



Follow-up Review of
Audit of Driver and Vehicle
Information Database Usage by the
Environmental and Consumer
Protection Division

Office of the County Auditor

Follow-up Review Report

Robert Melton, CPA, CIA, CFE, CIG
County Auditor

Review Conducted by:

Kathie-Ann Ulett, CPA, Deputy County Auditor
Gerard Boucaud, CIA, CISA, CDPSE, Audit Manager
Luis Martinez, CISA, CDPSE, Information Technology Audit Supervisor

Report No. 23-03
October 31, 2022



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY AUDITOR

115 S. Andrews Avenue, Room 520 • Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301 • 954-357-7590 • FAX 954-357-7592

October 31, 2022

Honorable Mayor and Board of County Commissioners

We have conducted a follow-up review of our Audit of Driver and Vehicle Information Database Usage by the Environmental and Consumer Protection Division Audit (Report No. 21-02). The objective of our review was to determine the implementation status of our previous recommendations.

We conclude that all three of our previous recommendations were implemented. We commend management for implementing our recommendations. The status of each of our recommendations is presented in this follow-up report.

We conducted this review in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the review to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our review objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our review objectives.

We appreciate the cooperation and assistance provided by the staff of the Consumer Protection Division throughout our review process.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Bob Melton".

Bob Melton
County Auditor

cc: Monica Cepero, County Administrator
Andrew Meyers, County Attorney
Kimm Campbell, Deputy County Administrator
Kevin Kelleher, Assistant County Administrator
Lenny Vialpando, Director, Resilient Environment Department
Philip McChesney, Acting Director, Consumer Protection Division

Broward County Board of County Commissioners

Mark D. Bogen • Lamar P. Fisher • Beam Furr • Steve Geller • Jared E. Moskowitz • Nan H. Rich • Tim Ryan • Michael Udine
www.broward.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IMPLEMENTATION STATUS SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
Scope and Methodology	2
Overall Conclusion	2
OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT	3
1. The Use of DAVID by Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department Did Not Always Comply with the Stated Purpose in the Memorandum of Understanding.....	3
2. Searches of DAVID Data were not Supported with Adequate Documentation Justifying the Business Purpose for Each Search.....	4

IMPLEMENTATION STATUS SUMMARY

Implementation Status of Previous Recommendations From the Audit of Driver and Vehicle Information Database Usage by the Environmental and Consumer Protection Division

REC. NO.	PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATION	IMPLEMENTED	PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED	NOT IMPLEMENTED	NOT APPLICABLE
1	Continue the discontinuance of the use of DAVID data for unapproved purposes and work with State of Florida DHSMV to update the MOU to align with the current usage of DAVID data by EPGM.	☒			
2a	Ensure that appropriate documentation is created and retained to support the business justification for DAVID searches. This documentation should link searches to specific situations.	☒			
2b	Ensure users are trained to accurately input the specific business purpose related to each database search.	☒			

INTRODUCTION

Scope and Methodology

The Office of the County Auditor conducts audits of Broward County's entities, programs, activities, and contractors to provide the Board of County Commissioners, Broward County's residents, County management, and other stakeholders unbiased, timely, and relevant information for use in promoting government accountability and stewardship and improving government operations.

We conducted a follow up review of our Audit of Driver and Vehicle Information Database Usage by the Environmental and Consumer Protection Division (Report No. 21-02). The objective of our review was to determine the implementation status of previous recommendations for improvement.

We conducted this review in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the review to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our review objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our review objectives.

Our follow-up review included such tests of records and other auditing procedures, as we considered necessary in the circumstances. The follow-up testing was performed for the period January 1, 2020, through August 31, 2022. However, transactions, processes, and situations reviewed were not limited by the audit period.

Overall Conclusion

We conclude that all three of our previous recommendations were implemented. We commend management for implementing our recommendations. The status of each of our recommendations is presented in this follow-up report.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

This section reports actions taken by management on the Opportunities for Improvement in our previous review. The issues and recommendations herein are those of the original review, followed by the current status of the recommendations.

1. The Use of DAVID by Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department Did Not Always Comply with the Stated Purpose in the Memorandum of Understanding.

The use of DAVID by Environmental Protection and Growth Management Department (EPGM) did not always comply with the stated purpose within the memorandum of understanding (MOU). The Environmental and Consumer Protection Division (ECP) was listed as the original requesting agency in the MOU. According to the MOU:

“The data will be used to determine whether the chauffeur registration applicant has a driving record that would bear a substantial relationship to the applicant's ability to operate a vehicle for hire in a safe manner.”

However, other agencies within EPGM, such as Building Code Services and Environmental Engineering & Permitting also utilized the database.

Upon notification of this issue, management immediately issued a memorandum requiring the agency to disable all access to DAVID and perform a user recertification process to allow only the access needed for the use stated within the MOU.

We recommended management continue the discontinuance of the use of DAVID data for unapproved purposes and work with State of Florida DHSMV to update the MOU to align with the current usage of DAVID data by EPGM.

Implementation Status: Implemented. Management worked with the State of Florida DHSMV to update the MOU in alignment with business needs for DAVID data usage.

2. Searches of DAVID Data were not Supported with Adequate Documentation Justifying the Business Purpose for Each Search.

During our review of the business purpose for the request of personal information, we identified the following issues:

- A. For thirteen of 60 (22%) searches reviewed, evidence supporting the business justification for the search was not created or retained.
- B. We noted 1,112 of 4,698 (24%) searches were performed using a generic business purpose code "Specific Agency Function" which was allowed but may not have provided management sufficient information to determine the actual business purpose. In addition, 23 of 4,698 (.5%) searches were performed with no associated business code.

Upon notification of this issue, management immediately issued a revised policy limiting use of DAVID data for the purpose of chauffeur/hack license applications and renewals. Each search was to be supported by documentation for this activity.

We recommended management immediately:

- A. Ensure that appropriate documentation is created and retained to support the business justification for DAVID searches. This documentation should link searches to specific situations.
- B. Ensure users are trained to accurately input the specific business purpose related to each database search.

Implementation Status:

- A. Implemented. Management developed new policies and procedures that included document retention requirements to support the business justifications for DAVID searches.
- B. Implemented. Management developed new policies and procedures that included document retention requirements to support the business justifications for DAVID searches. Users are required to acknowledge their understanding of the policies and procedures.