



Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Office of the State Auditor
Suzanne M. Bump

Making government work better

Official Audit Report – Issued June 30, 2022

Massachusetts Department of Transportation Aeronautics Division

For the period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2021





Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Office of the State Auditor
Suzanne M. Bump

Making government work better

June 30, 2022

Mr. Jeffrey DeCarlo, Administrator
Massachusetts Department of Transportation Aeronautics Division
Logan Office Center
1 Harborside Drive, Suite 205N
Boston, MA 02128

Dear Mr. DeCarlo:

I am pleased to provide this performance audit of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation's Aeronautics Division. This report details the audit objectives, scope, methodology, findings, and recommendations for the audit period, July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2021. My audit staff discussed the contents of this report with management of the agency, whose comments are reflected in this report.

I would also like to express my appreciation to the Aeronautics Division for the cooperation and assistance provided to my staff during the audit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "SMB", written over a light blue circular background.

Suzanne M. Bump
Auditor of the Commonwealth

cc: Jamey Tesler, Secretary of Transportation and Chief Executive Officer of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
OVERVIEW OF AUDITED ENTITY	3
AUDIT OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY	5
DETAILED AUDIT FINDINGS WITH AUDITEE’S RESPONSE.....	9
1. The Massachusetts Department of Transportation’s Aeronautics Division does not have a business continuity plan.....	9
2. The Aeronautics Division did not ensure that staff members signed its acceptable use policy and completed cybersecurity awareness training.	10
3. The Aeronautics Division does not have an internal control plan.....	12
OTHER MATTERS	15

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BCP	business continuity plan
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CTR	Office of the Comptroller of the Commonwealth
EOTSS	Executive Office of Technology Services and Security
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
ICP	internal control plan
IT	information technology
MassDOT	Massachusetts Department of Transportation
MBTA	Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In accordance with Section 12 of Chapter 11 of the Massachusetts General Laws, the Office of the State Auditor has conducted a performance audit of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation's (MassDOT's) Aeronautics Division for the period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2021.

In this performance audit, we determined whether the Aeronautics Division established a review process for its contract with Aurigo Software Technologies, Inc.¹ and assigned a project manager to ensure that changes made to the software development project under contract were reviewed and approved, whether the division followed policies and procedures for the acceptable use of its information technology resources and for cybersecurity awareness training, whether the division established a business continuity plan (BCP), and whether the division registered aircraft and recorded the registration revenue² generated during the audit period. In addition, we determined whether the Aeronautics Division updated its internal control plan (ICP) in response to significant effects of the 2019 coronavirus pandemic as required by the Office of the Comptroller of the Commonwealth. We also assessed whether the Aeronautics Division Drone Program operated in accordance with Part 48 of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 14 CFR 107.61, 14 CFR 107.73, and the "MassDOT Aeronautics Drone Team Inventory Standard Operating Procedures."

Below is a summary of our findings and recommendations, with links to each page listed.

Finding 1 Page 9	The Aeronautics Division does not have a BCP.
Recommendation Page 10	The Aeronautics Division, in conjunction with the new MassDOT employees assigned to this area, should develop, document, and test a BCP.

-
1. The Aeronautics Division contracted Aurigo Software Technologies, Inc. to configure and install an application called Aurigo Masterworks. Until 2021, the division used this application to process aircraft registrations and revenue collected from the registrations.
 2. Aircraft owners must annually register with, and pay a registration fee to, the Aeronautics Division to be based in one of the Commonwealth's public-use airports.

Finding 2 Page <u>10</u>	The Aeronautics Division did not ensure that staff members signed its acceptable use policy and completed cybersecurity awareness training.
Recommendations Page <u>12</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Aeronautics Division should implement a policy requiring personnel to complete new hire and annual cybersecurity awareness training.2. The Aeronautics Division should maintain a record of completion of cybersecurity awareness training for each employee.3. The Aeronautics Division should require all personnel to sign the “Acceptable Use of Information Technology (IT) Resources” policy.
Finding 3 Page <u>12</u>	The Aeronautics Division does not have an ICP.
Recommendations Page <u>13</u>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The Aeronautics Division should implement an ICP.2. The Aeronautics Division should maintain an up-to-date ICP and should review and update it at least annually.

OVERVIEW OF AUDITED ENTITY

The Massachusetts Department of Transportation's (MassDOT's) Aeronautics Division, formerly known as the Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission, is authorized by Chapter 90 of the Massachusetts General Laws. The division has jurisdiction over 35 of the Commonwealth's 38 public-use airports. It does not have jurisdiction over activities at Logan International Airport, Worcester Airport, and Hanscom Field, which are owned and operated by the Massachusetts Port Authority.

The Aeronautics Division received \$20,486,000 of total funding in fiscal year 2020 and \$14,916,000 of total funding in fiscal year 2021. The Aeronautics Division Drone Program received \$3,380,000 of that funding in fiscal year 2020 and \$4,625,000 in fiscal year 2021.

According to the Aeronautics Division's website,

We promote aviation throughout the Commonwealth. We also enhance airport safety, customer service, economic development, and environmental stewardship. . . .

We support public-use airports . . . in the Commonwealth and we:

- *promote economic development;*
- *inspect each airport for safety compliance;*
- *enhance environmental stewardship; and*
- *provide educational support to advance aviation and [science, technology, engineering, and mathematics] initiatives.*

MassDOT oversees four divisions: the Aeronautics Division, the Highway Division, the Registry of Motor Vehicles, and the Mass Transit Division. Each division is headed by an administrator, who is appointed by the Secretary of Transportation.

Aeronautics Division Drone Program

According to the website of the Aeronautics Division Drone Program,

The MassDOT Aeronautics Division Drone Program uses Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS, or "drones") to further the work of MassDOT and the [Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority, or MBTA] across the Commonwealth. The Drone Program is guiding adoption of drone technology within MassDOT and the MBTA in a manner that is safe, cost-effective, and secure.

The Aeronautics Division Drone Program conducts bridge, rail, subway tunnel, and airport inspections; asset monitoring; accident investigation; and incident response throughout the Commonwealth. The Aeronautics Division's drones have also been used in MBTA training exercises, subway evacuation drills, and pipeline explosion inspections. In spring 2019, the division used one of its drones to fulfill a request from the State House to photograph discoloration of the gold leaf on the State House dome. The images captured by the drone provided information that was necessary for the repair process. In December 2021, the division partnered with several agencies, including the Federal Aviation Administration, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Department of Homeland Security, to perform drone flight testing with the immediate goal of developing the capacity to provide pharmaceuticals, medical supplies, and lifesaving equipment to remote areas after storms and other natural disasters.

AUDIT OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

In accordance with Section 12 of Chapter 11 of the Massachusetts General Laws, the Office of the State Auditor has conducted a performance audit of certain activities of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation's (MassDOT's) Aeronautics Division for the period July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2021.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted 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.

Below is a list of our audit objectives, indicating each question we intended our audit to answer; the conclusion we reached regarding each objective; and, if applicable, where each objective is discussed in the audit findings.

Objective	Conclusion
1. For the contract between the Aeronautics Division and Aurigo Software Technologies, Inc., did the division establish a review process and assign a project manager to ensure that changes made to the software development project under contract were reviewed and approved in accordance with the executed contract's "Statement of Work"?	Yes
2. Has the Aeronautics Division established information technology (IT) policies and procedures for the acceptable use of its IT resources and for cybersecurity awareness training in accordance with MassDOT's "Acceptable Use of Information Technology (IT) Resources" policy and Sections 6.2.3 and 6.2.4 of the Executive Office of Technology Services and Security's (EOTSS's) Information Security Risk Management Standard IS.010?	No; see Finding <u>2</u>
3. Has the Aeronautics Division established a business continuity plan (BCP) in accordance with EOTSS's Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Standard IS.005?	No; see Finding <u>1</u>
4. Did the Aeronautics Division register aircraft and record the registration revenue generated during the audit period in accordance with the <i>MassDOT Aeronautics Division Finance Department Policies and Procedures Manual</i> ?	Yes
5. Has the Aeronautics Division updated its internal control plan (ICP) in accordance with the Office of the Comptroller of the Commonwealth's (CTR's) September 30, 2020 memorandum "[2019 Coronavirus, or] COVID-19 Pandemic Response Internal Controls Guidance"?	No; see Finding <u>3</u>

Objective	Conclusion
6. Does the Aeronautics Division Drone Program operate in accordance with Section 48 of Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 14 CFR 107.61, 14 CFR 107.73, and the “MassDOT Aeronautics Drone Team Inventory Standard Operating Procedures”?	Yes, but see <u>Other Matters</u>

To achieve our objectives, we gained an understanding of the Aeronautics Division’s internal controls related to the objectives by reviewing applicable policies and procedures, as well as conducting inquiries with division staff members and management. We evaluated the design, and tested the operating effectiveness, of internal controls used by the division to register drone pilots and aircraft.

To obtain sufficient, appropriate audit evidence to address our audit objectives, we conducted the following audit procedures:

- To determine whether the Aeronautics Division had established a process to review its Aurigo Software Technologies, Inc. contract, we obtained and reviewed the contract to verify that a project manager had been assigned to the project and an implementation team had reviewed and authorized changes before they were implemented.
- To determine whether the Aeronautics Division had established IT policies and procedures, we obtained and reviewed MassDOT’s “Acceptable Use of Information Technology (IT) Resources” policy and EOTSS’s Information Security Risk Management Standard IS.010. We requested signed “Acceptable Use of Information Technology (IT) Resources” policies for all personnel.
- To determine whether Aeronautics Division employees completed cybersecurity awareness training, we obtained and compared a list of all active personnel during the audit period along with their hire dates and requested all cybersecurity awareness training certificates for these personnel that were issued during the audit period.
- To determine whether the Aeronautics Division had established a BCP, we requested the plan from division management.
- To determine whether the Aeronautics Division registered aircraft and recorded registration revenue generated during the audit period in accordance with the *MassDOT Aeronautics Division Finance Department Policies and Procedures Manual*, we reviewed all the notification emails that the division sent to airport managers notifying them that their based aircraft lists³ were due.
- To determine whether the Aeronautics Division established and implemented policies and procedures for the registration of aircraft and the collection of aircraft registration fees during the audit period, we obtained and reviewed the *MassDOT Aeronautics Division Finance Department Policies and Procedures Manual*.

3. This is a list of aircraft registered at any of the 35 public-use airports over which the Aeronautics Division has jurisdiction.

- We obtained all aircraft registration and registration revenue data for the audit period. The data included the aircraft registration years, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) registration numbers, Aeronautics Division registration numbers, aircraft serial numbers, Aeronautics Division registration dates, and Aeronautics Division registration fee amounts. We then selected a random, statistical sample of 50 aircraft registrations from a population of 3,946, with a 90% confidence level, 5% tolerable error rate, and 0% expected error rate. To ensure that the division deposited the correct amounts in its operating bank account, we verified the amounts on the bank deposit detail statements, the check totals, the check numbers, and the totals from the bank's deposited check summaries and matched them all to the aircraft registration and registration revenue data. The division uses CTR's Cash Transfer Input form to track the transfer of money to the Commonwealth, which is meant to occur after fees are deposited; we matched the totals on this form to the deposit summary in Aurigo Masterworks, a software application that the Aeronautics Division implemented in 2017 and used to maintain aircraft registration and revenue information. (The Aeronautics Division decommissioned Aurigo Masterworks in April 2021 upon the partial implementation of its Salesforce application.⁴) Finally, we inspected the Cash Transfer Input form for supervisor signoff to ensure that the division created a separation of duties.
- To determine whether the Aeronautics Division updated its ICP in accordance with CTR's September 30, 2020 memorandum "COVID-19 Pandemic Response Internal Controls Guidance," we requested the ICP. We obtained and reviewed the division's latest ICP draft, dated July 2016.
- To determine whether the Aeronautics Division Drone Program operated in accordance with 14 CFR 107.61 and 107.73, we reviewed the requirements and found that all drone pilots must be registered with FAA. We obtained and reviewed a list of all eight of the division's licensed pilots and their FAA airman registry certificate numbers. We verified that all eight pilots were registered with FAA on FAA's airman registry website.
- We requested and reviewed the Aeronautics Division's drone inventory list and conducted an onsite inventory reconciliation at the division's headquarters. There were 21 drones on the list. We reviewed the list for the following: drone nickname, manufacturer, model, serial number, FAA drone registration number, registration issuance date, registration expiration date, and registration status ("active" or "inactive" in the FAA database). We then matched the serial numbers and FAA registration numbers to the drones and verified that 14 drones were on site. We also verified that the 14 drones externally displayed their FAA registration numbers.
- Through photographic evidence, we verified that the seven drones that were not at the Aeronautics Division's headquarters displayed their FAA registration numbers externally; what the seven drones' FAA registration numbers were; and what their serial numbers were.

Data Reliability Assessment

To gain an understanding of Aurigo Masterworks, we interviewed division personnel. To assess the reliability of the data provided to us from the application, we verified that the data did not contain blank fields, duplicates, or dates outside the audit period and that it did contain necessary data fields. We traced

4. Salesforce is a cloud-based customer relationship management software program that the Aeronautics Division uses to track aircraft registrations and process revenue from aircraft registration fees.

a random sample of 20 hardcopy aircraft registrations to the Aurigo Masterworks application to verify the accuracy and completeness of the application.

Drone data for this audit were in the form of spreadsheets. The Aeronautics Division provided a spreadsheet of drone pilots with their FAA airman registry certificate numbers and registry certificate issue dates. To assess the reliability of the data in this spreadsheet, we verified that the data did not contain blank records or duplicates. We interviewed knowledgeable personnel about employee access to the spreadsheet. We selected a sample of five pilots and matched their FAA airman registry certificate numbers from the spreadsheet to the FAA airman registry website.

To assess the reliability of the drone inventory spreadsheet, we verified that the data on the spreadsheet did not contain blank records or duplicates. We traced a sample of five drone records from the drone inventory spreadsheet to the physical drones. We traced the FAA drone registration numbers and serial numbers on the exteriors of the five drones to the drone inventory spreadsheet to verify them.

Based on the procedures described above, we determined that the Aurigo Masterworks, pilot, and drone data were sufficiently reliable for the purposes of our audit.

DETAILED AUDIT FINDINGS WITH AUDITEE'S RESPONSE

1. The Massachusetts Department of Transportation's Aeronautics Division does not have a business continuity plan.

In our two previous audits (2008-0044-4T, issued November 13, 2008, and 2016-0044-4A, issued August 18, 2017), we reported that the Massachusetts Department of Transportation's (MassDOT's) Aeronautics Division had not documented and tested a business continuity plan (BCP) to restore mission-critical and essential business functions in the event of an emergency. The division has still not developed, documented, and tested a BCP for business and operational objectives, potential risks and exposures, and the relative importance of the division's systems and data.

Without a BCP, staff members may not be sufficiently trained in performing recovery efforts, including those related to the Aeronautics Division's mission-critical applications. In addition, the division has not assessed its ability to continue operations in the event of a business interruption, which could lead to reputational loss, financial loss, or breaches of data.

Authoritative Guidance

Section 6 of the Executive Office of Technology Services and Security's (EOTSS's) Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Standard IS.005 states,

Commonwealth Executive Offices and Agencies must establish a Business Continuity Program. . . .

6.1.1.4 Develop business continuity plans (BCP): Each agency shall develop BCPs for critical business processes based on prioritization of likely disruptive events in light of their probability, severity and consequences for information security identified through the [business impact analysis] and risk assessment processes.

6.1.1.4.1 BCPs shall address both manual and automated processes used by the agency and document minimum operating requirements to resume critical functions/applications in an appropriate period of time.

Reasons for Noncompliance

The Aeronautics Division did not provide a reason that it did not have a BCP. However, during our audit, we learned that MassDOT had added two employees to support the development of BCPs.

Recommendation

The Aeronautics Division, in conjunction with the new MassDOT employees, should develop, document, and test a BCP.

Auditee's Response

Management concurs with the auditors' Recommendations, and the following actions will be taken to correct the situation.

The Aeronautics Division Deputy Administrator will immediately begin to work with the Aeronautics Administrator to ensure the business continuity plan (BCP) is developed and implemented. After implementation, the BCP will be reviewed on an annual basis.

The Deputy Administrator will work with the MassDOT IT Department to finalize and implement the Aeronautics Division BCP. The development, documentation, and testing will be accomplished in accordance with the Executive Office of Technology Services and Security's (EOTSS) Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery Standard.

In addition, the BCP will evaluate and document the effects and heightened risks resulting from the 2019 coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. The Aeronautics Division Deputy Administrator will ensure that all Aeronautics Division staff are advised of any BCP revisions.

Auditor's Reply

Based on its response, the Aeronautics Division has taken measures to address our concerns on this matter.

2. The Aeronautics Division did not ensure that staff members signed its acceptable use policy and completed cybersecurity awareness training.

The Aeronautics Division did not ensure that staff members signed the "Acceptable Use of Information Technology (IT) Resources" policy and completed cybersecurity awareness training. We requested all signed acceptable use policies for division staff members who were employed during the audit period. Division management could not produce any signed acceptable use policies for the staff members.

Also, the Aeronautics Division did not ensure that all its personnel completed security awareness training. We requested a list of all division staff members from the audit period, along with their cybersecurity awareness training certificates. We compared the certificates to the personnel list and found that 19 of 36 employees had not completed new hire or annual refresher cybersecurity awareness training.

Without educating all system users on their responsibility of protecting the security of information assets, the Aeronautics Division is exposed to a higher risk of viruses and malware, losses of sensitive data, unauthorized use of data, and financial and/or reputation losses.

Authoritative Guidance

MassDOT's "Acceptable Use of Information Technology (IT) Resources" policy states,

This policy sets forth the rules and requirements for authorized access to and acceptable use of information technology (IT) resources for the Massachusetts Department of Transportation ("MassDOT"). It is intended to protect MassDOT IT systems and networks, and information created, stored, or transmitted thereon, from harm without inhibiting the ability of users to perform their day-to-day job functions. . . .

This policy applies to all users who employ MassDOT IT resources to perform work or conduct official business on behalf of MassDOT or for other acceptable uses. . . .

Users must read, sign, and abide by [this policy].

The Aeronautics Division follows EOTSS's Information Security Risk Management Standard IS.010 for its information security training and awareness. Section 6.2 of the standard states,

*The objective of the Commonwealth information security training is to educate users on their responsibility to help protect the confidentiality, availability and integrity of the Commonwealth's **information assets**. Commonwealth Offices and Agencies must ensure that all personnel are trained on all relevant rules and regulations for cybersecurity.*

6.2.3 New Hire Security Awareness Training: All new personnel must complete an Initial Security Awareness Training course. . . . The New Hire Security Awareness course must be completed within 30 days of new hire orientation.

6.2.4 Annual Security Awareness Training: All personnel will be required to complete Annual Security Awareness Training.

Reasons for Noncompliance

The Aeronautics Division does not have a process in place to ensure that all personnel read and sign the required "Acceptable Use of Information Technology (IT) Resources" policy during onboarding.

In addition, there is no process to ensure that all new employees complete cybersecurity awareness training within 30 days of their hire dates or that other employees complete annual refresher training.

Recommendations

1. The Aeronautics Division should implement a policy requiring personnel to complete new hire and annual cybersecurity awareness training.
2. The Aeronautics Division should maintain a record of completion of cybersecurity awareness training for each employee.
3. The Aeronautics Division should require all personnel to sign the "Acceptable Use of Information Technology (IT) Resources" policy.

Auditee's Response

MassDOT will update the "Acceptable Use of Information Technology (IT) Resources" policy to include mandatory security awareness training at the time of onboarding and annually thereafter.

The onboarding process for personnel has been corrected to include Aeronautics contractors for the following mandatory actions:

1. *Attestation of compliance with the "Acceptable Use of Information Technology (IT) Resources" policy.*
2. *Completion of the current security awareness training curriculum relevant to the person's role. . . .*

MassDOT will report on the completion of annual training after the next annual training campaign has completed.

Auditor's Reply

Based on its response, the Aeronautics Division has taken measures to address our concerns on this matter.

3. The Aeronautics Division does not have an internal control plan.

The Aeronautics Division does not have an internal control plan (ICP). The division shared with us a draft copy of an ICP from 2016. The division has not implemented this draft ICP and has not documented the effect of, and evaluated the heightened risks created by, the 2019 coronavirus pandemic.

The lack of an ICP impedes the Aeronautics Division from identifying vulnerabilities that could prevent it from achieving organizational goals and objectives and exposes it to heightened risks in its operations.

Authoritative Guidance

Chapter 647 of the Acts of 1989 requires state agencies to maintain ICPs. In addition, the Office of the Comptroller of the Commonwealth (CTR) states in its *Internal Control Guide*,

Each department must maintain, and make available, an up-to-date Internal Control Plan. . . .

At the very least, the ICP must be reviewed and updated annually.

On September 30, 2020, CTR issued its "COVID-19 Pandemic Response Internal Controls Guidance" to all Massachusetts agencies. The guidance states,

- 1. If the impact to your department is such that it can be reflected in your Internal Control Plan (ICP), then update the ICP as you would for any other mid-year changes.*
- 2. Departments experiencing a significant impact, and requiring the accumulation of substantial documentation (e.g. changes to business processes, requirements of federal and state-specific laws or guidance, new funds or new programs), can draft a separate COVID-19 Pandemic Response Plan Appendix to the ICP as an organized set (hard or soft copies) of emails, documents, risk assessments, policies, and procedures.*

Reasons for Noncompliance

In a document provided to us by Aeronautics Division management, the division stated,

Due to the instability of the MassDOT Aeronautics Division program management systems (during the audit period) we have not finalized . . . the Internal Control Plan.

Recommendations

1. The Aeronautics Division should implement an ICP.
2. The Aeronautics Division should maintain an up-to-date ICP and should review and update it at least annually.

Auditee's Response

Management concurs with the auditors' Recommendations, and the following action will be taken to improve the situation.

*The Aeronautics Division Director of Administration and Finance will begin immediately to finalize and implement the Aeronautics Division internal control plan (ICP). The ICP will be in compliance with the requirements and recommendations presented in Chapter 647 of the Acts of 1989 and the Office of the Comptroller of the Commonwealth (CTR) **Internal Control Guide**. In addition, the ICP will document the effects of, and evaluate the heightened risks created by, the 2019 coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic.*

The Aeronautics Division Director of Administration and Finance will work directly with the Aeronautics Division Administrator and the Deputy Administrator to ensure the ICP is reviewed and updated on an annual basis. Upon annual revision the Aeronautics Division Director of Administration and Finance will ensure that all Aeronautics Division staff are advised of all revisions.

Auditor's Reply

Based on its response, the Aeronautics Division has taken measures to address our concerns on this matter.

OTHER MATTERS

The Massachusetts Department of Transportation Aeronautics Division's "Interim (Internal) Policy for the Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS)" does not contain emergency response procedures or sign-in/sign-out procedures for drones.

During our audit, we were given a demonstration of a drone flight mission at Union Point in Weymouth, as well as a walkthrough of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation Aeronautics Division's drone inventory at a secure location at Logan Airport. Both the walkthrough and the demonstration illustrated the Aeronautics Division Drone Program and its potential use for the Commonwealth. The division operates missions throughout Massachusetts. After completed missions, drones are not always stored at the division's secure location at Logan Airport. Rather, the division maintains several of its drones at the residences of Aeronautics Division Drone Program personnel.

It may be reasonable to maintain an asset at a drone pilot's residence if that process is addressed in the Aeronautics Division's policies and procedures, assists in the efficiency and effectiveness of work, and benefits the Commonwealth's endeavors. We asked whether the division had a policy or procedures for the secure storage of drones off site and learned that it did not. The division also does not have sign-in/sign-out procedures for its drones.

The Aeronautics Division has a draft of its "Interim (Internal) Policy for the Use of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS)" that is not signed and has not been updated since 2017. The policy does not address key risks associated with the Aeronautics Division Drone Program, namely organizational emergency response and monitoring of the drone inventory. Emergency response planning is critical to an organization like the Aeronautics Division and will become increasingly necessary as the program expands in size and scope.

The Aeronautics Division should establish a control environment related to its drone operations that includes policies and procedures for the secure storage of drones at Logan Airport and off site, precise accounting for its inventory with detailed sign-in/sign-out procedures, and ways to address emergencies.

The Office of the State Auditor believes that to ensure that the drone inventory is managed properly, and to address organizational emergency concerns, the Aeronautics Division should immediately develop and implement policies and procedures to address organizational emergency response and drone inventory tracking.