SysAudits | Systems Security Audit Professionals

OFFICE OF THE STATE INSPECTOR GENERAL
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

FINAL AUDIT REPORT

Audit of VITA's Service Level Agreement Management

Report No. 2023-PA-008

June 28, 2023

Prepared By: SysAudits.com LLC

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

Office of the State Inspector General

Michael C. Westfall, CPA
State Inspector General

P.O. Box 1151
Richmond, Virginia 23218

Telephone 804-625-3255
Fax 804-786-2341
www.osig.virginia.gov

September 6, 2023

The Honorable Glenn Youngkin
Governor of Virginia
P.O. Box 1475
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Governor Youngkin,

The Office of the State Inspector General engaged SysAudits, LLC to conduct an audit of Virginia Information Technologies Agency's management of service level agreements. The report is included below for your review and information.

OSIG would like to thank Virginia Information Technologies Agency Chief Information Officer Robert Osmond and his staff for their cooperation and assistance during this audit.

Sincerely,

[Michael electronic signature here]

Michael C. Westfall, CPA
State Inspector General

cc: The Honorable Jeff Goettman, Chief of Staff to Governor Youngkin
Isabella Warwick, Deputy Chief of Staff to Governor Youngkin
The Honorable Margaret McDermid, Virginia Secretary of Administration
The Honorable Emily Brewer, House Chair, Communications, Technology, and Innovation Committee
The Honorable Adam Ebbin, Senate Chair, General Laws, and Technology Committee
Robert Osmond, Chief Information Officer, Virginia Information Technologies Agency
Staci Henshaw, Auditor of Public Accounts

Executive Summary

SysAudits, LLC performed the Virginia Information Technologies Agency audit on behalf of the Office of the State Inspector General. The purpose of the audit was to assess and determine the effectiveness of VITA's management of service level agreements. Specifically, the audit objectives were to determine:

1. If service levels are being met for the Supplier Strategy & VITA Performance contracts and if there is accountability when service levels are not met; and
2. Whether the Service Level Management Program meets industry standards (NIST and ITIL) for monitoring IT service contracts and provides effective tracking and monitoring as prescribed in the contracts.

The scope of this audit included the Multisourcing Service Integrator (MSI) and its seven service Tower support providers.

We conducted this audit in accordance with *Government Accountability Office, 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.

The audit resulted in identifying three opportunities to improve VITA's service Tower monitoring and nine recommendations. We determined that VITA's oversight of monitoring the Tower metrics was being performed in accordance with ITIL and NIST. However, the following are opportunities to strengthen the delivery of Commonwealth of Virginia (COV) Tower contractor IT services:

Finding 1: While VITA's service level agreements (SLA) aligned with the National Institute of Standards for Technology (NIST) 800-53 Service Acquisition (SA) and Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) principles, VITA's SLAs required agency personnel to monitor a high volume of metrics that did not add clear value to products and services. Specifically, VITA collects and monitors 571 metrics for oversight of its Tower contractors on a monthly basis through critical service levels, key measurements, and critical deliverables. VITA acknowledged that the 571-service metrics may be too many and contain duplicative items that do not add value. Further, 94 of the 571 metrics do not have a service credit mechanism to withhold funds from the contractor for missing these service delivery requirements. The accountability for delivering the expected service delivery is diminished without the monetary impact for which service credits can be imposed. From our audit we made two recommendations:

1. Review Tower service levels that do not have a monetary impact and remove those that add no value to COV agencies.
2. Develop a formalized process to evaluate SLAs for duplicative and inefficient metrics at least annually and seek input from COV agencies in this process.

Finding 2: VITA did not share SLA metrics internally with agencies or formally categorize COV Agency feedback on the Tower service providers. VITA's current process includes obtaining feedback through meetings (quarterly and monthly) with COV agency leads and service providers

and by requesting agencies to respond to surveys on service provider performance. However, items were not consistently completed. From our audit we made two recommendations:

1. Develop a process to formally compare customer feedback to SLAs on a periodic basis to identify trends requiring SLA adjustments and those SLAs that were not met.
2. Develop a mechanism to formally share the expected metric requirements with agencies that use service Tower support contractors.

Finding 3: VITA implemented processes to collect and review data needed to verify SLA compliance, including a monthly review of contractor performance in meeting all SLAs. However, VITA did not formally document those processes and the related methodology for completing its review. From our audit we made five recommendations:

1. Evaluate the processes used to review the Monthly Validation Files to identify automation where possible.
2. Evaluate the current contracts for the Service Tower Providers and determine if the contract requirements and timelines of reviews should be modified to add additional review time.
3. Review current resources for monitoring and managing contract requirements and enhance resources and/or staffing as needed.
4. Determine if SLA Monthly Validation File sampling review is appropriate and document the methodology that should be used if sampling is allowed.
5. Update the Monthly Validation File review process to formalize and standardize service owner comments for unmet SLAs metrics that are submitted for exclusion (exclusion is the process where contract vendors request not meeting the metric be excluded).

The Virginia Information Technologies Agency fully concurred with all audit recommendations.

David Cole, CPA, CISA, CRISC
SysAudits.com LLC

Table of Contents	Page

Background

VITA relies on the service providers listed below to ensure the Commonwealth has the IT services required to meet its mission.

Services Provided	Platform Suppliers	Contract #
EUS: End-User Services	Iron Bow	VA-180915-IBTL
MF: MainFrame	Peraton	VA-160926-HPEN
MPS: Managed Print Services	Xerox	VA-191121-XERX
MSG-NTT Messaging	NTT Data	VA-210517-NTT
MSI: Multisourcing Service Integrator	SAIC	TBD
MSS: Managed Security Services	ATOS	VA-180112-ATOS
SSDC: Server Storage Data Center	Unisys	VA-180815-UC
VDN: Voice Data Network	Verizon	VA-151028-MCI5

One of VITA's key service agreements is the Multisourcing Service Integrator (MSI) and its seven service Tower support providers. At the time of audit, there were 571 service metrics that were included in service level agreements (SLAs) across the existing platform suppliers. The suppliers are available to support VITA's mission and enable the Commonwealth's information technology requirements. All suppliers that provide services to the Commonwealth are grounded in using the Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) as a basis for providing uninterrupted and high-quality service.

COV Tower Contractor Services Agency Survey and Feedback

The audit included a Tower service delivery survey to COV agencies. In addition, VITA performs agency service delivery feedback surveys, as well as Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) who also has performed surveys. We compared the results of our survey to the JLARC Survey and VITA Bi-Annual Survey from 2022 and determined that results from all three surveys were similar.

Audit Objectives

The objectives of this audit are to:

- Determine if service levels are being met by the Supplier Strategy & VITA Performance (SSP) contracts. If service levels are not met, are vendors being held accountable?
- Determine whether Service Level Management Program meets industry standards for monitoring information technology service contracts and provides effective tracking and monitoring in the detail as prescribed in the contracts.

Audit Scope, Methodology, Sampling, and Criteria

Scope:
The audit scope included the Multisourcing Service Integrator (MSI) and its seven service Tower support providers. The audit period of performance was November 2022 through May 2023.

Methodology:
The audit methodology included:

- Obtaining and reviewing the support service contracts and required SLAs.
- Identifying VITA contract monitors, and methods to monitor and document SLAs.
- Documenting deliverables and reporting requirements for each of the SLA vendors.
- Determining processes used to monitor and report SLAs to include documentation and communication of SLAs not being met, and any resolution.
- Determine that VITA is evaluating compliance and using the tools built into the contract to ensure compliance.
- Surveying impacted state agencies to review issues with service and delivery requirements.
- Assessing SLAs to contract requirements to determine if SLAs align to contract requirements, and are consistent with industry standards – NIST, ITIL, and other service industries.

Sampling:
No sampling was performed. SysAudits.com LLC reviewed all metrics and SLAs outstanding during the time of audit.

Criteria:
As-part of the audit, several criteria were used to assess the audit objectives. The following criteria were used to assess the audit objectives:

- **Virginia's Information Technology Resource Management, Information Security Standard 501**
  This standard provides IT security policy and guidance for the Commonwealth of Virginia.

- **NIST 800-53, External System Services (SA) 9**
  The following NIST guidance is recommended. Require that providers of external system services comply with organizational security and privacy requirements and employ the following controls:
  1. Define and document organizational oversight and user roles and responsibilities about external system services; and
  2. Employ processes, methods, and techniques to monitor control compliance by external service providers on an ongoing basis.

- **ITIL Foundation 4**

  The following ITIL guidance was deemed applicable.

  - **Services is defined as:** A means of enabling value co-creation by facilitating outcomes that customers want to achieve, without the customer having to manage specific costs and risks.
  - **Service offering:** Is a formal description of one or more services, designed to address the needs of a target consumer group. A service offering may include goods, access to resources, and service actions.
  - **Service offerings may include:**
    - Goods to be supplied to a consumer (for example, a mobile phone). Goods are supposed to be transferred from the provider to the consumer, with the consumer taking the responsibility for their future use.
    - Access to resources granted or licensed to a consumer under agreed terms and conditions (for example, to the mobile network, or to the network storage). The resources remain under the provider's control and can be accessed by the consumer only during the agreed service consumption period.
    - Service actions performed to address a consumer's needs (for example, user support). These actions are performed by the service provider according to the agreement with the consumer.

- **ITIL Principles**
  - Do fewer things but do them better. Minimizing activities to include only those with value for one or more stakeholders will allow more focus on the quality of those actions.
  - Respect the time of the people involved. A process that is too complicated and bureaucratic is a poor use of the time of the people involved.
  - Have processes that are easier to understand, more likely to adopt to embed a practice, make sure it is easy to follow.
  - Monitor: The governing body monitors the performance of the organization and its practices, products, and services. The purpose of this is to ensure that performance is in accordance with policies and direction.

- **ITIL Service Level Management**
  The purpose of the service level management practice is to set clear business-based targets for service levels, and to ensure that delivery of services is assessed, monitored, and managed against these targets:
  - Definition: Service level. One or more metrics that define expected or achieved service quality.
  - Definition: Service level agreement. A documented agreement between a service provider and a customer that identifies both services required and the expected service level.

Service level management provides the end-to-end visibility of the organization's services. To achieve this, service level management:

- Establishes a shared view of the services and target service levels with customers.
- Ensures the organization meets the defined service levels through the collection, analysis, storage, and reporting of the relevant metrics for the identified services.
- Performs service reviews to ensure that the current set of services continues to meet the needs of the organization and its customers.
- Captures and reports on service issues, including performance against defined service levels.

The skills and competencies for service level management include relationship management, business liaison, business analysis, and commercial/supplier management. The practice requires pragmatic focus on the whole service and not simply its constituent parts; for example, simple individual metrics (such as percentage system availability) should not be taken to represent the whole service.

Finding 1: VITA Service Level Agreements and ITIL Best Practices

While VITA's service level agreements (SLAs) aligned with NIST 800-53 Service Acquisition (SA) and Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) principles, VITA's SLAs required agency personnel to monitor a high volume of metrics that did not add clear value to products and services. Specifically, VITA collects and monitors 571 metrics for oversight of its Tower contractors on a monthly basis through critical service levels, key measurements, and critical deliverables. VITA acknowledged that the 571 service metrics may be too many and contain duplicative items that do not add value. Further, 94 of the 571 metrics do not have a service credit mechanism to withhold funds from the contractor for missing these service delivery requirements. The accountability for delivering the expected service delivery is diminished without the monetary impact for which service credits can impose.

VITA recently started an initiative to review all SLAs to identify duplicative service level metrics that do not add clear value to operations. Due to the high number of SLAs and its ongoing priorities, VITA had not yet completed the initiative. Therefore, the SLAs that did not add clear value were not yet removed or combined with other service level items.

Criteria: ITIL recommends for organization to "keep it simple and practical" for managing its value stream.[1] Specifically, ITIL prescribes if a process, service, action, or metric fails to provide value or produce a useful outcome, eliminate it. In a process or procedure, use the minimum number of steps necessary to accomplish the objective(s). Always use outcome-based thinking to produce practical solutions that deliver results. To apply the "keep it simple and practical" principle, ITIL recommends organizations consider and perform the following to successfully manage the value stream:

- Do fewer tasks but do them better: Minimizing activities to include only those with value for one or more stakeholders will allow more focus on the quality of those actions.
- Respect the time of the people involved: A process that is too complicated and bureaucratic is a poor use of the time of the people involved.
- Easier to understand, more likely to adopt: To embed a practice, make sure it is easy to follow.

Duplicative SLA's and SLA metrics without a monetary impact can hinder the COV in receiving full benefits of contracted services.

Recommendations:

1. Review those Tower service levels that do not have a monetary impact and remove those that are not deemed to add value to COV agencies. In addition, VITA should minimize Tower service level requirements that do not include a monetary impact.
2. Develop a formalized process to evaluate SLAs for duplicative and inefficient metrics at least annually and seek input from COV agencies in this process.

[1] ITIL defines the value stream as an organization's process for creating and delivering products and services to its stakeholders.

VITA's Response:

1. VITA is removing over half of all SLAs and removing the category of SLAs that do not have monetary impact with Project Evolution. This modification also is moving the program to a single target for all SLAs, removing the need to measure each SLA 2 times, once for Target and once for Minimum.

2a. VITA will develop a review cycle that will include input from the agencies through the Relationship Management Committee (RMC). The effectiveness of this process will be dependent upon the completion of the implementation of Project Evolution.

2b. Any recommendations for related changes based on this review will be reviewed with the Service Owners and presented to the SLM Forum in one of the Monthly SLM Forum meetings for decision.

Estimated Completion Date: June 2024

Finding 2: VITA's Processes for Managing Customer Feedback on Service Provider Performance

VITA did not share SLA metrics internally with agencies or formally categorize COV Agency feedback on the Tower service providers. VITA's current process includes obtaining feedback through meetings (quarterly and monthly) with COV agency leads and service providers and by requesting agencies to respond to surveys on service provider performance. However, items were not consistently completed.

VITA periodically obtains data to understand agencies' feedback on service provider support. Additionally, VITA demonstrated instances of adapting to emerging service provider issues to support agency concerns. However, VITA does not have a process to ensure that agency feedback is tracked and categorically analyzed on a periodic basis to identify trends requiring further investigation and SLA adjustments. An analysis of the last 12 months was unable to confirm a process that demonstrates a consistent repeatable process used to periodically catalog, analyze and compare customer feedback to SLAs to identify trends and adjustments that may be required. VITA explained that it relied on other oversight mechanisms such as its governance forums with service providers to address agency feedback and therefore implementing a process to periodically analyze customer feedback and update SLAs was not yet completed.

Additionally, VITA did not have a process to ensure that agencies had an adequate understanding of the metrics used to assess service providers. Specifically, VITA did not provide agencies with SLAs or other guidance to assess and monitor service provider performance. Without the SLAs, agencies explained they were uncertain about the specific metrics used to assess and monitor service provider performance. For example, agencies explained they did not understand the methodology for counting elapsed days for service tickets and the processes for determining whether agencies or the service provider were responsible for service issues. VITA explained that it does not share SLAs with agencies due to the high volume of SLAs and reliance on the Multisourcing Service Integrator's processes to facilitate discussions between relevant stakeholders on an ongoing basis.

Criteria: ITIL recommends organizations to have a process to collaborate and promote visibility. Specifically, ITIL encourages organizations to work together across boundaries. This produces the likelihood of greater buy-in, more relevance to objectives, and increased likelihood of long-term success. ITIL also recommends feedback to be analyzed to identify improvement opportunities, risks, and issues.

VITA's lack of a formalized process to periodically analyze customer feedback for potential SLA adjustments increases the risk of service issue trends not being identified and addressed timely. Additionally, agencies do not have adequate visibility into the metrics used to assess service providers; thereby, reducing their opportunity to provide meaningful feedback and identify larger service issues. Overall, these risks pose additional risks to agency operations that rely on the Service Tower support to complete their mission.

Recommendations:

1. Develop a process to formally compare customer feedback to SLAs on a periodic basis to identify trends and adjustments that should be made to SLAs.

2. Develop a mechanism to formally share the expected metric requirements with agencies that use Service Tower support contractors.

VITA's Response:

1a. VITA has developed a handoff process between the Customer Satisfaction Review Team and the SLM Team.

1b. Research and determine the methodology. Then develop a work instruction for the SLM Team that will be used to evaluate trends and adjustments based on the feedback received.

2. VITA will develop a mechanism that makes SLA definitions and metrics more easily available for agency review. This is dependent on completion of Project Evolution and will require resources outside the SLM team to implement.

Estimated Completion Date: May 2024

Finding 3: VITA's Monitoring of Service Level Agreements

VITA implemented processes to collect and review data needed to verify service level agreement compliance, including a monthly review of contractor performance in meeting all SLAs. However, VITA did not formally document those processes and the methodology for completing its review. For example, we noted the following internal control weaknesses in the process:

- VITA service owners validate a Monthly Validation File (validation file) for each SLA by sampling specific service tickets included in the file. However, VITA has not yet formally documented the minimum standards for sampling or the criteria that service owners should use. For example, the minimum number of items that must be sampled for review, formally documenting items included in the sample, or factors justifying items that should be prioritized for sampling (e.g., higher risk or visibility items) were not documented to ensure that service owners had a standardized process for selecting samples. VITA explained that it wanted service owners to have flexibility in reviewing large volumes of data and therefore did not formalize a sampling standard. Further, VITA explained that service owners rely on their knowledge of ongoing operations and professional judgement when reviewing validation files, and therefore sampling standards were not yet developed.

- VITA service owners did not consistently complete a field in the validation files to capture service owner comments to document the rationale for approving requests to exclude non-compliant service level agreements from contractor performance. Instead, VITA relied on discussions with the contractors and stakeholders through other forums and meetings. In addition, VITA deemed completing the field for each item under review may be too time consuming under the current process.

Additionally, we identified possible staffing and timing constraints in VITA's review process of SLAs through the validation file. Specifically, VITA stated that it has a limited number of reviewers due to each reviewer having to be intimately familiar with the SLAs. VITA added that under the current validation file review process, it only has approximately two weeks to review all SLA metrics to confirm compliance and approve exclusions. On any given month, VITA may review over 450 of 571 SLAs metrics in two weeks. Further challenging VITAs review timeline is that each SLA metric could have as many as eighty specific items that must be verified.

As a result, VITA stated that it plans to further automate the monthly review process once it completes its project to remove SLA redundancies and implements. VITA plans to reassess staffing and review the timeline to determine what adjustments are needed once these efforts are completed. Specifically, VITA acknowledged that it may not have enough time each month to complete its validation file review and is continuing to address this concern in multiple ways:

- Reducing SLAs that must be processed each month through the removal of overlapping and duplicative items, combining where feasible, and leveraging other oversight tools where appropriate.
- Enforcing the deadlines in the contract for suppliers to submit information to VITA.
- Modifying future contracts, and working to modify current contracts, to move the suppliers' delivery date and correspondingly the MSI Delivery to VITA date.

Criteria: ITIL recommends for organizations to ensure that delivery of services is assessed, monitored, and managed against these targets:

- Provides the end-to-end visibility of the organization's services, and ensures the organization meets the defined service levels through the collection, analysis, storage, and reporting of the relevant metrics for the identified services.
- Performs service reviews to ensure that the current set of services continues to meet the needs of the organization and its customers.
- Captures and reports on service issues, including performance against defined service levels.

Without effective internal controls over SLA monitoring processes, VITA may not be able to ensure that contractor performance is adequately reviewed and verified. For example, inconsistent sampling procedures and documentation of completed reviews of requested exclusions increases the risk that oversight of SLA compliance does not meet VITA mission requirements.

Recommendations:

1. Once Project Evolution and the implementation of the latest version of SLA 2.3.4 – Security & Vulnerability Patching are completed, evaluate the processes used to review the Monthly Validation Files to identify automation where possible.
2. Evaluate the current contracts for the Service Tower Providers and determine if the contract requirements and timelines associated with the Monthly Validation File should be modified to provide VITA with additional review time.
3. Based on the evaluations in Recommendations 1 and 2, VITA should review its current resources for monitoring and managing contract requirements and enhance its resources and/or staffing as needed.
4. Determine if sampling of SLA items for review in the Monthly Validation File is appropriate and document the methodology that should be used if sampling is allowed.
5. Update the Monthly Validation File review process to formalize and standardize service owner comments for unmet SLAs metrics that are submitted for exclusion.

VITA's Response:

1. VITA will continue to replace the current, mostly manual processes with increased automation of the monthly processing, where available tools and technology use are feasible. Efforts undertaken will be documented as improvement efforts and tracked as such.

2a. As part of Project Evolution, VITA is requesting a change to the delivery date of the data. This is the first step that once implemented and coupled with automation will be reassessed to determine if additional steps are required.

2b. Re-evaluate and document additional recommended changes.

3. VITA will gather and assess evaluation timeframes and will notate and address resource needs.

4. VITA will document expectations for the development of sampling methodology to be used by each reviewer.

5. VITA will update the appropriate documentation and work instructions around Service Owner comments related to SLA exceptions. VITA has already worked with MSI and implemented a specified field for recording the reviewer(s) of the file.

Estimated Completion Date: August 2024

Appendix – VITA Response & Corrective Action Plan

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Robert Osmond
Chief Information Officer
Email: cio@vita.virginia.gov

Virginia Information Technologies Agency
7325 Beaufont Springs Drive
Richmond, Virginia 23225
(804) 510-7300

TDD VOICE -TEL. NO.
711

June 20, 2023

BY EMAIL

Mr. Michael Westfall, State Inspector General
Office of the State Inspector General (OSIG)
c/o Benjamin.Sutphin@osig.virginia.gov & David Cole <11dc@audshield.com>

Dear Mr. Westfall:

The Virginia Information Technologies Agency (VITA) has received the draft report on VITA's Service Level Agreement (SLA) management. Thank you for the performance review by the Office of the State Inspector General (OSIG) and external auditor SysAudits over the course of the past year. We appreciate the careful review and outside insight in this important area.

The report found VITA's SLA management in conformance with National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 800-53 and Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) principles. The report findings and recommendations affirm and align with VITA's in-progress efforts to improve the efficiency and value of the multisourcing services integrator (MSI) service level agreements (SLAs) and overall improvements to the SLA review process. Planning for the efforts, referred to as Project Evolution, began in March 2022 and the project initiated in August 2022. The project streamlines MSI administration by reducing the number of SLAs by 50%, focuses the service tower contracts on more specific targets, and eliminates a category of unnecessary SLAs that did not have associated service level credits.

The report also addressed other mechanisms that could support and enhance VITA's monthly SLA review cycle: enhancing input and feedback from customer agencies, improving access to SLAs and associated metrics data, and a sampling process and additional staff. Attached is a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) that addresses more specifically the recommendations from the draft audit.

Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft report and provide an agency response.

Sincerely,

Robert Osmond

Robert Osmond
Chief Information Office of the Commonwealth

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

VITA Corrective Action Plan

Finding No.	Recommendation	Corrective Action	Deliverable	Estimated Completion Date	Responsible Position
1	1. Review those Tower Service Levels that do not have a monetary impact and remove those that are not deemed to add value to COV agencies. In addition, VITA should minimize Tower service level requirements that do not include monetary impact	1. VITA is removing over half of all SLAs and removing the category of SLAs that do not have monetary impact with Project Evolution. This modification also is moving the program to a single target for all SLAs, removing the need to measure each SLA 2 times, once for Target and once for Minimum.	1a. Delivery of new SLM related exhibits to all Suppliers	August 2023	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics
			1b. Update of measurement tools to the single measurement for all SLAs	August 2023	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics
	2. Develop a formalized process to evaluate SLAs for duplicative and inefficient metrics at least annually and seek input from COV agencies in this process.	2a. VITA will develop a review cycle that will include input from the agencies through the Relationship Management Committee (RMC). The effectiveness of this process will be dependent upon the completion of the implementation of Project Evolution.	2. Deliver a review Process leveraging the appropriate tools & forums	June 2024	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics

Finding No.	Recommendation	Corrective Action	Deliverable	Estimated Completion Date	Responsible Position
		2b. Any recommendations for related changes based on this review will be reviewed with the Service Owners and presented to the SLM Forum in one of the Monthly SLM Forum meetings for decision.			
2	1. Develop a process to formally compare customer feedback to SLAs on a periodic basis to identify trends and adjustments that should be made to SLAs.	1a. VITA has developed a handoff process between the Customer Satisfaction Review Team and the SLM Team.	1a. Handoff process from Survey Team to SLM Team	Complete	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics
		1b. Research and determine the methodology. Then develop a work instruction for the SLM Team that will be used to evaluate trends and adjustments based on the feedback received.	1b. Work Instruction updates	March 2024	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics
	2. Develop a mechanism to formally share the expected metric requirements with agencies that use Service Tower support contractors.	2. VITA will develop a mechanism that makes SLA definitions and metrics more easily available for agency review. This is dependent on completion of Project Evolution and will require resources outside the SLM team to implement	2. Portal or other accessible mechanism for seeing/reviewing definitions and measurements in the SLM portfolio	May 2024	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics.

Finding No.	Recommendation	Corrective Action	Deliverable	Estimated Completion Date	Responsible Position
3.	1. Once Project Evolution and the implementation of the latest version of SLA 2.3.4 – Security & Vulnerability Patching are completed, evaluate the processes used to review the Monthly Validation Files to identify automation where possible.	1. VITA will continue to replace the current, mostly manual processes with increased automation of the monthly processing, where available tools and technology use are feasible. Efforts undertaken will be documented as improvement efforts and tracked as such.	1a. Complete automation of Validation File review decisions	December 2023	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics.
			1b. Create documented plan for next phases of automation	Project Evolution go-live +6 and +12 months	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics.
	2. Evaluate the current contracts for the Service Tower Providers and determine if the contract requirements and timelines associated with the Monthly Validation File should be modified to provide VITA with additional review time.	2a. As part of Project Evolution, VITA is requesting a change to the delivery date of the data. This is the first step that once implemented and coupled with automation will be reassessed to determine if additional steps are required.	2a. New delivery date implemented	August 2023 (currently pending supplier signatures)	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics.
		2b. Re-evaluate and document additional recommended changes	2b. Follow-up assessment of impact of automaton and identify & document additional needs	August 2024 (evaluated quarterly over 6-12 mos. after implementation date of 2a)	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics.

Finding No.	Recommendation	Corrective Action	Deliverable	Estimated Completion Date	Responsible Position
	3. Based on the evaluations in Recommendations 1 and 2, VITA should review its current resources for monitoring and managing contract requirements and enhance its resources and/or staffing as needed.	3. VITA will gather and assess evaluation timeframes and will notate and address resource needs	3. Provide a current resource assessment following Project Evolution and completion of Validation File intake automation	May 2024	Chief of Core Infrastructure Services
	4. Determine if sampling of SLA items for review in the Monthly Validation File is appropriate and document the methodology that should be used if sampling is allowed.	4. VITA will document expectations for the development of sampling methodology to be used by each reviewer	4. Documented expectations for development of sampling methodology.	June 2024	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics.
	5. Update the Monthly Validation File review to formalize and standardize service owner comments for unmet SLAs metrics that are submitted for exclusion.	5. VITA will update the appropriate documentation and work instructions around Service Owner comments related to SLA exceptions. VITA has already worked with MSI and implemented a specified field for recording the reviewer(s) of the file.	5. Documented work instructions for Service Owner Comments	December 2023	Manager, Performance & Data Analytics.