Ms. Holly Hartell Acting Chief Information Officer



# ARLINGTON COUNTY AUDITOR FOLLOW UP AUDIT REPORT REPORT NO. DT\$2025FL001

## INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the FY 2025 Audit Plan, the Office of County Auditor (OCA) conducted a follow-up audit to the Department of Technology Services (DTS) audit report issued May 2021. The purpose of this follow-up audit was to assess whether the outstanding audit recommendations implemented by management effectively addressed the original findings identified by OCA.

## BACKGROUND

As part of the FY 2020 Annual Audit Work Plan, OCA performed a performance audit (audit) of the contract management process in DTS. In Arlington County (the County), contract management is primarily the responsibility of a department that uses a contract, such as DTS. Contract management involves overseeing signed agreements between the County Purchasing Agent and vendors, fostering ongoing relationships to ensure contract compliance and maximize value for the County. Some DTS-managed contracts are also utilized by other departments. DTS assigns a primary owner, and sometimes a secondary owner, to each contract. These individuals are responsible for key management tasks and are selected based on their operational expertise to evaluate contract effectiveness.

In May 2022, OCA issued a follow-up audit report, noting that seven of the nine findings remained open. This follow-up aims to verify the status of these seven findings, as detailed in the "Audit Findings and Recommendation Status" section.

#### CONCLUSION

Management has addressed the audit findings and implemented corrective actions for six of the seven findings. Audit finding 1.6 will be monitored and verified after 4Q2025, with results reported to the Audit Committee.

The Office of County Auditor thanks DTS and DMF for their support during the follow-up process.

# AUDIT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION STATUS

Audit Finding 1.1	Effective contract management files are not adequate.		
Recomme	ndation	Action Taken	Conclusion
Recommendation  DTS should review the current contract management maturity model and identify areas of improvement in both the short and long term. These should be incorporated into the department's strategic objectives to strengthen and enhance procedures in order to continue meeting the needs of other County departments and the public.		The May 2022 follow-up audit confirmed that DTS reviewed the contract maturity model, implemented process improvements with supporting documentation, and adopted a DTS Procurement Policy. DTS has	Implemented. No further action required by OCA
departments and the	ривпс.	since updated its policy to reference the Contract Administration appendix in the County Procurement Policy, revised the SharePoint site for contract management, and ensured Contract Administrator training records were accurate and well-maintained, as verified by OCA.	

Audit Finding 1.2	Lack of in-depth contract management and ethics training for DTS staff.		
Recomme	ndation	Action Taken	Conclusion
DTS should develop a	schedule for	OCA reviewed staff training	Implemented. No further
refresher trainings rela	ated to contract	logs, detailing completed	action required by OCA.
management skills and	d ethics to be	courses, dates, and	
regularly administered	d to all contract	upcoming refresher sessions.	
management staff. DT	S should also	The Purchasing and Ethics	
consider working in co	njunction with the	Refresher Course and the	
Purchasing Office to d	etermine if this	Solicitations and Contracts	
training can be administered to all County		Refresher Course require a	
staff. DTS should maintain evidence of		minimum passing score of	
employees' completion of the initial		70%. A sample comparison	
contract management training, as well as		of Project Officers against	
any refresher trainings in training logs.			
These logs should detail the employees'			

Ms. Holly Hartell Acting Chief Information Officer

Audit Finding 1.2	Lack of in-depth contract management and ethics training for DTS staff.		
Recommendation		Action Taken	Conclusion
names, the course completed, and the		training logs revealed no	
date completed. Othe	r County functions,	discrepancies.	
such as the Human Resources			
Department, may be able to assist in			
maintaining this training log information			
and making it available upon request to			
DTS.			

Audit Finding 1.3	Contract management training does not cover skills required and proper governance.		
Recommendation		Action Taken	Conclusion
DTS should identify a contract management addresses skills and to VPPA, as well as other guidelines for contract Subsequently, DTS may begin a process of systall contract managers consistent practices a across the department	supplementary t training that ppics discussed in best practice t management. anagement should tematically training to ensure re being performed	DMF Purchasing provides Project Officers with contract administration training covering oversight, governance, and performance management. The training content was reviewed and was found to be sufficient.	Implemented. No further action required by OCA.

Audit Finding 1.4	There are no department policies and procedures for contract management.		
Recomme	endation	Action Taken	Conclusion
DTS management sho disseminate the revise Administration Policy managers to be utilize of contract administra County guidance shou all contract managers department managen	ed County Contract to all contract ed in the execution ation procedures. ald be adhered to by and enforced by	The County Purchasing Manual, including the Contract Administration appendix, is readily available on AC Commons and accessible to all County employees. Additionally, the DTS Procurement Policy is published and accessible to all DTS employees on the DTS SharePoint site.	Implemented. No further action required by OCA.

Ms. Holly Hartell Acting Chief Information Officer

Audit Finding 1.5	Specific departmental contract management procedures are not established.		
Recomme	ndation	Action Taken	Conclusion
DTS management should develop department-specific contract management procedures that align with the County's Contract Administration Policy and best practices pertaining to the administration of technology contracts. Procedures should adhere to the		The corrective actions noted under Audit Finding 1.1 resolved this recommendation.	Implemented. No further action required by OCA
overarching County policy, with specific guidance related to the types of contracts managed by the department. Working with the Purchasing Office would help to implement this recommendation.			

Audit Finding 1.6	Contract file management is not consistent.		
Recomme	endation	Action Taken	Conclusion
DTS contract managers County's Contract Admi update all contract reco contract file requiremen contracts are executed, be set up and maintaine assigned contract mana	nistration Policy and ords to align with the outlined. As new contract files should ed regularly by the	OCA conducted a review of the DTS contract SharePoint site to assess its completeness and accuracy. No exceptions were noted. However, six contracts were randomly selected to verify that proper documentation was maintained to ensure compliance with the Contract Administration Policy. Of these, three contracts could not be verified for compliance with policy requirements.	Continuing Action Required. Further follow-up activity will be performed post 4Q2025.  Management Response: DTS will create a Super Project Officer function within the DTS Finance team to oversee contract management across the department, review and audit processes and documentation and provide a level of assurance on compliance and standardization across the department. This function will be integrated into existing job responsibilities and will not require additional resources. DTS has made great efforts to improve the contract management functions and ensure all project officers are aware of the responsibilities of the role. In the fall of 2021, DTS implemented a purchase requisition process in ServiceNow with a workflow that requires approval of all requests by the DTS Procurement Officer and

Ms. Holly Hartell Acting Chief Information Officer

Audit Finding 1.6	Contract file management is not consistent.		
Recomme	ndation	Action Taken	Conclusion
			the DTS Finance Manager to verify that quotes and requests are in compliance with the terms of the contract and with the County's policy. In 2022 the DTS Finance team stood up monthly meetings with project officers to answer questions, provide updates on contract matters and policy
			changes. To address this most recent finding, DTS will be developing some standardized tools, such as check lists for reviewing invoices, guides for invoice review and contract management, and annual training to DTS project officers on use of these tools, DTS processes, and DTS contract management practices. Expected implementation will be 4Q2025.

# Audit Finding 2.1

Contract Administration guidelines to provide specific guidance for Project Officers regarding when the inter-departmental coordination is needed prior to purchase approval is not included within the policy.

Conclusion
Implemented. No further action required by OCA.

Ms. Holly Hartell Acting Chief Information Officer

## **ABOUT US**

## **Compliance Statement**

The County Auditor conducted this follow up audit by applying the applicable principles of generally accepted government auditing standards. The government auditing standards do not cover follow up reviews. The County Auditor's follow-up work is informed especially by the principles articulated in the following key standards: evidence; documentation of auditor's work; communication with an audited entity; reporting of audit work to those charged with management and governance; and auditor professional judgment. The County Auditor employs a risk-based approach to follow-up work. The County Auditor requires verification of the implementation status for all recommendations that are initially reported by management to be implemented.

## **Authority**

The County Auditor is appointed by the Arlington County Board under the authority of § 15.2-709.2 of the Code of Virginia, 1950, as amended.

### **County Auditor**

Wayne M. Scott, CIA, CISA, County Auditor

## **County Board**

Takis Karantonis, Chair Matt De Ferranti, Vice-chair Susan Cunningham Maureen Coffey Julius D. Spain, Sr.

#### **Audit Committee**

Maureen Coffey, Co-chair
Susan Cunningham, Co-chair
Mark Schwartz, County Manager
Maria Meredith, Director, Department of Management and Finance
Thelma Askey, Fiscal Affairs Advisory Commission
Luanne Lohr, Community Member
John Vihstadt, Community Member
William (Bill) Wiggins, Community Member

Ms. Holly Hartell Acting Chief Information Officer

# REPORT DISTRIBUTION

- cc: M. Coffey, County Board
  - S. Cunningham, County Board
  - M. Schwartz, County Manager
  - M. Corr, County Attorney
  - A. Miller, Deputy County Manager
  - M. Meredith, Director DMF
  - L. Porfiri, Chief of Staff