

Victoria L. Gruber  
Executive Director



Brian S. Tanen, CPA, CFE  
Legislative Auditor

**DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE SERVICES**  
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AUDITS  
MARYLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

May 12, 2026

Senator Guy J. Guzzone, Chair  
Senate Budget and Taxation Committee  
Miller Senate Office Building, 3 West Wing  
11 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Delegate Benjamin S. Barnes, Chair  
House Appropriations Committee  
Taylor House Office Building, Room 121  
6 Bladen Street  
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dear Senator Guzzone and Delegate Barnes:

The Office of Legislative Audits (OLA) has reviewed the actions taken by the Department of Information Technology (DoIT) to resolve the eight repeat audit findings (that were addressed by 12 recommendations) in our March 29, 2024 audit report. This review was conducted in accordance with a requirement specified in the April 2025 *Joint Chairmen's Report* (JCR), pages 87 and 88.

The JCR required that, prior to the release of \$250,000 of its administrative appropriation for fiscal year 2026, DoIT must take corrective action on all repeat audit findings on or before November 1, 2025. The JCR language further provided that OLA submit a report to the budget committees listing each repeat audit finding along with a determination that each repeat finding was corrected. The OLA report is required to be submitted to allow 45 days for the budget committees to review and release the funds prior to the end of the fiscal year. Certain detailed information and exhibits have been deemed cybersecurity related and therefore have been redacted in accordance with the State Government Article Section 2-1224(i), of the Annotated Code of Maryland

DoIT provided a status report to OLA, dated November 1, 2025, detailing corrective actions that had been implemented with respect to the eight repeat audit findings (**Exhibit 1**). The DoIT status report indicated that corrective action was in progress for at least some of the recommendations for the non-cybersecurity-related findings.

In accordance with State law, the status of the cybersecurity-related findings have been redacted.

After discussing our review results, DoIT generally agreed with the accuracy of the information presented. We wish to acknowledge the cooperation extended to us during the review by DoIT. We trust our response satisfactorily addresses the JCR requirement. Please contact me if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

*Brian S. Tanen*

Brian S. Tanen, CPA, CFE  
Legislative Auditor

cc: Senator Shelly L. Hettleman, Senate Chair, Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee  
Delegate Jared Solomon, House Chair, Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee  
Joint Audit and Evaluation Committee Members and Staff  
Senator William C. Ferguson IV, President of the Senate  
Delegate Joseline A. Peña-Melnyk, Speaker of the House of Delegates  
Governor Westley W. Moore  
Comptroller Brooke E. Lierman  
Treasurer Dereck E. Davis  
Attorney General Anthony G. Brown  
Secretary Yaakov Weissmann, Esq., Department of Budget and Management  
Secretary Katie Olson Savage, Department of Information Technology  
James L. Saunders, State Chief Information Security Officer, Department of Information  
Technology  
Victoria L. Gruber, Executive Director, Department of Legislative Services  
Yashodhara Rai, Policy Analyst, Department of Legislative Services

## Exhibit 1 to May 12, 2026 Letter to Joint Chairmen



Wes Moore | Governor  
Aruna Miller | Lt. Governor  
Katie Savage | Secretary

November 1, 2025

Brian Tanen  
Department of Legislative Services  
Office of Legislative Audits  
351 West Camden Street, Suite 400  
Baltimore, MD 21201

Dear Mr. Tanen,

On behalf of the Maryland Department of Information Technology (DoIT), I am pleased to submit the enclosed JCR 2025 Status Report, prepared in response to the requests outlined in the 2024 Joint Chairmen's Report. This submission provides detailed updates on DoIT's progress in addressing audit findings and implementing corrective actions across our Major Information Technology Development Projects (MITDPs), enterprise services, and security operations.

As reflected in the report, DoIT has made significant progress in strengthening project oversight, improving cost reporting accuracy, enhancing security controls, and modernizing operational processes. We remain committed to continued collaboration with the Office of Legislative Audits and the General Assembly to ensure transparency, accountability, and the effective stewardship of State technology resources.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me or my office. We appreciate your ongoing partnership and oversight.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Katie Savage". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Katie Savage  
Secretary  
Department of Information Technology

## Exhibit 1 to May 12, 2026 Letter to Joint Chairmen

### Major Information Technology Development Projects (MITDPs)

#### Finding 2

DoIT did not effectively monitor MITDPs to ensure they were on budget and on schedule and that changes to the scope and cost of the project were appropriate.

#### Recommendation 2a

We recommend that DoIT ensure annual ITPRs are submitted by State agencies, and that DoIT reviews and approves them prior to submitting it to DBM and DLS for budget analysis purposes (repeat).

Status of Recommendation 2a			
Status as of 11/1/2025	Completed	Completion Date:	06/30/24
Please provide details of corrective action taken.	<p>The current process allows for DoIT review and approval of annual ITPRs to be performed in a timely manner, as long as State agencies are submitting these reports on time, prior to DBM and DLS reviews for budget analysis purposes. House Bill 738/Senate Bill 705 also gives DoIT more authority to hold agencies accountable when they do not meet oversight requirements, as defined and set forth in DoIT policy and procedures, including missing deadlines.</p> <p>DoIT continues to refine our processes on an ongoing basis, focusing on enhancements that support to ensure that annual ITPRs are submitted by State agencies timely. Since this finding was initially closed, DoIT has implemented the following improvements as well:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Implemented new tools to make submitting, reviewing, and reading ITPRs easier.</li><li>● Updated the ITPR collection and review process and timeline to allow more time for review and discussion with agencies.</li><li>● Changed the funding structure and ITPR requirements for new projects.</li></ul> <p>With these changes, all except one project submitted their FY27 ITPRs on time and that one exception was blocked by forces beyond their control.</p>		

#### Recommendation 2d

We recommend that DoIT require the OPMs to ensure monthly health assessments are provided by State agencies, verify the accuracy of information reported, and provide justifications for the risk ratings (repeat).

## Exhibit 1 to May 12, 2026 Letter to Joint Chairmen

Status of Recommendation 2d			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2025</b>	Completed	<b>Completion Date:</b>	06/30/24
<b>Please provide details of corrective action taken.</b>	<p>The monthly health assessment process has been enhanced to provide a green / yellow / red rating on defined criteria. Additionally, OAs are independently providing an assessment of the rating to ensure the information provided by agencies is justified and accurate to our knowledge. Projects that fail to submit the monthly reports are escalated to agency leadership. If projects do not submit the required information on project expenses, generally included in the month reports, these expenses are not reimbursed by ITIF. These changes were implemented in spring 2024.</p>		

**Finding 4**  
**DoIT could not support cost data and conclusions included in its annual report submitted to the Governor, DBM, and General Assembly; and did not always include changes in schedule, cost, and other identified problems with MITDPs, as required by State law.**

### Recommendation 4a

**We recommend that DoIT ensure that its annual reports include accurate estimated costs to complete (repeat).**

Status of Recommendation 4a			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2025</b>	Completed	<b>Completion Date:</b>	06/30/24
<b>Please provide details of corrective action taken.</b>	<p>DoIT has implemented new review steps of midyear and end-of-year reports to ensure that they reflect the latest information DoIT has received on projects.</p> <p>In addition, DoIT has taken the following corrective actions to ensure actual and projected costs are as accurate as reasonably possible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Require agencies to include expenditure data in monthly health checks</li> <li>● DoIT implemented a monthly review of FMIS GENT reports of MITDP expenditures to the agency reported amounts</li> </ul> <p>These new procedures help to ensure actual costs incurred are reported correctly. This, along with additional enhancements to processes, as noted in response to Finding 2, help ensure estimated costs to complete projects are as accurate as reasonably possible. All information used to</p>		

## Exhibit 1 to May 12, 2026 Letter to Joint Chairmen

	<p>develop and that support information in the annual report will be retained for future reference. In the future, much of this information will be stored in the new PMIS the team is planning.</p> <p>DoIT continues to refine our processes on an ongoing basis. Since this finding was initially closed, DoIT has implemented the following improvements as well:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Standardized the rebaseline process agencies must follow to increase the expected cost of any MITDP</li> <li>● Added a new section to the FY25 end-of-year report. Each project narrative now includes an addendum providing any new information learned about that project between the end of FY25 and when the report draft is finalized (September 30, 2025). Any additional changes that happen between October 1, 2025 and November 1, 2025, when the report is delivered, will be reflected in the forthcoming mid-year report delivered in January 2026.</li> </ul>
--	---

### Information Systems Security and Control and Enterprise Services

**The Information Systems Security and Control and Enterprise Services section, including findings 11 through 14, has been deemed to contain cybersecurity-related information and audit findings and was redacted from the publicly available report and correspondence.**

#### **Finding 11**

**Redacted cybersecurity-related finding.**

Status of Recommendation 11			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2025</b>		<b>Completion Date:</b>	
<b>Please provide details of corrective action taken.</b>	Agency corrective actions have been redacted by OLA.		

## Exhibit 1 to May 12, 2026 Letter to Joint Chairmen

### Finding 12

Redacted cybersecurity-related finding.

#### Status of Recommendation 12a

Status as of 11/1/2025		Completion Date:	
Please provide details of corrective action taken.	Agency corrective actions have been redacted by OLA.		

#### Status of Recommendation 12b

Status as of 11/1/2025		Completion Date:	
Please provide details of corrective action taken.	Agency corrective actions have been redacted by OLA.		

#### Status of Recommendation 12c

Status as of 11/1/2025		Completion Date:	
Please provide details of corrective action taken.	Agency corrective actions have been redacted by OLA.		

### Finding 13

Redacted cybersecurity-related finding.

#### Status of Recommendation 13a

Status as of 11/1/2025		Completion Date:	
---------------------------	--	------------------	--

## Exhibit 1 to May 12, 2026 Letter to Joint Chairmen

<b>Please provide details of corrective action taken.</b>	Agency corrective actions have been redacted by OLA.		
<b>Status of Recommendation 13b</b>			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2025</b>		<b>Completion Date:</b>	
<b>Please provide details of corrective action taken.</b>	Agency corrective actions have been redacted by OLA.		

**Finding 14**  
Redacted cybersecurity-related finding.

<b>Status of Recommendation 14</b>			
<b>Status as of 11/1/2025</b>		<b>Completion Date:</b>	
<b>Please provide details of corrective action taken.</b>	Agency corrective actions have been redacted by OLA.		

### Enterprise Technology Support Services (ETSS)

**Finding 15**  
DoIT did not have formal written agreements with 57 of the 130 State and local entities receiving ETSS and did not recover \$4.8 million from nine entities with agreements for services provided.

#### Recommendation 15a

We recommend that DoIT enter into formal MOUs with all agencies for which it provides ETSS. The MOU should clarify DoIT and agency responsibilities, specific services to be provided by each, and a mechanism to provide for the cost of these services (repeat).

**Status of Recommendation 15a**

## Exhibit 1 to May 12, 2026 Letter to Joint Chairmen

Status as of 11/1/2025	In Progress (91% Complete)	Completion Date:	TBD
<p><b>Please provide details of corrective action taken.</b></p>	<p>DoIT has created a revised enterprise services MOU that addresses the areas noted by the auditors and has made significant progress in getting signatures from all 79 units of government that have a legislative appropriation for DoIT services. To date, DoIT has executed MOUs with 72 out of 79 agreements. While DoIT continues to follow up and make contact, the following units of government have been non-responsive: Department of Legislative Services, MD Stadium Authority, Canal Place Preserve Authority, Property Tax Assessments Appeal Board, St. Mary's College of MD, University of MD System, and Maryland Environmental Science.</p> <p>It is important to note that there is not a separate MOU for the Boards and Commissions (D15), which is rolled into the Governor's Coordinating Offices and falls under their MOU. The DoIT (F50) budget includes a legislative appropriation for DoIT services. There is not an MOU related to this, and DoIT has not been included in the 79 units of government noted above.</p>		

## Exhibit 1 to May 12, 2026 Letter to Joint Chairmen

### Equipment

#### Finding 16

DoIT did not adequately control its equipment inventory and did not maintain accurate detail records.

#### Recommendation 16a

We recommend that DoIT comply with the requirements of the DGS *Inventory Control Manual* by conducting annual independent physical inventories (repeat).

Status of Recommendation 16a			
Status as of 11/1/2025	In Progress	Completion Date:	12/31/25
Please provide details of corrective action taken.	On August 5th, DoIT received approval from DGS to use its deployed IT asset management system to update the existing automated processes for the inventory of IT equipment after six (6) months of collaboration. DoIT is currently working through the integration and sample data collection and expects to have this completed by the end of the calendar year.		

**Exhibit 2 to May 12, 2026 Letter to Joint Chairmen**

**Status of Repeat Findings in Office of Legislative Audits’ (OLA) March 29, 2024  
Audit Report on the Department of Information Technology (DoIT)**

<b>Prior Recommendations Pertaining to Repeat Findings</b>	<b>DoIT Reported Status</b>	<b>Status Based on OLA Review</b>
<b>Major Information Technology Development Projects</b> 2. We recommend that DoIT <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ensure annual Information Technology Project Requests are submitted by State agencies, and that DoIT reviews and approves them prior to submitting it to the Department of Budget and Management and the Department of Legislative Services for budget analysis purposes.</li> </ol>	Completed	Resolved
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. require the oversight project managers to ensure monthly health assessments are provided by State agencies, verify the accuracy of information reported, and provide justifications for the risk ratings.</li> </ol>	Completed	Resolved
4. We recommend that DoIT <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ensure that its annual reports include accurate estimated costs to complete and retain documentation to support the amounts reported.</li> </ol>	Completed	Resolved
<b>Information Systems Security and Control Enterprise Services<sup>1</sup></b>		
11. Status Redacted.		
12. Status Redacted.		
13. Status Redacted.		
14. Status Redacted.		

<sup>1</sup> Specific information related to cybersecurity-related findings 11, 12, 13, and 14 has been redacted for the publicly available report in accordance with State Government Article 2-1224(i) of the Annotated Code of Maryland.

## Exhibit 2 to May 12, 2026 Letter to Joint Chairmen

### Status of Repeat Findings in Office of Legislative Audits' (OLA) March 29, 2024 Audit Report on the Department of Information Technology (DoIT)

Prior Recommendations Pertaining to Repeat Findings	DoIT Reported Status	Status Based on OLA Review
<b>Enterprise Technology Support Services (ETSS)</b> 15. We recommend that DoIT a. enter into formal memorandum of understanding (MOUs) with all agencies for which it provides ETSS. The MOU should clarify DoIT and agency responsibilities, specific services to be provided by each, and a mechanism to provide for the cost of these services.	In Progress	--
<b>Equipment</b> 16. We recommend that DoIT comply with the requirements of the Department of General Services <i>Inventory Control Manual</i> by a. conducting annual independent physical inventories.	In Progress	--