes were added to the Government Code in 2005 and amended in 2007. The Framework was established by DIR and the Statewide Project Delivery Program maintains and ensures that the Framework is published on the DIR website. Any Framework amendments are reviewed, classified, and prioritized by the Change Advisory Board (CAB) which has representatives from nine state agencies listed in Attachment 3 of this report.

The purpose of the Framework is to assist state agencies in a consistent manner for project selection, control, and evaluation. This method also must align with agency business objectives. The Framework consists of several review gates (milestones) which are sequenced to allow for the effective development of projects by agencies. For the project to be approved for development, the Business Case and Statewide Impact Analysis deliverables must be submitted by state agencies to the Quality Assurance Team (QAT) after the agency's head and other agency personnel approve the documentation substantiating completion of these requirements. Between 2008 and 2010, the SPD trained 201 employees at 54 different agencies, 15 universities, and 1 city on the Framework (see Attachment 4). In

2012, the SPD program developed a new pilot program to train agencies on the use of the Framework. Two agencies participated in the pilot presentations and from these two agencies between 15 and 20 employees were trained on the Framework review gates. The Framework<sup>14</sup> review gates are:

- Business Justification Review Gate
- Project Planning Review Gate
- Solicitation and Contracting Review Gate
- Project Implementation Review Gate
- Benefits Realization Review Gate

Listed within the Review Gates are sub-processes that must be accomplished and approved by the agency head before the next Review Gate is started. These processes give a structured approach to information resources project development.

We read the Texas Government Code §2054.301 to §2054.307 and examined it for differences with the Texas Project Delivery Framework Handbook<sup>15</sup> that is published on the DIR website. This visual comparison revealed that the Handbook was organized in a way that new employees of state agencies could understand the requirements of the Framework.

#### **Issue 4.1 – Statutory References on DIR Website Should Reflect Complete Statutory Guidance**

On the DIR website is the Texas Project Delivery Framework (Framework) which is a guide used by state agencies to complete documents that are submitted to the QAT so that they can evaluate, control, and select major Information Resources Projects that state agencies might want to develop. The Framework has review gates that must be accomplished, approved by agency officials and submitted to the State's Quality Assurance (QAT). The Framework Quick Reference in the Framework Manual published on the DIR website states that the statutory authority for the Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval tool under the Solicitation and Contracting review gate is Government Code §2054.307 which actually only references agency approval,. Therefore the references on the website are incomplete. The General Appropriations Act 82<sup>nd</sup> Legislature Section 9.01 (c) requires changes to be submitted to the QAT. By DIR publishing an incomplete statutory authority, agencies might be confused about their requirements to submit Contract Amendments and Change Orders greater than 10% of the original costs of the project to the QAT.

#### **Recommendation 4.1:**

We recommend that DIR include both §2054.307 and the General Appropriations Act 82<sup>nd</sup> Legislature Section 9.01 (c) as the statutory references for the Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval tool on its website.

---

<sup>14</sup> Framework Quick Reference- Attachment 2 to this report

<sup>15</sup> [dir.texas.gov/SiteCollectionDocuments/IT%20Leadership/Framework/handbook.pdf](http://dir.texas.gov/SiteCollectionDocuments/IT%20Leadership/Framework/handbook.pdf)

**Management Response:**

Management concurs. The statutory references will be added to the instructions template for the Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval tool. The change request process for updating Framework tools will be used to implement this change prior to Website publication. These changes will coincide with the next release of the Framework, September 2013 and will be reviewed every two years to address any changes in law that occurs during session.

**Estimated Completion Date:** September 30, 2013.

**Person responsible for implementation:** Director, Technology Planning, Policy & Governance

**Issue 4.2 – DIR website Framework examples**

The Framework documents published on the DIR website did not provide the agencies with in-depth examples of completed and accepted Framework review gate deliverables. This point was also mentioned by agencies in a survey conducted by the State Auditor and reported in the recently released State Auditor Report on ‘Statewide Processes Intended to Assist State Entities in Developing Major Information Resources Projects.’<sup>16</sup> If agencies do not have good examples of acceptable deliverables, the agency might not understand how to complete the Framework requirements and have to re-submit deliverables since the QAT might not have accepted the first submission which would be a waste of effort by the agency and the QAT.

**Recommendation 4.2:**

We recommend that the DIR consider publishing on its website examples of acceptable Framework review gate deliverables to be used as a reference guide by state agencies when they develop their documents for the QAT.

**Management Response:**

Management concurs. This was previously included as an action item based on an SAO audit. The examples will be added to the instructions template and website materials. These changes will coincide with the next release of the Framework, September 2013.

**Estimated Completion Date:** September 30, 2013.

**Person responsible for implementation:** Director, Technology Planning, Policy & Governance

---

<sup>16</sup> Texas State Auditor’s Report #12-047

### **Issue 4.3 – Training on the Texas Project Delivery Framework**

The SPD program trains agencies on the use of the Framework. Examples of the purposes of the training are to assist state agencies to associate Framework deliverables with review gates and identify submission requirements of the deliverables, and improve the quality of documents sent to the QAT. Before 2011, framework training was conducted based on a classroom setting with an average of 33 attendees per class for six classes. (See: Attachment 4). In 2011 no training took place, and in 2012 SPD developed a new pilot framework training presentation. This pilot program was based on training an agency in a small group setting. In 2012, two agencies and between 15 to 20 employees were trained . Training is important to help ensure that state agencies have the tools and skills needed in order to complete the requirements of the Framework.

#### **Recommendation 4.3:**

We recommend that the DIR offer training on the Framework to all state agencies on a regular basis.

#### **Management Response:**

Management concurs. Project Delivery Framework training will be provided to agencies on a regular basis. Training sessions will be conducted using different methods such as Webinars, online tools, and in-person workshops. Examples of Framework deliverables may be provided as a training resource. Pending prioritization of tasks and resource availability, DIR will hold, at a minimum, one in-class training session and one Webinar annually. In addition several “one-on-one” workshops will be offered. Training will cover Project Delivery Framework best practices.

**Estimated Completion Date:** February 28, 2014.

**Person responsible for implementation:** Director, Technology Planning, Policy & Governance

#### **Subsequent Event to the audit:**

After the completion of our fieldwork, the Technology, Planning, Policy and Governance division hired two full time employees. One of those employees coordinates and leads the Statewide Project Delivery program and serves as a member of the Quality Assurance Team.

## Attachment 1 – Texas Administrative Code §216.11

### RULE §216.11 Requirements

---

Each state agency shall manage information resources projects based on project management practices that meet the following criteria:

- (1) Include a method for delivery of information resources projects that solve business problems;
  - (2) Include a method for governing application of project management practices;
  - (3) Be documented, repeatable, and include a single reference source (e.g., handbook, guide, repository) that communicates how to effectively apply use of the project management practices components;
  - (4) Include a project classification method developed by DIR (see <http://www.dir.state.tx.us/projectdelivery/projectmgmt/classify/index.htm>), the agency, or another source that:
    - (A) Distinguishes and categorizes projects according to level of complexity and risk (e.g., technology, size, budget, time to deliver); and
    - (B) Defines how to use the project classification method to establish, scale, and execute the appropriate level of processes;
  - (5) Include a method to periodically review, assess, monitor, and measure the impact of project management practices on the agency's ability to achieve its core mission;
  - (6) Align with use of the Texas Project Delivery Framework;
  - (7) Accommodate use of other practices and methods that intersect with application of project management practices; and
  - (8) Be reviewed and updated at least annually to help ensure continuous process improvement.
- 

**Source Note:** The provisions of this §216.11 adopted to be effective November 11, 2007, 32 TexReg 7894

---

## Attachment 2- Framework Quick Reference

“The following tables identify by review gate each Framework tool and its statutory references, agency-level approval authorities, and submission entities. The dash (–) means *does not apply*.”

Source: DIR website Texas Project Delivery Handbook version 2.7 December 31, 2012 pages 7-9

<http://www.dir.texas.gov/management/projectdelivery/projectframework/Documents/handbook.pdf>

### Business Justification Review Gate

Tool	Required	Statutory Reference	Approved By	Submit To
Business Case	Yes	2054.303	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agency Head</li> <li>Executive Sponsor,</li> <li>Technology Sponsor,</li> <li>Project Manager,</li> <li>Information Security Officer</li> </ul>	QAT
Business Case Checklist	Yes	-	-	-
Business Case Workbook Checklist	Yes	-	-	-
Statewide Impact Analysis	Yes	2054.303	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agency Head</li> <li>Executive Sponsor,</li> <li>Technology Sponsor,</li> <li>Project Manager,</li> <li>Information Security Officer</li> </ul>	QAT
Project Charter	Yes	2054.307	-	-
Business Justification Review Gate Approval	Yes	2054.307	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agency Head</li> </ul>	-

### Project Planning Review Gate

Tool	Required	Statutory Reference	Approved By	Submit To
Project Plan	Yes	2054.304/2 054.1181	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agency Head</li> <li>Executive Sponsor,</li> <li>Technology Sponsor,</li> <li>Project Manager,</li> <li>Information Security Officer</li> </ul>	QAT
Supplemental tools: Project Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Contract Register</li> <li>Work Breakdown Structure</li> <li>Change Control Request</li> <li>Issues tracking</li> <li>Project Status</li> <li>Quality Register(*)</li> <li>Quality Project Areas, Categories, and Measurers</li> <li>Communication Register (*)</li> <li>Configuration Items Register(*)</li> <li>Performance Register(*)</li> <li>Performance Project Areas, Categories, and Measures</li> <li>Risk Assessment Tables</li> <li>Risk Register(*)</li> <li>Risk Checklists</li> <li>Risk Item</li> <li>Risk Status</li> </ul>	No	-	-	QAT – If marked (*)
Monitoring Report	Yes	2054.1181	-	QAT
Project Planning	Yes	2054.307	Agency Head	-

Tool	Required	Statutory Reference	Approved By	Submit To
Review Gate Approval				

#### Solicitation and Contracting Review Gate

Tool	Required	Statutory Reference	Approved By	Submit To
Technology Addendum - CPA	Yes	2262.101	-	-
Acquisition Plan (Identified in 2054.305 as Procurement Plan)	Yes	2054.305/2054.1181	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agency Head</li> <li>• Executive Sponsor,</li> <li>• Technology Sponsor,</li> <li>• Project Manager,</li> <li>• Information Security Officer</li> </ul>	QAT
Contract Advisory Team Review and Delegation (CATRAD) Application - CPA	Yes	2262.101	-	CAT
Contract Amendment and Change Order Approval	Yes	2054.307	Agency Head approval if contract costs increase above 10% or contract completion date changes significantly.	QAT – if contract costs increase above 10%
Solicitation and Contracting Review Gate	Yes	2054.307	Agency Head	-

#### Project Implementation Review Gate

Tool	Required	Statutory Reference	Approved By	Submit To
Acceptance to Deploy	yes	2054.307	-	-
Project Closeout Report	Yes	2054.307	-	-
Project Implementation Review Gate Approval	Yes	2054.307	Agency Head	-

#### Benefits Realization Review Gate

Tool	Required	Statutory Reference	Approved By	Submit To
Post-Implementation Review of Business Outcomes	Yes	2054.306	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agency Head</li> <li>• Executive Sponsor</li> <li>• Technology sponsor</li> <li>• Project Manager</li> <li>• Information Security Officer</li> </ul>	QAT
Benefits Realization Review Gate Approval	Yes	2054.307	Agency Head	-

## **Attachment 3- Change Advisory Board**

### ***Calendar Year 2012 – Change Advisory Board Members***

#### **Member – Agency**

- Maryloretto Buckley – Texas Department of Insurance
- Gloria Carrillo – Texas Department of Motor Vehicles
- Hayley Hall – Office of the Attorney General
- Heather Hall – Department of Aging and Disability Services
- Patti Layne – University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center
- Jennifer Pigeon – Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
- Kevin Rohrer – Commission on State Emergency Communications
- Linda Safranski – Texas State University System
- Kay Shores – Department of Assistive and Rehabilitative Services

Source: <http://www2.dir.state.tx.us/management/projectdelivery/projectframework/Pages/CABMembers.aspx>

## Attachment 4- Training Statistics

### Project Management Practices

Year	Agencies	Attendees Agencies	Universities	Attendees Universities	Cities	Attendees Cities
2008	60	163	9	12		
2009	22	99	8	11	1	3
2010	22	52	3	3		

### Project Management Repeat Attendees

Training Date	Attendees	Attended Previously
2/27/2008	139	0
8/20/2008	36	8
6/30/2009	32	4
7/15/2009	37	8
9/30/2009	44	7
7/13/2010	28	8
7/15/2010	27	5

### Framework

Year	Agencies	Attendees Agencies	Universities	Attendees Universities	Cities	Attendees Cities
2008	15	28	5	5		
2009	16	102	7	7	1	1
2010	23	55	3	3		

### Framework Repeat Attendees

Training Date	Attendees	Attended Previously
8/20/2008	34	0
6/30/2009	34	2
7/15/2009	34	0
9/30/2009	41	1
7/13/2010	33	8
7/15/2010	25	2
Average Attendees	33	