

## Tracking SiteManager Contract Sampling and Testing Requirement Modifications

OKDOT audits for, among other things, Contract Sampling and Testing Modifications done by Construction Residencies as part of our materials finalization and certification process. This was a key requirement of a very well represented and supported Committee that determined what our official process should do.

OKDOT's bigger picture decisions:

1. We had to disable the delete function from Contract S/T windows. Instead, our policy is to leave everything there and zero out the N per in the test frequency. When things were deleted, there was no record that they had ever existed.
2. We had to create an Outstanding Items List (OIL) Tool that would allow us to address these concerns globally when a Contract was still in pending status – active status was too often too late.
3. We had to address the OIL and then generate contract materials in Central Office at a Systems Admin. Level prior to turning the Contract over to the Residency.
  - a. We discovered that some Residencies simply would not generate materials
  - b. We saw it best to hold the Contract for at least 1 day once materials were generated
  - c. We needed to be more hands-on in addressing OIL items globally

OKDOT's specific methods:

- For any given Contract, we query for the earliest date of modifications in Contract S/T's and hold that to be the Contract's materials generation day.
- We query for any modification dates greater than the generation date and flag those as subsequent Contract S/T modifications.
- From those subsequent modifications, we filter out any that were done by any user that is a member of a security group involved in highest level change order approvals. (Approving a change order has the potential to update Contract S/T requirements)

We encourage appropriate Contract S/T modifications by Residencies. All we require is for general remarks to indicate what they modified and an appropriate explanation why. If things are changed more than once, add onto the remarks. Our audit report simply lists out all of the little details. Our policy also suggests a reviewer look at global S/T's if they wish to see probable original settings.

The most frequent complaint I've heard about this subject to date is from Users who get flagged and claim to have put everything back exactly like it was originally. Their opinion is the flags should go away. We tell them it is not possible to do that, it's OK, and they simply need leave a general remark stating what they just told us.

Dave 5/10/2008