



Internal Audit
Department

301 W Jefferson St
Suite 660
Phoenix, AZ 85003

[maricopa.gov/
internalaudit](http://maricopa.gov/internalaudit)

602.506.1585

Superior Court Finance and Technology

June 2017

*Internal Audit Report Authorized by the
Maricopa County Board of Supervisors*

Report Highlights	Page
Most accounts payable and purchasing cards (P-Cards) expenditures were authorized and supported; controls over gift card purchases could be strengthened.	1
Controls over contracts and pricing are good; improvements are needed to ensure compliance with insurance requirements.	4
Travel, training, and mileage expenditures were adequately supported with minor exceptions.	7
Capital fixed assets are inventoried annually, as required.	10
Court Technology Services (CTS) has an effective information technology (IT) governance process.	10
Controls over passwords, user account management, and security awareness are in place but could be strengthened.	11
CTS will prepare a disaster recovery plan.	16

Objectives

To determine that Superior Court:

- Accounts payable controls are sufficient to ensure that payments are authorized and paid according to policy.
- Purchasing card (P-Card) controls are sufficient, and are followed consistently.
- Complies with the terms and conditions of the contracts and the Judicial Procurement Code.
- Travel and training expenditures are authorized and paid according to policy.
- IT general controls and critical application controls over data confidentiality, integrity, and availability are effective and adequate.

Scope

This audit focused primarily on controls over finance and IT. The audit covered fiscal years (FY) 2014 – FY 2016. We interviewed key personnel and reviewed policies and procedures, the procurement code, and select contracts, invoices, purchase orders, price lists, quotations, P-Card logs, reconciliations, and other supporting documents. We also reviewed passwords, user account access, backups, application changes, system access and training, and IT governance.

Standards

This audit was approved by the Board of Supervisors and was conducted in conformance with International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing. The specific areas reviewed were selected through a formal risk-assessment process.

Auditors

Stella Fusaro, Audit Manager, CIA, CGAP, CRMA, CFE
Daniel Griedl, Senior Auditor, CIA
Susan Adams, Senior IT Auditor, MBA, CISA, ITIL
Kenton Schaben, Senior Auditor, CFE
KPMG LLP

This report is intended primarily for the information and use of the County Board of Supervisors, County leadership, and other County stakeholders. However, this report is a public record and its distribution is not limited. We have reviewed this information with Superior Court management. The Action Plan was approved by Janet Barton, Presiding Judge, on June 2, 2017. If you have any questions about this report, please contact Stella Fusaro, Audit Manager/Interim County Auditor, at 602-506-1777.

Audit Results

Issue #1: Accounts Payable

Observation: We reviewed supporting documentation for 40 transactions totaling \$3,355,062 to verify that the amounts paid to the 7 vendors were correct. For 32 of 40 (80%) invoices, pricing was properly supported and in compliance with contract terms. Contract pricing information was not available for the remaining 8 invoices, as discussed below.

Superior Court could not provide price lists for six invoices. However, all six were paid in accordance with the pricing outlined in the vendor's quotation. The pricing outlined in the quote could not be verified because the State of Arizona (State) contract that was used expired in 2014, and price lists were removed from the State procurement website. The Superior Court Records Retention Policy requires that procurement-related records be retained for six years after the end of the contract. For the remaining two invoices, the rate for one contractor was not documented in the 2014 contract and pricing could not be verified.

We also reviewed the Superior Court Accounts Payable Processing Procedures and Court Technology Services (CTS) Work Order Purchasing Process Procedure. We found that the Accounts Payable Processing Procedures have not been updated to reflect the changes for the County financial system that was implemented in July 2016. In addition, the CTS procedure that communicates processes for procuring technology items is in draft form and has not been finalized.

Conclusion #1A: Most payments reviewed were authorized and supported.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #1B: Some contract pricing information was not available.	
Recommendations	Superior Court Action Plan
1B-1 Develop procedures to ensure that pricing information is retained in accordance with record retention requirements.	Concur – in progress A procedure will be developed and implemented to ensure that IGAs and state contracts are stored and available within the Maricopa County repository for future review. Target Date: 09/01/17

Recommendations	Superior Court Action Plan
<p>1B-2 Develop procedures to ensure that hourly rates for all contractors are included in the contract documentation.</p>	<p>Concur – completed</p> <p>All hourly rates for contractors are included in the contract documentation per contractual procedures. The audit finding included an invoice from 2014. The invoices audited from 2015 -2016 did include hourly rates per the contractual procedures.</p> <p>Target Date: Complete</p>
<p>Conclusion #1C: Accounts payable procedures are not current, and the CTS procedure for procuring technology items has not been finalized</p>	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
<p>1C-1 Update the Accounts Payable Processing Procedures to reflect the new County financial system; finalize the CTS Work Order Purchasing Process Procedure.</p>	<p>Concur – in progress</p> <p>The Accounts Payable Processing Procedures are currently being updated to include the new CGI county financial system.</p> <p>Target Date: 12/01/17</p> <p>Concur – in progress</p> <p>The CTS Work Order Purchasing Process Procedures are complete and currently under legal review.</p> <p>Target Date: 08/01/17</p>

Issue #2: Purchasing Cards (P-Cards)

Observation: We reviewed 52 P-Card transactions totaling \$74,156. All transactions were properly supported by itemized receipts and were for justified business purposes. Single transaction purchase limits were not exceeded. However, we found that cardholders purchased nine gift cards valued at \$1,479. The purchases did not comply with the P-Card policy; employees used the gift cards to make purchases for various programs. Documentation of gift card receipts evidencing how the gift card was spent was not maintained. Gift cards are a negotiable form of payment and lack of proper controls can lead to misuse and/or fraud.

We reviewed one monthly P-Card reconciliation for five cardholders to determine if monthly reconciliations were complete and approved by the supervisor. All five reconciliations included a P-Card log of transactions and the bank statement or an account activity summary of transactions. We noted two exceptions; (1) one cardholder

went over his monthly spending limit and (2) one reconciliation was missing the cardholder and the supervisor signatures indicating review and approval. All five cardholders are Certified Agency Procurement Aides who recently completed the required P-Card training.

Conclusion #2A: P-Card transactions were supported and the business purpose was documented.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #2B: Controls over gift cards need strengthening.	
Recommendations	Superior Court Action Plan
2B-1 Develop procedures to ensure gift cards are purchased and used in accordance with P-Card policy.	Concur – will implement with modifications There is currently a gift card purchasing policy in place which will be modified to include a quarterly financial audit to ensure that all gift cards are accounted for and supporting documentation is maintained. The policy will include tighter controls and the use of a chain of custody tracking sheet to identify the custodial supervision of the gift cards at all times. Target Date: 07/01/17
2B-2 Inventory all gift cards on hand, and develop procedures to ensure that gift cards are properly accounted for and supporting documentation is maintained.	Concur – will implement with modifications There is currently a gift card purchasing policy in place which will be modified to include a quarterly financial audit to ensure that all gift cards are accounted for and supporting documentation is maintained. The policy will include tighter controls and the use of a chain of custody tracking sheet to identify the custodial supervision of the gift cards at all times. Target Date: 07/01/17
Conclusion #2C: P-Card monthly reconciliations were completed.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A

Issue #3: Contract Compliance – Procurement Code

Observation: We reviewed 13 contracts (5 interpreter, 3 mental health, 3 American Sign Language, and 2 translation) to determine that the contracts were (a) executed by authorized personnel in accordance with the Judicial Procurement Code, and (b) contained appropriate dispute resolution and termination provisions. We found no exceptions.

We also reviewed the bid package for the Mental Health Services Contract, which was the only large contract procured in FY 2016, to determine compliance with Judicial Procurement Code bid requirements. Bid documentation was sufficient to support the contract award.

While Superior Court Procurement has procedures for soliciting, evaluating, and awarding a contract bid, processes have not been formalized for (a) determining the adequacy of the responses, (b) addressing missing or inaccurate documentation (e.g., should the response be considered incomplete and the responder disqualified from providing the service), or (c) correcting documents after initial receipt.

Conclusion #3A: Contracts reviewed were properly authorized and required contract clauses were clearly outlined.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #3B: Bid documentation was sufficient to support the Mental Health Services Contract award.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #3C: Bid documentation procedures were not formalized.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
3C-1 Prepare written bid evaluation procedures that include processes for (a) determining the adequacy of the bid, (b) addressing missing or inaccurate documentation, and (c) correcting documents after initial receipt.	Concur – in process Procedures will be developed and implemented to ensure that written bid evaluations include the determination for the adequacy of the bid, addresses missing or inaccurate documentation and how to handle document corrections after initial receipt. Target Date: 09/01/17

Issue #4: Contract Compliance – Interpreter Contracts

Observation: We reviewed 222 transactions totaling \$79,182 from 5 contracts for interpreter services. We found all rates charged agreed to the contracted rates. All invoices were reviewed, approved, and paid according to the terms and conditions of the contract and policies and procedures.

We also reviewed supporting documentation to determine if the number of hours charged by the contractor was properly supported. For 12 of 222 (5%) interpretation sessions, there was no supporting documentation for the number of hours worked.

Additionally, the interpreter contract requires that contractors pass a background check and submit a fingerprint card. We reviewed supporting documentation for 19 interpreters and found that background checks were completed and fingerprint cards were on file, as required. However, most background check forms were missing manager and Court Security signatures. Court Security signatures indicate the background check was completed.

Conclusion #4A: Invoices for interpreter services agreed to the contracted rates.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #4B: Documentation to support total hours billed by interpreters was on file for 95% of interpreter sessions. However, in some cases, support could not be located.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
4B-1 Develop and implement a process to ensure supporting documentation is retained according to record retention requirements.	Concur – in process The Court Interpreter / Translation Services (CITS) department is currently assessing a software solution with Maricopa County (OnBase) as well as an off the shelf software program to handle the scheduling of interpreters. These software systems are specifically designed to handle scheduling and allow for the documents to be retained in accordance with retention guidelines. Target Date: 01/01/18

Conclusion #4C: Interpreter background checks were completed and fingerprint cards were on file. Most background check forms were missing one or more signatures.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
4C-1 Ensure the signatures to document completion of background checks for court interpreters are completed.	Concur – will implement with modifications Currently the process involves obtaining an email approval that the background check has been completed from Court Security. All emails will be printed out and kept with the forms. Alternate methods such as the possibility of an electronic form and e-signatures that are acceptable are being considered, as obtaining additional signatures on a paper form will lengthen the process of receiving the background check results. Target Date: 01/01/18

Issue #5: Contract Compliance – Insurance

Observation: We reviewed insurance documentation for 13 contracts (5 interpreter, 3 mental health, 3 American Sign Language, and 2 translation) to determine compliance with contract insurance provisions.

We found that there are no procedures in place to ensure that (a) insurance renewals are obtained, or (b) amounts and types of coverage obtained comply with the contract provisions. Of the 13 contracts reviewed, we found that the following Certificates of Insurance on file with Superior Court were expired: 10 General Liability, 10 Professional Liability, 8 Automobile Liability, and 5 Worker’s Compensation.

Also, all required additional insureds (e.g., State, County, and Superior Court) were not named, as required by the contract, on 13 Professional Liability, 11 General Liability, and 9 Automobile Liability Certificates of Insurance. Coverage amounts were less than the contractually-required amount on 2 Professional Liability Certificates.

There was no waiver of subrogation on 11 General Liability and 11 Worker’s Compensation Certificates of Insurance as required by the contract. If an insurance company pays its insured on a claim to make the insured whole, the insurance company has the right to sue the third party that caused the damage. A waiver of subrogation provision prevents the insurance company from suing the State, County, and Superior Court.

Additionally, the contracts outline the required minimum insurance rating. One insurance carrier did not meet the minimum standard, and five certificates did not list the identification number necessary to verify the rating.

Conclusion #5A: Improvements are needed to ensure compliance with contractually-required insurance coverage.	
Recommendations	Superior Court Action Plan
5A-1 Develop written procedures to ensure that all contractors or vendors meet the contractually-required insurance provisions, and that documentation is current, renewals are obtained, and additional insureds are named.	<p>Concur – in process</p> <p>Several software solutions are currently being reviewed with Maricopa County through the new CGI financial system as well as a current solicitation for software that may be able to accommodate Certificate of Insurance provisions, renewals, name of the insured and ensure that the documentation is current. Procedures will be created to emulate the State Risk Management policy.</p> <p>Target Date: 09/01/17</p>
5A-2 Review Certificates of Insurance for all contracts to ensure provisions are met.	<p>Concur – in process</p> <p>Several software solutions are currently being reviewed with Maricopa County through the new CGI financial system as well as a current solicitation for software that may be able to accommodate Certificate of Insurance provisions, renewals, name of the insured and ensure that the documentation is current. Procedures will be created to emulate the State Risk Management policy.</p> <p>Target Date: 09/01/17</p>

Issue #6: Travel and Training

Observation: We reviewed 28 travel and training transactions totaling \$253,217, including 12 travel transactions and 16 education reimbursements, bus/shuttle payments, and expenses related to training presentations. We tested for compliance with policy and procedures. Our findings are summarized below:

- No exceptions were noted for 23 of the 28 (82%) transactions.
- For one transaction, lodging was overpaid by \$660, as the hotel rate exceeded the GSA¹ lodging rate and there was no waiver request or justification documented, as required by policy. Also an extra night of lodging was paid.

¹ County policy requires that travelers follow rates set by the Federal General Services Administration (GSA) for meals, incidentals and lodging.

- Three transactions were missing receipts.
- One transaction was missing signatures on the travel forms.

We also reviewed 14 employee travel reimbursements (trips), totaling \$14,394. We found that Superior Court generally maintained documentation, obtained approvals, calculated travel status mileage, travel advances and reconciliations accurately, and submitted travel expense reports on time. However, we found minor exceptions, as noted below.

- For three transactions, meal per diem was overpaid a total of \$135 because the per diem was calculated using a prior version of the travel policy.
- For four transactions, lodging was overpaid by a total of \$1,087, as the hotel rate exceeded the GSA rate and there was no waiver request or justification documented.
- For one transaction, a mathematical error resulted in a \$100 underpayment to the traveler.
- For two transactions, required receipts were missing (one lodging and one training conference receipt).

Additionally, Superior Court did not use a P-Card for 1 airfare expenditure and 13 lodging expenditures, and there was no written waiver by the agency head, as required by policy.

Conclusion #6A: Superior Court generally maintained documentation to support travel transactions, obtained approvals, calculated travel advances and reconciliations accurately, and submitted travel expense reports on time, with some minor exceptions.	
Recommendations	Superior Court Action Plan
6A-1 Remind travel coordinators and travelers to review the current County travel policy. Have travel coordinators take a training class if necessary.	Concur – in process Out dated travel policies have been removed from the web-site and replaced with the Maricopa County Travel Policy which is utilized for processing travel & training documents for the Judicial Branch. All employees have currently taken the most recent training class, with the exception of one new employee who is scheduled to take the class on June 15, 2017. Target Date: 06/15/17

Recommendations	Superior Court Action Plan
<p>6A-2 Provide written justification for lodging overpayments or obtain reimbursements from the travelers.</p>	<p>Concur - completed</p> <p>The policy for obtaining authorization for lodging that exceeds GSA rates has been reiterated with all A/P employees. Additionally, it has been reiterated to A/P employees that the Judicial Branch will not pay for personal expenses relating to travel. All personal expenses will be the responsibility of the traveler.</p> <p>Target Date: Complete</p>
<p>Conclusion #6B: Superior Court travel policies are outdated.</p>	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
<p>6B-1 Update the court travel policy, guidelines, and mileage reimbursement guidance to reflect current policies and procedures.</p>	<p>Concur – completed</p> <p>Out dated travel policies have been removed from the web-site and replaced with the Maricopa County Travel Policy which is utilized for processing travel & training documents for the Judicial Branch.</p> <p>Target Date: Complete</p>

Issue #7: Mileage Reimbursements

Observation: We reviewed 38 local mileage reimbursements totaling \$10,131 to verify that the mileage, rate used, and amount reimbursed were accurate. We found that all 38 (100%) reimbursements were mathematically accurate. We also reviewed 10 of the 38 reimbursements and verified that all 10 (100%) had the necessary approvals and documentation required by policy.

<p>Conclusion #7A: Mileage reimbursements were approved and properly supported.</p>	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
<p>None</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Issue #8: Fixed Asset Inventory Controls

Observation: We reviewed Superior Court Fixed Asset procedures and verified that Superior Court completes a physical verification of the capital assets (greater than \$5,000) annually. However, we found that Superior Court does not have a comprehensive inventory control list of non-capitalized items (less than \$5,000) with a high-theft risk. As a good practice, tagging and inventorying these items is recommended at least once every two years. Without an inventory control list and periodic physical inventory, items can become lost, stolen, or otherwise go unaccounted.

Conclusion #8A: Superior Court verifies capital assets annually.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #8B: Superior Court does not track high-theft risk non-capital assets.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
8B-1 Develop and maintain an inventory control list for high-theft risk non-capitalized assets and establish procedures to ensure items are tagged and inventoried periodically.	<p>Concur – in process</p> <p>The Maricopa County Capital Asset Manual “highly recommends” that high theft non-capitalized assets be inventoried on a Departmental Inventory Control List. A policy will be developed to tag future incoming assets such as laptops and tablets that are considered to be high theft items. A process will be included to inventory the non-capitalized assets annually at the same time that capitalized assets are inventoried.</p> <p>Target Date: 12/01/2017</p>

Issue #9 Information Technology – IT Governance

Background: Court Technology Services (CTS) is responsible for the technology environment in the Courts. The Integrated Court Information System (iCISng) is the Court’s case management system. Agile Jury is a vendor managed system used for jury management functions. Windows Active Directory (Active Directory) is used to manage user network access to computer resources.

Observation: We reviewed the CTS IT Governance documentation including update meetings, annual budgets, and evidence of monthly reporting, and noted that CTS has effective IT governance procedures in place that are in accordance with documented policies.

Conclusion 9A: CTS has an effective IT governance process in place.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A

Issue #10: Information Technology – Passwords

Observation: We compared Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Security Policy password requirements (minimum length, password expiration, history, number of attempts before lockout, and lockout duration) to Agile Jury and iCISng password requirements. We found that while both Agile Jury and iCISng use passwords for system access, password controls over both applications could be strengthened.

We also reviewed the Active Directory settings (impacting iCISng and Agile Jury accounts) to determine if they meet the CJIS Security Policy standards for all settings. There were no exceptions.

Conclusion #10A: iCISng and Agile Jury password settings do not meet CJIS Security Policy requirements.	
Recommendations	Superior Court Action Plan
10A-1 Formally document policies and procedures for all CTS systems with password and account lockout parameters in accordance with the CJIS Security Policy or best practices.	<p>Concur – in progress</p> <p>Currently working on policies and procedures for CTS and e-Agile Jury. Business Services Division, Jury Mgmt., and CTS then will be working on this so that the changes can be implemented successfully to our customers.</p> <p>Target Date: November 1, 2017</p> <p>Owner : iCIS Software Architect / Security Analyst</p>

Recommendations	Superior Court Action Plan
<p>10A-2 Configure password and account lockout settings for iCISng accounts to meet CJIS Information Security policy requirements.</p>	<p>Concur – in process</p> <p>We have a project on IT Governance list for this, will bring up at the next meeting in June.</p> <p>Target Date: Date will be determined at that time.</p> <p>Owner : iCIS Software Architect / Security Analyst</p>
<p>10A-3 Establish written procedures defining Agile Jury expected password complexity requirements. Require all users to update current passwords to meet the new requirements. Request and install password setting upgrades as they become available from the vendor.</p>	<p>Concur – in progress</p> <p>Working with Agile Jury team to develop new standards.</p> <p>Target Date: September 1, 2017. Remaining items will be completed June 1, 2018 after upgraded Agile Jury system is in production.</p> <p>Owner: Jury Manager/Security Analyst/DCIO (Deputy Chief Information Officer)</p>
<p>Conclusion #10B: Active Directory password settings align with CJIS Security Policy.</p>	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
<p>None</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Issue #11: Information Technology – User Access

Observation: CTS has documented iCISng user account management policies and procedures. However, CTS has not formally documented user account policies and procedures for Active Directory (including servers and databases) and Agile Jury. We evaluated whether, (1) administrative (super user) access was appropriately restricted, (2) user access was approved and documented, and (3) terminated employees’ access was removed timely.

Administrative User Access

To determine if access was properly restricted, we reviewed a list of users with administrative (super user) access. We found that access is appropriately restricted for Active Directory, iCISng servers and databases, and Agile Jury. Administrative users on the iCISng application were not appropriately restricted.

User Account Administration

We reviewed 25 new user accounts and 25 user access modifications. We found that CTS retained new user and modification request documentation from iCISng application

and Active Directory (including iCISng servers and databases) users. CTS relies on the Jury Department to maintain documentation for Agile Jury.

We noted that the Jury Department performs annual reviews of Agile Jury user accounts. However, user access reviews were not performed for Active Directory and iCISng during the audit period. Server and database level reviews were performed on a semi-annual basis; however, changes requested as part of the review were not consistently completed. In addition, formally documented policies requiring periodic reviews are not in place.

Terminated User Accounts

We reviewed a sample of 25 iCISng and Active Directory terminated users and found there was no evidence that 7 iCISng application accounts were removed from the system. We reviewed 26 Agile Jury user accounts and found that 12 were for current users; the remaining 14 were properly disabled.

Conclusion #11A: CTS has iCISng user account management policies and procedures; policies and procedures have not been formally documented for Active Directory (including servers and databases) and Agile Jury application users.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
11A-1 Document user access administration policies and procedures for all servers, databases, and applications.	Concur – in progress We will modify our current policies and procedures for iCISng and update Agile Jury. Target Date: September 1, 2017. Owner : Manager Infrastructure & Database/ Security Analyst
Conclusion #11B: Administrative (super user) access was appropriately restricted for all areas tested with the exception of iCISng application administrators.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
11B-1 Restrict access to administrative accounts at the application, operating system, server, and database levels based on the principle of least privilege.	Concur – in progress We will review all administrative accounts, and prepare project to go to IT Governance. We will be presenting it at the July IT Governance meeting. Target Date: TBD Owner: Manager : Manager Infrastructure & Database/ Security Analyst

Conclusion #11C: New user and user access modifications for Active Directory and iCISng were properly documented; CTS could not provide documentation for Agile Jury new user access and modifications to access.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
11C-1 Establish formal procedures to grant and modify user access to all applications, operating systems, and databases based on business needs and appropriate approvals. Maintain documentation.	Concur – in progress Work with Agile Juror customers using iCISng policies to modify for their system. Target Date: September 1, 2017 Owner: Jury Manager/Security Analyst /DCIO
Conclusion #11D: CTS did not consistently update Active Directory and iCISng user access after termination or reassignment.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
11D-1 Establish procedures to ensure prompt removal of application, operating system/server, and database access upon termination or changes to job responsibilities.	Concur – in progress Active Directory monthly review process is written and has been implemented since February 2017. We will create a new process policy for iCIS as we have with Active Directory (AD). Target Date: October 1, 2017. Owner: Security Analyst / DCIO
Conclusion #11E: CTS does not conduct periodic user access reviews for Active Directory and iCISng applications.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
11E-1 Develop procedures to periodically validate whether access needs have changed due to changes in job responsibilities or termination. Consider validating account access quarterly for applications, operating system, servers, and databases.	Concur – in progress Currently doing AD (this has started on 2/1/2017) and will build a process to do this for iCIS which will be complex due to internal and external users. Target Date: January 15, 2018. Owner: Security Analyst/HR/Manager Infrastructure and Databases

Issue #12: Information Technology – Change Management and Segregation of Duties

Observation: We reviewed a sample of six Agile Jury and iCISng application changes and found that five lacked evidence of testing and/or approval prior to deployment. Effective July 2016, CTS implemented a change control process. To determine if the new process was followed, we selected the most recent iCISng change and noted that it appeared to be operating effectively. However, the process has not been formalized.

Separate iCISng environments are in place for development, testing, and production activities. However, we found that three iCISng users have access that allows them to both develop changes and put changes into production.

As Agile Jury is a vendor managed application, no CTS users have the ability to make changes to the application, but they are responsible for testing and approving changes. We reviewed three changes and found that they were tested and approved.

We inspected access to system interfaces and noted that access to add, modify, or remove interfaces is appropriately restricted to super users on the systems.

Conclusion #12A: CTS recently implemented an iCISng change management process; policies and procedures have not been formalized.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
12A-1 Implement formal change management policies and procedures for all CTS systems and include specific control points for the authorization, testing, and approval of changes, segregation of duties, and separate environments.	<p>Concur – will implement with modifications</p> <p>New formalized processes, using Team Foundation Server (TFS) and JIRA (Help desk ticketing system) for control. Need to get all areas of development on similar processes. As for segregation of duties, programmers that are also doing production support need access and this will be documented in JIRA tickets and we will limit when they get access.</p> <p>Target Date: February 1, 2018</p> <p>Owners: DCIO/ng Software Architect/Web Manager/Production Support Mgr.</p>

Conclusion #12B: CTS has implemented separate development and test environments; however, some segregation of duties conflicts exist.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
12B-1 Segregate access of those who can develop changes from those that can put changes into production.	Concur – will implement with modifications Our staff is small, production support is done by programmers, will document in JIRA(ticketing system)/TFS (Team Foundation Server). We will look at how limit access. Target Date: June 15, 2017 Owners: DCIO/ng Software Architect/Web Manager/Production Support Mgr
Conclusion #12C: Agile Jury change management procedures appear to be effective.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #12D: Access to interfaces is appropriately restricted.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A

Issue #13: Information Technology – Backups and Disaster Recovery

Observation: We reviewed 15 iCISng and Agile Jury automated reports and system backup jobs to determine if the jobs ran according to schedule and were programmed to alert IT management of failures or errors. We found no exceptions.

We inquired about data restoration testing procedures and were told that CTS does not have a policy requiring periodic data restoration tests. CTS did not perform restoration tests during the audit period. Testing ensures that data is available in case of an outage.

Through inquiry, we determined CTS does not have a current disaster recovery plan in place for the people, processes, hardware, and physical facilities relevant to the iCISng and Agile Jury applications and supporting servers and databases.

Conclusion #13A: Automated jobs and system backups are programmed to run regularly and alert IT management of any exceptions.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
None	N/A
Conclusion #13B: CTS did not perform backup restoration tests and does not have a policy requiring data restoration testing.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
13B-1 Document data restoration policies and procedures, and conduct regular backup restoration tests.	<p>Concur – in progress</p> <p>We currently run restoration of iCIS data weekly for multiple environments. We need to make sure that the documentation is formalized and published.</p> <p>Target Date: July 1, 2018</p> <p>Owner: DCIO/Manager Infrastructure & Database</p>
Conclusion #13C: CTS does not have a current disaster recovery plan.	
Recommendation	Superior Court Action Plan
13C-1 Document a disaster recovery plan. Procedures should include an annual plan review and periodic testing.	<p>Concur – in progress</p> <p>We are going to the Cloud next year with our disaster recover so we will be building the new processes using the Cloud as our basis.</p> <p>Target Date: July 1, 2018</p> <p>Owner: Manager Infrastructure & DB, DCIO</p>

Issue #14: Information Technology – Security Awareness

Observation: We reviewed 25 iCISng and Agile Jury (application, server, and database) users and to determine that new user training was completed as required by CTS policies and procedures. We found that CTS could not provide evidence of training for 24 of 25 new users added. CTS indicated that they do not maintain new user or annual security awareness training documentation for CTS system users from outside agencies.

Conclusion #14A: CTS did not maintain evidence of user security awareness training.

Recommendation

Superior Court Action Plan

14A-1 Ensure policies and procedures address retaining security awareness training documentation for all using agencies.

Concur – in progress
Create a policy for outside agencies and inside individuals and have verification by manager on the request forms for access.
Target Date: August 1, 2017
Owner: Security Analyst/Manager Operations