

# MICROBYTE

---

STRATEGIC BUSINESS CONSULTING

## OPERATIONAL READINESS AUDIT

# Bayport Civil & Survey, P.C.

*Hauppauge, New York*

PREPARED BY

**Matthew Engel**

*President, Microbyte, Inc.*

ENGAGEMENT PERIOD

March 3 - March 28, 2026

### SAMPLE DOCUMENT

*This is an illustrative sample audit prepared for prospective clients. Bayport Civil & Survey, P.C. is a fictional firm. Any resemblance to real organizations is coincidental. All names, figures, systems, and findings are fabricated for demonstration purposes.*

# CONTENTS

---

<b>I.</b> Executive Summary.....	3
<b>II.</b> How to Use This Report .....	5
<b>III.</b> Engagement Overview.....	7
<b>IV.</b> Operational Findings.....	9
<b>V.</b> Technology Findings.....	12
<b>VI.</b> Financial Findings.....	15
<b>VII.</b> Strategic Observations .....	17
<b>VIII.</b> Recommendations .....	19
<b>IX.</b> Appendices .....	22

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Bayport Civil & Survey, P.C. engaged Microbyte to conduct an Operational Readiness Audit covering financial, operational, and technology systems. The engagement ran from March 3 through March 28, 2026, and included document review, system inspection, and interviews with the principal, the controller, the office manager, two project managers, and the IT vendor of record.

**Microbyte performs diagnostic engagements only.** This report identifies findings and recommends owners for remediation. Microbyte does not perform implementation, configuration, or ongoing advisory work; recommendations are categorized to support the client's selection of internal staff or specialist providers.

The firm is operationally healthy. Project pipeline is strong, technical reputation in the Suffolk County market is well-established, and the founder-to-second-generation ownership transition completed in 2018 is stable. The findings below describe operational gaps that constrain growth, create avoidable financial risk, or depend on individual employees in ways that would not survive their departure. None of the findings indicate immediate distress. Several represent material annual margin opportunities.

This audit identified ten findings. Three are rated HIGH severity, five MEDIUM, and two LOW. Estimated annual financial impact across all findings ranges from \$590,000 to \$1,075,000, exclusive of one-time risk events (data loss, key-employee departure) which carry separate qualitative ratings.

### FINDINGS SUMMARY

ID	FINDING	SEVERITY	EST. IMPACT
F-01	Project accounting in Deltek Vision is operating below 30% of licensed capability	HIGH	\$180K-\$310K/yr
F-02	Critical project tracking depends on a single Access database maintained by one employee	HIGH	Operational continuity
F-03	Revenue recognition timing creates 60 - 90 day distortion in monthly P&L	HIGH	\$0 / decision risk
F-04	AR aging discipline absent; >120 day balances exceed \$740K with no formal collection process	MEDIUM	\$200K - \$400K cash
F-05	Three licensed surveyors approaching retirement with no documented succession plan	MEDIUM	Strategic / 3-5 yr
F-06	SharePoint document management lacks consistent project folder structure	MEDIUM	\$60K - \$95K/yr
F-07	QuickBooks and Deltek Vision are not reconciled monthly; differences carried for quarters	MEDIUM	Audit / financial

ID	FINDING	SEVERITY	EST. IMPACT
F-08	No formal change order process; scope creep absorbed into fixed-fee margins	MEDIUM	\$120K-\$220K/yr
F-09	Field crew time entry uses paper tickets transcribed weekly; 3 - 5 day data lag	LOW	\$30K - \$50K/yr
F-10	No documented IT continuity plan; critical systems concentrated in single physical office	LOW	Risk / latent

### TOP THREE PRIORITIES

1. F-01 Deltek Vision underutilization. The firm pays for a project accounting platform that is not configured to perform percentage-of-completion revenue recognition, project profitability tracking, or resource forecasting. Three of the four highest-value features in the existing license are unused. The controller maintains parallel spreadsheets that perform a fraction of what the system was designed to do. Reconfiguration is feasible without a system replacement.
2. F-02 Single-employee dependency on the project tracking database. The Access database that links project numbers to client billing, surveyor assignments, and deliverable status is maintained by one office employee. There is no documentation, no backup procedure beyond the office file server, and no successor identified. This employee has 14 years of institutional knowledge encoded into the database structure that exists nowhere else.
3. F-03 Revenue recognition timing distortion. Monthly P&L statements lag actual project economics by 60 to 90 days because work-in-process is recognized only at billing milestones rather than as work is performed. Owner is making capital allocation and hiring decisions on financial statements that do not reflect current operating reality.

---

**Engagement scope and boundaries.** *This audit covered financial reporting, operational workflow, technology systems, and strategic risk concentration. It did not cover: technical engineering deliverable quality, regulatory licensing compliance, employee compensation benchmarking, or cybersecurity penetration testing. Findings related to those areas are noted as observations only. The engagement concludes with delivery of this written report and a one-hour findings presentation. A 30-day follow-up call is included to clarify findings. No implementation services are included or implied.*

---

## II. HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

This report is a diagnostic instrument. It identifies what is working, what is not, and what is at risk. It does not direct the firm's response. The principal and her advisors retain full discretion over which findings to act on, in what order, and through which providers.

### Structure

Findings are organized by functional domain: Operational, Technology, Financial, and Strategic. Each finding is presented in the same format - observation, why it matters, what was observed, and a reference to the related recommendation. Findings are rated HIGH, MEDIUM, or LOW based on the combination of likelihood, financial impact, and time-to-remediation defined in the Methodology section.

Recommendations are presented separately in Section VIII and are sequenced by suggested order of execution rather than by finding number. Each recommendation carries an estimate of effort and an explicit identification of who is best positioned to perform the work.

### Recommendation ownership

Every recommendation is labeled with one of two ownership categories:

<b>INTERNAL</b>	Work that is best performed by existing employees. Typically process design, policy documentation, internal training, and recurring operational disciplines.
<b>SPECIALIST</b>	Work that requires a provider with specific technical, regulatory, or platform expertise. The recommendation identifies the type of specialist; selection of the specific provider is the client's decision.

**Microbyte is not listed as an owner on any recommendation.** This is by design. The audit is the deliverable. Implementation, configuration, training, and ongoing advisory work fall outside the engagement and are best performed by parties with the specific operational capacity, technical depth, or regulatory standing the work requires.

### Selecting specialists

Where a recommendation is labeled Specialist, the report identifies the type of provider best suited to the work (for example, “a Deltek-certified implementation partner” or “the firm’s existing IT vendor”). It does not recommend specific firms. Three practical paths for identifying specialists:

- Existing relationships. The firm's CPA, attorney, banker, and current technology vendors often have direct experience with relevant specialists and can refer.

- Platform vendor directories. Software platforms named in this report (Deltek Vision, QuickBooks Enterprise) maintain published directories of certified implementation partners with verifiable credentials.
- Industry associations. Professional services firms benefit from peer referrals through industry associations; the principal's peer network is usually the highest-trust source.

### **Suggested order of action**

Section VIII presents recommendations in suggested execution order. The sequencing reflects dependencies (some recommendations enable others) and a balance of urgency and effort. The firm is not obligated to follow the suggested order; the sequencing is provided as a starting point.

### **After the engagement**

This engagement concludes upon delivery of this report and the accompanying findings presentation. A 30-day follow-up call is included for the principal to ask clarifying questions during the firm's early implementation work. Microbyte is available for future diagnostic engagements (audit refresh, supplemental scope) under separate engagement letters. Microbyte does not perform implementation work and will not bid on the remediation of findings identified in this report.

## III. ENGAGEMENT OVERVIEW

### Scope of Work

The engagement covered four functional areas: project accounting and financial reporting; operational workflow and document management; technology systems inventory and integration; and strategic observations affecting succession, growth, and risk concentration. Scope was defined in the engagement letter executed on February 24, 2026.

### Engagement Details

ENGAGEMENT TYPE	Operational Readiness Audit (productized)
ENGAGEMENT PERIOD	March 3 - March 28, 2026 (four weeks)
LEAD CONSULTANT	Matthew Engel, President, Microbyte, Inc.
ENGAGEMENT LETTER	Executed February 24, 2026
FEE STRUCTURE	Fixed fee, paid 50% on engagement, 50% on delivery
CONFIDENTIALITY	Mutual NDA executed February 24, 2026
DELIVERABLES	Written audit report; one-hour findings presentation; 30-day follow-up call

### Methodology

Findings were developed through document review, direct system inspection (read-only access to all production systems where granted), and structured interviews. Where findings depended on data extraction (e.g., AR aging analysis, project margin reconstruction), source data was provided by the controller and is referenced in Appendix A. No assumptions were made about systems or processes that were not directly observed.

Severity ratings reflect a combination of likelihood, financial impact, and time-to-remediation. HIGH indicates findings that warrant action within 90 days. MEDIUM indicates findings that warrant action within 6 months. LOW indicates findings that should be tracked but do not require immediate action. Estimated impact ranges are derived from observed data where possible and from comparable benchmarks where direct measurement was not available; ranges are deliberately wide to reflect estimation uncertainty.

### Documents Reviewed

- Audited financial statements, fiscal years 2023 and 2024 (prepared by external CPA firm)
- Internal monthly P&L statements, January 2025 through February 2026
- AR aging report as of February 28, 2026

- Project list with billing status, January 2024 through February 2026
- Deltek Vision configuration documentation and user role assignments
- QuickBooks Enterprise chart of accounts and class structure
- SharePoint document library structure (sample of 24 active project folders)
- Employee roster with role, tenure, and licensing status (provided by office manager)
- Active client engagement letters (sample of 12)
- IT vendor service agreement and most recent monthly support summary

### **Personnel Interviewed**

- Principal (1 hour, two sessions)
- Controller (90 minutes, three sessions)
- Office manager (1 hour)
- Project manager - public sector practice (45 minutes)
- Project manager - private development practice (45 minutes)
- Survey department supervisor (30 minutes)
- IT vendor representative (30 minutes, by phone)

### **What This Audit Did Not Cover**

The following areas fell outside the engagement scope and are not addressed in the findings or recommendations. They are listed here so that the absence of comment should not be read as endorsement.

- Technical quality of engineering or surveying deliverables
- Regulatory licensing status of the firm or individual professionals
- Compensation, benefits, or employee classification compliance
- Cybersecurity penetration testing or formal IT security assessment
- Insurance coverage adequacy or claims history
- Tax planning, entity structure, or owner compensation strategy
- Marketing, business development, or competitive positioning analysis

Several of these areas surfaced incidentally during interviews and are noted as observations in Section VI where relevant.

## IV. OPERATIONAL FINDINGS

**F-02**
**Critical project tracking depends on a single employee**
**HIGH**  
*Operational continuity*

### OBSERVATION

The firm uses a Microsoft Access database, originally built in 2011 and extended continuously since, as the operational system of record for project tracking. The database links project numbers to client information, assigned surveyors and engineers, deliverable status, billing milestones, and field schedule data. It is the source of truth for which projects are active, who is working on them, and what has been delivered. The database is maintained by one office employee with 14 years of tenure. No other employee has edit-level access. No documentation exists for the database structure, the queries, or the macros that automate weekly reporting.

### WHY THIS MATTERS

If this employee departs, is unavailable for an extended period, or is otherwise unable to maintain the database, the firm loses real-time visibility into project status. The database can be opened by others in read-only mode, but the data entry workflows, the report generation, and the integration with the weekly billing cycle all depend on this individual. A two-week absence would create reconciliation work measured in weeks, not days. A permanent departure without succession planning would require either a crash project to migrate the data and rebuild the workflow, or operating without the system while a replacement is built.

### WHAT WE OBSERVED

- Database file resides on the office file server with nightly backup to local NAS only
- No off-site backup of the database; if the office is unavailable, the database is unavailable
- Macros and queries are not documented; the controller does not know what they do
- Data validation depends on the maintainer manually checking for errors during weekly report runs
- The Deltek Vision system contains overlapping data but is not synchronized; the Access database is treated as authoritative

### RECOMMENDATION REFERENCE

*See Section VIII, Recommendation 2.*

**F-08**
**No formal change order process; scope creep absorbed into margins**
**MEDIUM**  
*\$120K - \$220K/yr*

### OBSERVATION

The firm operates on fixed-fee engagements for the majority of private-sector work. Scope changes during engagements are common and are typically handled through informal email exchanges or verbal agreement. There is no standard change order document, no requirement that changes be priced and approved before work begins, and no process for tracking scope additions against the original fee. Project managers report routinely absorbing 10 to 25 percent additional scope on engagements without billing for it.

### WHY THIS MATTERS

Engineering firms in this revenue range typically realize project margins of 22 to 32 percent. Reviewed project profitability for fiscal year 2024 indicates margins running 4 to 7 percentage points below that range on private-sector work. The most likely contributor, based on interviews and document review, is uncompensated scope expansion. On approximately \$9.4M of fixed-fee private-sector revenue, a 4-point margin compression equals roughly \$376,000 of unrecognized fees per year. Conservative recovery of one-third of that amount through formal change order discipline supports the estimated impact range.

### WHAT WE OBSERVED

- Sample of 18 engagements reviewed; 14 had documented or interview-confirmed scope additions
- Of those 14, two had supplemental fee agreements; the remaining twelve absorbed additions
- No template change order document exists in the firm's standard engagement materials
- Project managers are not trained or incentivized to identify or price scope changes
- The principal expressed awareness of the issue and frustration that prior attempts to address it had not produced lasting change

### RECOMMENDATION REFERENCE

*See Section VIII, Recommendation 4.*

<b>F-09</b>	<b>Field crew time entry creates 3 - 5 day data lag</b>	<b>LOW</b> \$30K - \$50K/yr
-------------	---	--------------------------------

### OBSERVATION

Field crews record time on paper tickets that are returned to the office at the end of each work week. Office staff transcribe the tickets into Deltek Vision the following Monday and Tuesday. By the time time entries reach the project accounting system, they are 3 to 5 calendar days old. Errors and missing entries are typically not detected until weekly billing runs the following Friday, at which point the field crews have already started the next week's work and may not remember the prior week's details accurately.

### WHY THIS MATTERS

The data lag introduces three problems: time entries that should be billed in one period are sometimes posted to the next, distorting weekly project status; corrections require chasing field crews for memory-based clarifications, which consumes office and field time; and project managers cannot accurately gauge weekly

burn rate against budget in real time. Mobile time entry systems compatible with Deltek Vision exist and would substantially eliminate the lag. The estimated impact is conservative and reflects recovered office time and reduced billing leakage rather than transformative gains.

#### **RECOMMENDATION REFERENCE**

*See Section VIII, Recommendation 6.*

## V. TECHNOLOGY FINDINGS

**F-01**
**Deltek Vision operating below 30% of licensed capability**
**HIGH**  
 \$180K - \$310K/yr

### OBSERVATION

Deltek Vision is the firm's project accounting platform. The license includes modules for project accounting, resource planning, time and expense, billing, accounts receivable, project management, and reporting. Direct inspection of the system configuration shows that only billing, accounts receivable, and a basic time and expense workflow are configured for production use. The project accounting module is configured but not populated with budgets, leaving project profitability tracking effectively non-functional. Resource planning is not configured at all. The reporting module contains five custom reports of which two are in active use.

### WHY THIS MATTERS

The firm pays approximately \$42,000 per year in Deltek Vision licensing and support. The same fee structure applies whether 30 percent or 100 percent of the platform is used. More importantly, the controller maintains parallel spreadsheets that perform fragmentary versions of what the unused modules were designed to do - project profitability tracking in Excel, resource forecasting on a whiteboard, custom reports built manually each month from data exports. The estimated impact range reflects three components: recovered controller and project manager time (approximately 20 hours per week combined), improved project margin visibility leading to earlier intervention on under-performing projects, and elimination of reconciliation between Deltek and parallel spreadsheets.

### WHAT WE OBSERVED

- Project accounting module: configured but no project budgets entered; profitability views non-functional
- Resource planning module: not configured; resource availability tracked on whiteboard in survey department
- Time and expense: configured for office staff only; field crews use paper (see F-09)
- Reporting module: 5 custom reports exist, 2 in use; remaining 3 were built by the prior controller and are not understood by current staff
- Workflow approvals: not configured; all approvals run through email
- Document attachments: not used; all project documentation lives in SharePoint (see F-06)

### WHAT WE DID NOT ASSESS

*This audit did not evaluate whether Deltek Vision is the appropriate long-term platform for the firm. The finding addresses only that the existing license is substantially underutilized. A separate platform-fit assessment would compare Deltek to alternatives (BST Global, Ajera, Unanet) and is recommended as a follow-on engagement before any major reconfiguration investment.*

**RECOMMENDATION REFERENCE**

*See Section VIII, Recommendation 1.*

<b>F-06</b>	<b>SharePoint lacks consistent project folder structure</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b> <i>\$60K - \$95K/yr</i>
-------------	---	--

**OBSERVATION**

Project documentation lives in SharePoint Online. The firm has used SharePoint for approximately seven years. There is no enforced naming convention or folder structure for project folders. A sample of 24 active project folders reviewed during the engagement showed at least eight distinct organizational patterns. Some folders are organized by deliverable type (drawings, calculations, correspondence), others by project phase, others chronologically, and several appear to have no organizing principle. Search functionality is enabled but produces unreliable results because metadata is inconsistent and document titles often do not reflect content.

**WHY THIS MATTERS**

The cost of inconsistent document organization is paid in time spent searching, in duplicate work when prior deliverables cannot be located, and in occasional rework when the wrong version of a document is used. The estimated impact reflects approximately 90 minutes per week of search overhead per professional staff member (32 staff × 1.5 hr/wk × 50 wk × \$40/hr blended) plus an estimated 10 to 15 hours per quarter of duplicate work or version-related rework. The firm has not measured this cost directly; the range reflects benchmarks from comparable firms.

**RECOMMENDATION REFERENCE**

*See Section VIII, Recommendation 5.*

<b>F-10</b>	<b>No documented IT continuity plan</b>	<b>LOW</b> <i>Risk / latent</i>
-------------	---	------------------------------------

**OBSERVATION**

All on-premise systems - the Access database, the file server, the local backup NAS - reside in the Hauppauge office. There is no formal IT continuity plan, no off-site replication of on-premise data, and no documented recovery procedure. SharePoint, Deltek Vision, QuickBooks Online, and email are cloud-based and would survive a Hauppauge office incident, but the Access project tracking database and the on-premise file server containing AutoCAD drawings and historical project files would not.

**WHY THIS MATTERS**

The likelihood of a single-incident loss of the Hauppauge office is low. The consequences would be material: weeks of operational disruption, potential loss of historical project files used for ongoing client reference, and

exposure to professional liability if regulated deliverables cannot be reproduced. The cost of remediation is modest relative to the exposure. This finding is rated LOW because the likelihood is low, not because the impact would be.

#### **RECOMMENDATION REFERENCE**

*See Section VIII, Recommendation 8.*

## VI. FINANCIAL FINDINGS

<b>F-03</b>	<b>Revenue recognition lags actual work by 60 - 90 days</b>	<b>HIGH</b> <i>Decision risk</i>
-------------	---	-------------------------------------

### OBSERVATION

The firm recognizes revenue at billing milestones rather than as work is performed. For fixed-fee engagements typically structured with 25/50/75/100 percent billing milestones, this means revenue for work performed in March is often not recognized until April or May when the next milestone is reached. Monthly P&L statements reflect billing activity rather than work-in-process, and consequently lag actual project economics by 60 to 90 days on average.

### WHY THIS MATTERS

Percentage-of-completion accounting is the AICPA-recommended method for engineering firms with multi-period engagements. The firm's external CPA prepares year-end financials on a percentage-of-completion basis, but internal monthly statements do not. The result is that the principal is making capital allocation, hiring, and pricing decisions on internal financials that do not reflect current operating reality. In a stable revenue environment this distortion is tolerable. In a growth or contraction environment, it leads to systematic delay in seeing trends.

### WHAT WE OBSERVED

- Internal P&L for February 2026 reported \$1.32M revenue; estimated work-in-process revenue for the period was approximately \$1.51M
- Reconciliation of internal-to-external statements at year-end 2024 required a \$340,000 work-in-process adjustment
- Deltek Vision is capable of producing percentage-of-completion reporting if project budgets are populated (see F-01)
- Controller acknowledged the gap and indicated that prior attempts to populate project budgets had stalled due to time constraints

### RECOMMENDATION REFERENCE

*See Section VIII, Recommendations 1 and 3.*

<b>F-04</b>	<b>AR aging discipline absent; &gt;120 day balances exceed \$740K</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b> <i>\$200K - \$400K cash</i>
-------------	---	--

### OBSERVATION

AR aging as of February 28, 2026 shows total outstanding receivables of \$2.31M. Of this, \$740,000 (32 percent) is over 120 days old. The aging profile suggests systemic collection delay rather than a small number of disputed accounts. There is no formal collection process, no regular AR review meeting, and no escalation protocol for accounts that age past 90 days.

### WHY THIS MATTERS

Public sector clients (NYS DOT, Suffolk County, town engineering departments) typically pay slowly but reliably. Private developer clients vary widely. The 120+ day balance contains both, and the lack of differentiation in collection approach is the operational issue. Industry benchmarks for engineering firms with similar client mix suggest that disciplined collection practices typically reduce 120+ day balances by 50 to 70 percent within 6 months. Recovering even half of the current 120+ balance through structured collections would represent approximately \$370,000 in cash, plus reduced ongoing capital tied up in receivables. The estimated impact range reflects this one-time recovery plus ongoing benefit.

### RECOMMENDATION REFERENCE

*See Section VIII, Recommendation 7.*

**F-07**

**QuickBooks and Deltek Vision not reconciled monthly**

**MEDIUM**  
*Audit / financial*

### OBSERVATION

The firm runs general ledger accounting in QuickBooks Enterprise and project accounting in Deltek Vision. The two systems are not integrated and are not reconciled on a monthly basis. Reconciliation occurs annually as part of year-end close, at which point material differences typically require investigation and adjustment.

### WHY THIS MATTERS

Carrying unreconciled differences between subledger and general ledger for multiple months creates two problems: errors compound and become harder to trace as time passes, and the year-end reconciliation becomes a multi-week project that pulls the controller off other work during the firm's busiest financial period. Monthly reconciliation, while requiring discipline, is materially less work in aggregate than annual reconciliation. This finding does not indicate any current accounting irregularity; it identifies an operational risk that grows the longer it remains unaddressed.

### RECOMMENDATION REFERENCE

*See Section VIII, Recommendation 3.*

## VII. STRATEGIC OBSERVATIONS

This section contains observations that surfaced during the audit but fall outside its formal scope. They are presented as observations rather than findings because the audit did not include the analysis necessary to make recommendations with confidence. Each represents an area the principal may wish to evaluate further through dedicated work.

<b>F-05</b>	<b>Three licensed surveyors approaching retirement; no documented succession</b>	<b>MEDIUM</b> <i>Strategic / 3 - 5 yr</i>
-------------	--	--

### OBSERVATION

The firm employs eleven licensed land surveyors. Three are within five years of typical retirement age and have indicated to colleagues, though not formally to firm leadership, that they intend to retire within that window. The licensed surveyor population in New York is contracting, and the firm has not hired a licensed surveyor in over four years; recent surveyor additions have been licensed-track professionals still completing experience requirements. There is no documented succession plan for the retiring surveyors' active client relationships, project portfolios, or institutional knowledge of long-running municipal accounts.

### WHY THIS IS IN THIS SECTION RATHER THAN IN FINDINGS

Workforce planning, professional licensing strategy, and succession planning are areas where firm leadership has context and judgment that this audit did not develop. The observation is presented to ensure leadership attention; specific recommendations require a deeper assessment than this engagement covered.

### Other observations

#### OWNER CONCENTRATION IN OPERATIONS

The principal personally signs every invoice over \$5,000, personally reviews and approves every project proposal regardless of size, and is the relationship owner for approximately 60 percent of the firm's revenue. This level of personal involvement was characteristic of the founding generation and was largely inherited as a working pattern. It is sustainable at current revenue levels but constrains the firm's ability to grow or to operate during the principal's planned absences. This is observation, not criticism: many successful professional services firms operate this way deliberately. It is noted because it appeared during interviews and may warrant deliberate consideration.

#### PUBLIC-PRIVATE REVENUE MIX

Public sector revenue is approximately 55 percent of total. Public sector work has stable margins and reliable, if slow, payment characteristics. Private sector work has more volatile margins (see F-08) but pays faster and offers higher growth potential. The current mix appears to have evolved rather than been deliberately chosen. Whether the mix is optimal is a strategic question outside this audit's scope.

**TECHNOLOGY VENDOR CONCENTRATION**

The firm's IT services are provided by a single vendor under a fixed-monthly contract. The vendor has performed reliably for over a decade. The relationship has not been evaluated against alternatives during that period, and the contract auto-renews annually. Vendor concentration in IT is not inherently a problem; lack of periodic re-evaluation is.

## VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations are sequenced by suggested order of execution rather than by finding number. Sequencing reflects dependencies (some recommendations enable others) and effort-to-impact ratios. Each recommendation is categorized by who is best positioned to execute it: internal staff or a specialist provider. Microbyte does not appear as an owner; the rationale is explained in Section II.

### 1 Configure Deltek Vision project accounting and reporting modules to production use

*Related findings: F-01, F-03, F-07*

OWNER  
Specialist

Specialist type: Deltek-certified implementation partner (Deltek Vision or Vantagepoint practice). Estimated effort: 60 to 80 hours over 8 weeks. The work falls into three phases. Phase 1 populates active project budgets and enables percentage-of-completion reporting (resolves F-03). Phase 2 retires three of the controller's parallel spreadsheets in favor of native Deltek reporting. Phase 3 establishes the monthly QuickBooks-to-Deltek reconciliation procedure (resolves F-07, in coordination with Recommendation 3). Recommended before any decision about platform replacement: the underutilized configuration is the more immediate problem. The firm should request fixed-fee proposals from two or three Deltek partners; pricing in this market typically ranges from \$18,000 to \$32,000 for a scope of this size.

### 2 Document the project tracking database and identify a successor maintainer

*Related findings: F-02*

OWNER  
Internal

Estimated effort: 40 hours of the current maintainer's time, spread over 6 weeks, with a designated second employee shadowing. Deliverable is a written runbook covering data model, query inventory, macro purpose, weekly procedures, and known edge cases. Off-site backup of the database file should be implemented immediately and is independent of this work. Migration to a more robust platform is a longer-term consideration; documentation and successor identification are urgent regardless of long-term direction.

### 3 Establish monthly subledger-to-general-ledger reconciliation procedure

*Related findings: F-03, F-07*

OWNER  
Internal

Estimated effort: 6 to 8 hours per month, ongoing. Procedure should be documented, assigned to the controller with a specific monthly close date, and reviewed by the principal. The first three months will

require additional time to clear historical differences; subsequent months will be substantially less. This recommendation is dependent on Recommendation 1 being at least partially complete.

**4**

### Implement formal change order process for fixed-fee engagements

*Related findings: F-08*

OWNER  
Specialist

Specialist type: professional services operations consultant with engineering or AEC industry experience. Estimated effort: 30 to 40 hours over 4 weeks. Scope should include: change order template development, project manager training, integration with Deltek Vision billing workflow, and 90-day post-implementation review. The principal's leadership in enforcing the new process is critical; prior internal attempts have lapsed without it. Whichever provider is engaged, the engagement letter should require explicit executive sponsorship and a measurable post-implementation review at 90 days. Alternative: this work can be performed internally by a designated project manager if a written process and enforcement mechanism are established before any change order discipline is expected to take hold.

**5**

### Develop and enforce SharePoint project folder structure standard

*Related findings: F-06*

OWNER  
Internal

Estimated effort: 20 hours to develop standard, plus 4 to 6 hours per existing active project to retrofit. Recommend retrofitting only active projects; archived projects can remain in current state. Standard should be documented, distributed, and enforced through quarterly spot-checks by the office manager. This is internal work; no outside consultant is needed once the standard is defined.

**6**

### Evaluate mobile time entry options for field crews

*Related findings: F-09*

OWNER  
Specialist

Recommend engaging a Deltek-certified implementation partner to evaluate Vantagepoint Mobile (the modern Deltek mobile time entry product) or an alternative. This is specialist work outside Microbyte's scope. Estimated implementation cost from a Deltek partner: \$8,000 to \$15,000 plus ongoing per-user licensing. Payback period likely 12 to 18 months.

**7**

### Implement structured AR collections process

*Related findings: F-04*

OWNER  
Internal

Estimated effort: 16 hours to establish, then 4 to 6 hours per week ongoing. Process should differentiate by client type (public, private developer, private commercial) and establish escalation triggers at 60, 90, and 120 days. Recommend the controller and office manager share execution; principal involvement at 120-day escalation. The 120+ day backlog should be addressed in a one-time push concurrent with new process rollout.

**8****Implement off-site backup for Hauppauge on-premise systems***Related findings: F-10***OWNER  
Specialist**

Recommend the existing IT vendor implement automated nightly off-site backup of the file server and the Access database to a cloud destination. Estimated one-time setup: \$1,500 to \$3,000. Estimated ongoing cost: \$150 to \$300 per month. This is straightforward IT vendor work and does not require additional specialist engagement beyond the existing relationship.

## IX. APPENDICES

---

### Appendix A - Document Review Log

Documents listed in Section III, “Documents Reviewed,” were reviewed during the engagement period. All documents remain the property of Bayport Civil & Survey, P.C. Microbyte retained no copies of source financial data following engagement completion, in accordance with the executed engagement letter and NDA.

### Appendix B - Interview Log

Interviews listed in Section III, “Personnel Interviewed,” were conducted on-site at the Hauppauge office between March 5 and March 19, 2026, with one IT vendor interview conducted by phone on March 12, 2026. Interview notes were retained by Microbyte through the engagement period and destroyed upon delivery of the final report, in accordance with the executed NDA.

### Appendix C - Methodology Notes on Impact Estimation

Estimated annual impact ranges in this report reflect a deliberately conservative methodology. Where direct measurement was possible (e.g., AR aging analysis, Deltek licensing fees), figures are derived from observed data with uncertainty ranges of approximately  $\pm 20$  percent. Where benchmark data was used (e.g., search overhead per professional, change order recovery rates), ranges are wider to reflect estimation uncertainty. No estimate in this report should be treated as a forecast or a guarantee of outcome. All estimates are presented to support relative prioritization rather than absolute financial planning.

### Appendix D - Glossary

**Percentage-of-completion accounting:** Revenue recognition method that recognizes revenue as work is performed, in proportion to project completion, rather than at billing milestones or project completion.

**Subledger:** A subsidiary accounting record that contains detail supporting a control account in the general ledger. In this engagement, Deltek Vision functions as the project accounting subledger and QuickBooks Enterprise contains the general ledger.

**Work-in-process (WIP):** Work that has been performed but not yet billed. WIP represents earned but unbilled revenue under percentage-of-completion accounting.

**Shadow stack:** Software, spreadsheets, and databases that perform business-critical functions but exist outside formal IT systems. Typically maintained by individual employees, undocumented, and absent from IT budgets and continuity plans.

**MICROBYTE, INC.**

*Strategic Business Consulting*

[microbytec corp.com](http://microbytec corp.com)

Long Island, New York