H. CARL MCCALL
STATE COMPTROLLER

A.E. SMITH STATE OFFICE BUILDING
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12236

STATE OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF THE STATE COMPTROLLER

April 16, 1999

Ms. Katherine N. Lapp
Director of Criminal Justice
and Commissioner
Division of Criminal Justice Services
4 Tower Place
Albany, NY 12203-3702

Re: Report 99-Y-23

Dear Ms. Lapp:

To assist in your oversight of the Division of Criminal Justice Services (Division) Year 2000 compliance progress, we reviewed selected steps being taken by the Division as of March 17, 1999, to make the Computerized Criminal History System (CCHS), the Wanted System, and the Statewide Automated Fingerprint Identification System (SAFIS) Year 2000 compliant. These systems have been designated "mission critical" systems by New York State's Office for Technology (OFT), which is responsible for overseeing the State's Year 2000 readiness. CCHS is the central repository of criminal history information in New York State. The Wanted System is used to track wanted or missing persons. SAFIS is a statewide collection of ten-finger fingerprints, utilized as a crime solving tool for investigators throughout New York State. The steps we selected for review pertained to Year 2000 project planning and management, Year 2000 systems testing, identification and correction of systems data exchanges, and the establishment of contingency plans for continuing important business and service functions in the event of a Year 2000-related failure.

The objective of our review was to assess whether the Division appears to be taking the necessary steps to address Year 2000 problems related to the CCHS, Wanted System, and SAFIS. To complete our review we interviewed Division personnel and we reviewed Division documents. In addition, we obtained and analyzed Division responses to a Year 2000 assessment questionnaire that we designed (see attached Tables). Unlike an audit, a review does not include testing or verification of information and records provided by the Division and does not include a review of internal controls. Therefore, we cannot conclude whether the CCHS, Wanted System, or SAFIS will be Year 2000 compliant in a timely manner.

The results of our review show that the Division is taking many of the steps necessary to address Year 2000 problems related to the CCHS, Wanted System, and SAFIS. For example:

- Efforts to correct the three systems are covered by a written Year 2000 project plan and schedule, and Division management monitors the efforts.

- There were plans for testing the three systems and guidance was available for completing testing.

- All data exchanges among the three systems have been identified and appropriate corrections of data exchanges are being made.

However, the Division has not yet taken substantial steps to prepare contingency plans to ensure the continuance of business and service functions that are dependent on the three systems we reviewed. Therefore, should any of the systems experience a Year 2000-related failure, the Division may not be prepared to provide for such functions. We encourage the Division to expedite its contingency planning process. In addition, there are delays in the completion of the planned work on SAFIS, with the expected completion date now being June 30, 1999. We encourage the Division to closely monitor the status of this project to ensure that this target date is met.

Major contributors to this review were Brian Reilly, James Brunt, Deb Spaulding, Jorge Vázquez, and Jerry Steigman.

Your comments to this review are welcomed. We wish to express our appreciation to the management and staff of the Division of Criminal Justice Services for the courtesies and cooperation extended to our auditors during this review, and hope that it is helpful to your Year 2000 monitoring and oversight responsibilities.

Very truly yours,

William P. Challice
Audit Director

cc: Barbara S. Gordon, DCJS
Gary Davis, OFT

DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES
YEAR 2000 ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
COMPUTERIZED CRIMINAL HISTORY SYSTEM

TABLE I

A colored "traffic light" Legend is included in the table below to assist management in focusing an appropriate level of attention on the issues identified in the Status and Comments sections of the Review Findings.

Legend:

	Status/Comments contain matters which may be of immediate concern to management.		Status/Comments contain matters which management may wish to consider.		Status/Comments do not contain issues which require immediate management consideration.

Review Findings:

	YEAR 2000 STEPS	STATUS	COMMENTS
	A. PROJECT PLANNING & MANAGEMENT		
	A1. Is there a written Year 2000 Project Plan and does it include/identify steps needed to correct the System in question?	Yes	Efforts to correct the System are covered by a written Year 2000 project plan and schedule.
	A2. Does the Plan (or any other available record) define what is meant by "compliance" when describing systems at the agency which are Year 2000 ready?	Yes	The Division defines compliance as the System's ability to accurately process, update, and transmit information beyond the Year 2000. The definition considers data exchanges with partners.
	A3. Is there a written schedule covering the time frame for achieving compliance for the System in question?	Yes	A detailed schedule for remediation of the System is in place.
	A4. Is progress toward completion of the schedule for the System in question being monitored?	Yes	Division management monitors the efforts at weekly and biweekly meetings. Progress is further monitored through various reports to Division managers, executive management, and via quarterly reporting to OFT.

TABLE I (Cont'd.)

	YEAR 2000 STEPS	STATUS	COMMENTS
	A5. Is the System in question meeting the schedule (no significant slippage being reported)?	Yes	The process is meeting the schedule.
	B. TEST PLANS		
	B1. Is there a documented test plan and does it include/identify steps needed to ensure that the System in question will process as expected after it has been corrected to comply with Year 2000?	Yes	The Division has a written test plan that addresses all aspects of the testing strategy, including what testing is to be performed on the System, who is going to perform those tests, the sequence of the events, and a manner to monitor and respond to the results of the testing.
	C. DATA EXCHANGES		
	C1. Have all data exchange partners/interfaces for the System in question been identified and included on a written inventory record?	Yes	All interchanges were inventoried, complete with the type of interface, uses, and contacts.
	C2. Have data exchange interfaces been considered in the overall Year 2000 Project Plan and the test plan covering the System in question?	Yes	The data exchanges have been considered in the overall plan and given adequate emphasis.
	D. CONTINGENCY PLANS		
	D1. Is there a written business contingency plan in place for the System in question and does the plan specify steps for completing vital business functions if the System in question is noncompliant or inoperable for Year 2000 purposes?	No	The Division is beginning the process of contingency planning for the System in accordance with OFT guidelines. Division management and staff have discussed contingency planning, but at this point, there are no formalized, written per-system or agency-wide Year 2000 contingency plans.

DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES
YEAR 2000 ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
STATEWIDE AUTOMATED FINGERPRINT IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

TABLE II

A colored "traffic light" Legend is included in the table below to assist management in focusing an appropriate level of attention on the issues identified in the Status and Comments sections of the Review Findings.

Legend:

	Status/Comments contain matters which may be of immediate concern to management.		Status/Comments contain matters which management may wish to consider.		Status/Comments do not contain issues which require immediate management consideration.

Review Findings:

	YEAR 2000 STEPS	STATUS	COMMENTS
	A. PROJECT PLANNING & MANAGEMENT		
	A1. Is there a written Year 2000 Project Plan and does it include/identify steps needed to correct the System in question?	Yes	Efforts to correct the System are covered by a written Year 2000 project plan and schedule.
	A2. Does the Plan (or any other available record) define what is meant by "compliance" when describing systems at the agency which are Year 2000 ready?	Yes	The Division defines compliance as the ability of the System to accurately process, update, and transmit information beyond the Year 2000. The definition does consider data exchanges with partners.
	A3. Is there a written schedule covering the time frame for achieving compliance for the System in question?	Yes	A detailed schedule for remediation of the System is in place.
	A4. Is progress toward completion of the schedule for the System in question being monitored?	Yes	Division management monitors the efforts at weekly and biweekly meetings. Progress is further monitored through various reports to Division managers, executive management, and via quarterly reporting to OFT.

Table II (Cont'd.)

	YEAR 2000 STEPS	STATUS	COMMENTS
	A5. Is the System in question meeting the schedule (no significant slippage being reported)?	No	The Division originally planned to have SAFIS completed by December 31, 1998. In mid-1997, this estimate was revised to December 31, 1999 because the vendor was unable to deliver the updated and Year 2000 compliant version of the proprietary system, SAFIS. Division management took action to compel the vendor to expedite its efforts, and the vendor delivered the software on February 1, 1999. Consequently, the revised completion date for the SAFIS project is now June 30, 1999.
	B. TEST PLANS		
	B1. Is there a documented test plan and does it include/identify steps needed to ensure that the System in question will process as expected after it has been corrected to comply with Year 2000?	Yes	The Division has a written test plan that addresses all aspects of the testing strategy, including what testing is to be performed on the System, who is going to perform those tests, the sequence of the events, and a manner to monitor and respond to the results of the testing.
	C. DATA EXCHANGES		
	C1. Have all data exchange partners/interfaces for the System in question been identified and included on a written inventory record?	Yes	All interchanges were inventoried, complete with the type of interface, uses, and contacts.
	C2. Have data exchange interfaces been considered in the overall Year 2000 Project Plan and the test plan covering the System in question?	Yes	The data exchanges have been considered in the overall plan and given adequate emphasis.
	D. CONTINGENCY PLANS		
	D1. Is there a written business contingency plan in place for the System in question and does the plan specify steps for completing vital business functions if the System in question is noncompliant or inoperable for Year 2000 purposes?	No	The Division is beginning the process of contingency planning for the System in accordance with OFT guidelines. Division management and staff have discussed contingency planning, but at this point, there are no formalized, written per-system or agency-wide Year 2000 contingency plans.

DIVISION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES
YEAR 2000 ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
WANTED SYSTEM

TABLE III

A colored "traffic light" Legend is included in the table below to assist management in focusing an appropriate level of attention on the issues identified in the Status and Comments sections of the Review Findings.

Legend:

	Status/Comments contain matters which may be of immediate concern to management.		Status/Comments contain matters which management may wish to consider.		Status/Comments do not contain issues which require immediate management consideration.

Review Findings:

	YEAR 2000 STEPS	STATUS	COMMENTS
	A. PROJECT PLANNING & MANAGEMENT		
	A1. Is there a written Year 2000 Project Plan and does it include/identify steps needed to correct the System in question?	Yes	Efforts to correct the System are covered by a written Year 2000 project plan and schedule.
	A2. Does the Plan (or any other available record) define what is meant by "compliance" when describing systems at the agency which are Year 2000 ready?	Yes	The Division has defined compliance as the System's ability to accurately process, update, and transmit information beyond the Year 2000. The definition does consider data exchanges with partners.
	A3. Is there a written schedule covering the time frame for achieving compliance for the System in question?	Yes	A detailed schedule for remediation of the System is in place.
	A4. Is progress toward completion of the schedule for the System in question being monitored?	Yes	Division management monitors the efforts at weekly and biweekly meetings. Progress is further monitored through various reports to Division managers, executive management, and via quarterly reporting to OFT.

TABLE III (Cont'd)

	YEAR 2000 STEPS	STATUS	COMMENTS
	A5. Is the System in question meeting the schedule (no significant slippage being reported)?	Yes	The process is meeting the schedule.
	B. TEST PLANS		
	B1. Is there a documented test plan and does it include/identify steps needed to ensure that the System in question will process as expected after it has been corrected to comply with Year 2000?	Yes	The Division has a written test plan that addresses all aspects of the testing strategy, including what testing is to be performed on the System, who is going to perform those tests, the sequence of the events, and a manner to monitor and respond to the results of the testing.
	C. DATA EXCHANGES		
	C1. Have all data exchange partners/interfaces for the System in question been identified and included on a written inventory record?	Yes	All interchanges were inventoried, complete with the type of interface, uses, and contacts.
	C2. Have data exchange interfaces been considered in the overall Year 2000 Project Plan and the test plan covering the System in question?	Yes	The data exchanges have been considered in the overall plan and given adequate emphasis.
	D. CONTINGENCY PLANS		
	D1. Is there a written business contingency plan in place for the System in question and does the plan specify steps for completing vital business functions if the System in question is noncompliant or inoperable for Year 2000 purposes?	No	The Division is beginning the process of contingency planning for the System in accordance with OFT guidelines. Division management and staff have discussed contingency planning, but at this point, there is no formalized, written per-system or agency-wide Year 2000 contingency plans.