



Technology Investment Council



State of Delaware
Technology Investment Council Meeting Minutes
March 13, 2012

Technology Investment Council Attendees

Name	Organization	Attendance	Represented by
James Sills	DTI	Present	
Russ Larson	Controller General	Present	
Ann Visalli	OMB Director	Present	
Dr. Lillian Lowery	DOE	Represented	Karen Field Rogers
Myron Steele	Chief Justice	Represented	Pat Griffin
James Canalichio	Dixon Valve & Coupling Company	Present	
Dan Grim	University of Delaware	Present	
Carlos Vieira	Bank of America	Present	
Kris Younger	82 North LLC	Not Present	
Glenn Tascione	Barclay's Bank	Not Present	

Call to Order:

Secretary Sills called the March 13, 2012 TIC meeting to order at approximately 9:01 am.

Welcome:

Secretary Sills welcomed everyone, and introductions were made at the Dover and Wilmington Video Teleconference (VTC) locations. TIC members' attendance was noted, as shown in the above table. Others in attendance included DTI Senior Staff, DTI Team Leaders, IRM Council Representative, DTI Project Managers, Legislative Analyst, and the Major Project Managers/Sponsors from DHSS, Courts, and DCYFS.

Old Business:

Secretary Sills asked if all the members received and reviewed the December 13, 2011 TIC meeting minutes and requested a motion to approve them. Pat Griffin requested a correction be made on the minutes on page 3; "JIC" should be changed to "GIC". The correction was noted, and a motion to approve the minutes was made by Pat Griffin. Dan Grim seconded the motion. With no opposition, the motion was carried.

Strategic Plan Update ~ Matt Payne:

DTI sent the original Strategic Plan to the IRM Council for feedback to be included in the updated plan. No new categories were added; only minor changes were made. In this plan, DTI focused on the delivery methods being used in other industries, such as Software as a Service. The benefits to these types of solutions include speed, less upfront out of pocket costs, and the ease to walk away from after the engagement. DTI will begin to create a new plan for next year which will be a complete rewrite and will align the timing of the budget along with the strategic plan. The current plan has moved from a being theoretical plan to one that is more actionable. DTI will be reviewing this plan every 12 months, updating and applying the tactical efforts to reach the more strategic, long-term vision.

Pat Griffin: Has the governance structure changed, or is that a representation of what it has always been in the plan itself?

Secretary Sills: We have not changed the governance structure at all.

Matt Payne: One thing that we will look into in the next iteration is more information to Data Governance.

2010 – 2012 Strategic Plan:

Secretary Sills requested a motion to approve the 2010-2012 Strategic Plan. Pat Griffin made a motion to approve it, and Dan Grim seconded the motion. With no opposition, the motion was carried.

IT Consolidation Update (ITC): Agency Status ~ Bill Hickox:

Department of Agriculture (DDA) is the newest agency that has entered into consolidation. DDA made the request to be consolidated because their IT manager is retiring in June 2012. DDA is expected to be fully consolidated by the end of the fiscal year. DTI has achieved over \$1.3M in cost avoidance and savings since the inception of ITC which includes software licensing, hardware, contractual support, and FTE savings. Some major accomplishments that have been made to date include consolidating the DOS Data Center into William Penn Data Center, consolidating desktop support for DOS, DOF, and DEDO, consolidating help desk support for DelDOT, DOF, DOS, and DEDO, eliminating four FTE positions through attrition for \$200K in savings, eliminating three IT contractor positions for \$200K in savings, and having better visibility into major systems from an apps development standpoint. DTI has become very focused not only in cost savings but also on risk mitigation. There have been several entities from which DTI has uncovered significant risk within their IT systems from an infrastructure and support perspective. The current status of the initial agencies include: DTI has entered into the final phase of consolidation with DOS which includes migrating the Carvel support into the DTI complement; DTI is developing hardware plan migration to address some risk within the DOF infrastructure; DTI is working with DOE on a data center consolidation plan; DelDOT has been the most cooperative agency in this ITC effort. As a result, DTI has migrated several items ahead of schedule. For example DTI is now providing all database support for DelDOT and migrating Disaster Recovery/Business Continuity and Telecom. DTI is also beginning phase II for DEDO, which includes starting their equipment lifecycle. Finally, DTI is in the process of DDA's IT inventory and analysis.

Russ Larson: Are you getting any push back from anybody?

Bill Hickox: We choose to focus on those agencies that are being cooperative. We recognize there are certain areas that are near and dear to peoples' hearts; one of those areas happens to be Application Development. They like the fact that the application developers are very closely tied to their business, and they can reach out and touch them and say, 'I want you to change the following'. There is a concern within the agencies that if they are consolidated that those folks won't listen to them if they reach out. One of the examples we are pushing is with the DOS. While we have consolidated the Application Developers at the DOS, they still physically reside in the business. We didn't pick them up and move them here to William Penn. They are there engaged with the business, so they can continue to understand and be able to respond to those needs. That is the example we are really pushing to try give people more of a comfort level. The "proof is in the pudding"; when they see it, and as they experience it, they are much more pleased to continue on. There are folks that said in the beginning they were reluctant, and now they are pleased on how it has gone. We are trying to use these case studies to share with those agencies that aren't as accepting. A good sign is that we have agencies coming to us and saying they would like to be next. That is what happened with the Department of Agriculture.

Russ Larson: Do you have any agencies that simply say they do not want to participate?

Bill Hickox: There is an Executive Order, so 'we don't want to participate' is not necessarily an option. So we are getting participation, but when it comes to the recommendations, there are some struggles and push back.

Ann Visalli: There is also a priority order. For example, Agriculture wasn't really in your initial priorities, but the opportunity presented itself. We support the consolidation, but we are not a good candidate at this point in the priority order, so we have to go ahead and move forward in filling our IT positions.

Bill Hickox: Anytime when a position comes up, Brian calls me, and we discuss it to make sure the timing is right.

Ann Visalli: To do too much at once and have a failure would be more detrimental than going slowly and doing it right.

Russ Larson: The world that I come from often hears from agencies that don't particularly pay a lot of attention to these Executive Orders, and so they complain about them. The people I work for hear that side and not the other, so it gets muddy. That is something that has to be avoided in order to move forward.

Secretary Sills: This is a cultural change; before we were siloed here at the State, and now we are trying to collaborate and consolidate hardware, software, infrastructure, and resources. It is a cultural change/shift. We are

spacing a little slower than I thought we would pace, but we are making really good progress. We are documenting the systems, what people do, and the savings. In the long run, it makes sense; we are gaining efficiencies, and we are saving money. That is the bottom line. It takes a little bit of give and take with the individual Cabinet Secretaries and their next level down. That is the part, I don't want to say we struggle, but it is taking longer to get people on board. I would say, overall, most people are on board once they see the deliverables that we present back to them.

Broadband Grant Update ~ Mike Hojnicky

DTI is now in the third year of the Broadband Grant Mapping project that the NTIA awarded the state of Delaware. This involves mapping broadband services, collecting, and reporting data on a public website to be part of the National broadband map. The next stage involves planning and outreach and is fully funded by federal dollars that will continue for five years. DTI has partnered with the Institute of Public Administration from the University of Delaware. They are working with DTI on reaching out to the local communities and identifying opportunities to enhance broadband initiatives going forward. DTI will be taking the lead on an Awareness campaign, which is a Train the Leader Program. This involves training the leaders of community and church groups to educate the citizens on how and where to access broadband. In January, the NTIA had a successful site visit at DTI to review the project progress and deliverables.

Information Security Program Update ~ Elayne Starkey

DTI recently participated in a U.S. Department of Homeland Security sponsored exercise; Cyber Storm IV. This exercise simulates a coordinated attack on our Medicaid databases. The exercise play allowed for hackers to gain access and tamper with Medicaid patient records. It hypothetically left hundreds of patients without care, sitting in doctor's offices, unable to fill prescriptions, and unable to get the care they needed. Video injects were used in the 1 ½ day exercise to make it more effective and as real as possible. This is the fourth round of these exercises, and Delaware has participated in three out of the four. This exercise was a chance for DTI and other agencies, such as DHSS and Medicaid Services, to test their incident response/COOP plans. Overall, these exercises are worthwhile, and DTI and the other agencies came away with beneficial lessons learned and ways to improve the process.

Web Conferencing ~ Elayne Starkey

Historically, within state government, it has been a requirement for anyone that wants to participate in a web conference to go through the DTI Service desk to receive a reservation. The reason for this was so DTI can run the traffic through a terminal server intended to protect the end user's desktop. From a security standpoint, it has worked well. However it was inconvenient and was not meeting our customers' needs. Therefore, effective on March 1st, DTI reconfigured the process and dropped the blocks on the web conferencing sites. Now customers can navigate and access the webinars directly. This is an added convenience for the customers. However, it is an increase security risk. DTI is trying to mitigate any risks by educating our customers and encouraging users to handle their desktops carefully.

Pat Griffin: Has a notice gone out about that change yet?

Elayne: Yes, the notice went out through our traditional channels, which are though the IRMs and ISOs. We also did direct, targeted communication to anyone that has asked for a web conference reservation in the last 30 days.

Data Governance Update ~ Matt Payne

A new Data Governance Committee was created and, for now, includes the following agency participants: DTI, DHSS, DelDOT, DSCYF, DOE, DOF, OMB, and DOC. The intent of this committee is to eventually include all agencies and members of state government. It will then be broken down into subcommittees based on functions such as education, social services, financial, and law enforcement. The objective is to promote the sharing of data within state government and to ensure the accuracy and consistency of that data. The committee has introduced some standards and policies. One policy is for projects that are getting started; they must include Data Models to understand the project's expectations and requirements. Another is to utilize consistency in tools by encouraging their use. The committee includes individuals that are both functional and technical from each area/agency. The functional experts are the data stewards that understand the needs of their agency. The technical individuals create the environment and promote the sharing of the data. To date, there have been two meetings. Agenda topics that were discussed during the first meeting were the vision, objectives, benefits, and examples were reviewed from other states. The second meeting focused on creating the Data Governance Committee Charter, reviewing State standards and policies, and a sample data model. During the next meeting, an overview of a Data Integration Hub concept and data warehousing will be reviewed. Ronda Ringer from DelDOT is the Committee Chairperson. Currently, the committee is trying to find someone from the Attorney General's office to participate for the legal perspective, and ensure we are following the law. The plan is to meet for about four to five months to get the framework together and then invite the other agency/group participants to create the subcommittees to develop future strategies.

Pat Griffin: When you get to the point when you are talking about the Justice system, we very much want to be involved.

Matt Payne: Dale and Deb Lindell have spoken with DELJIS. We will get to everybody; we just tried to shrink the initial group to get started.

Marianne Kennedy: We certainly would like to be involved in the Charter process.

Matt Payne: The framework for the Charter should be started by the next meeting, but it is going to be a living document. We just want something to give people as an introductory into it, so they understand what the purpose/scope is and how it is going to work. Then we will present it to everybody.

Ann Visalli: Will this also cover data sharing? We have data that needs to be matched against tax payer information, and we know we don't have access and do not want access to tax payer information. My concern is to make sure DTI has signed off, so that there is some accountability in the exchange of the data. Even if it seems secure, there is someone else in another agency that is touching it. I have concerns – is that included in this process?

Matt Payne: Yes it is. Security and the movement of data are some of the items that were identified in our last meeting. We don't yet know exactly how everything is going to work; we are still at the beginning. But that is clearly one of the items that needs to be addressed.

Ann Visalli: It is the human error that has the highest risk. So no matter how much security you go through, if in the end you have access to the data and it's on somebody else's side of the wall, then what happens at that point – who is responsible?

Matt Payne: There will be rules about who can get to what and who can do what.

Major Projects Update:

DACSES Replacement Project – Midge Holland (DHSS) ~

The DACSES project is progressing. The functional design has been drafted, and the technical design is moving forward. There are 257 deliverables in this project, and 55 have been signed off. 149 of those deliverables are still to come. The budget is still on target. Training and Organizational Change Management is one of their biggest initiatives in getting Child Support ready to implement the new application. They are ensuring they have firm agreements with all their partners regarding the data sharing issue. Their biggest risk is staffing; they have had a difficult time getting staff for their IRM position to support the vetting of deliverables, participate in the development process, be there for knowledge transfer, and prepare for post implementation support. They have had positions appropriated for this project in 2009 and have yet to fill them. They have to come up with a strategy of either getting those positions filled or finding a way to get staff certainty, so they have people in place to be able to do the job that needs to be done. Other issues include finalizing interface details and partner development work, working with DMMA and ODBC, reaching out to some of our partners for conversion files, manual data cleanup for data conversion, and unanticipated change requests. Upcoming activities include working on the 3rd re-baseline of the schedule, continuing to draft the functional and technical designs, moving towards building out the rest of the environment, including user acceptance testing, training, and production. They will also continue to recruit for the vacant positions. The IV&V review is scheduled for April. Midge Holland expressed a personal concern about User Acceptance Testing (UAT) – she will be putting forth a proposal to the Executive Sponsors to talk about how they might shore up the State resources to ensure they have a very successful UAT strategy in place. She feels they have a gap in skill on their team in that area.

Secretary Sills: It says scheduled re-baseline; so is the project going to be 30 months, 36 months, 39 months...?

Midge Holland: The re-baseline will make sure we are on track and to look for areas, so if we need to crash we can bring it back. It's really resourcing issues. We have the major milestones laid out, but we are looking to re-baseline to make sure the resources that we have identified are properly allocated and again look at the relationships between the various tasks and structures to make sure we are not missing anything, so if we need to crash we can. And we agreed to periodically baseline when we signed.

Secretary Sills: So with the extension of the project, is it going to increase the cost?

Midge Holland: We've got the cost covered. It is in our budget request this year and the budget projections for the remaining years of the project. At this point, we are not looking at any increase in cost for the schedule we are looking at.

Carlos Vieira: You mentioned difficulty getting staff; can you talk a little more about that and particularly any lessons learned?

Midge Holland: We learned a couple of things: the kinds of positions that we would need for the project were identified very early on and revisions were made to that staffing structure, but since we are a .Net application we are finding it very difficult within the merit system to hire people at merit salaries who will come or stay for those positions. We fill them, they stay a few months, and they move on. Some folks have stayed long enough to participate in some training and have moved on. They are just too many opportunities for a more lucrative salary for them to stay in a state position.

Carlos Vieira: What is the answer to that? It sounds like it is not a problem that is just with your project – it sounds like a statewide problem.

Midge Holland: I believe it is a statewide problem. I can't tell you what the answer is – I can tell you what our frustrations are with the merit salary structure, which really seems to be the issue. We have done some creative recruiting, but it is really a question of salary. We really need to put our heads together around what the options might be.

Carlos Vieira: Secretary Sills have you taken an action item on this? This sounds like it is going to be problem with every project using this technology.

Secretary Sills: This is a relatively new skill that has been out there the last four years or so. It is in high demand. There are a lot of technologies that are moving to that platform. I don't have any answer unfortunately. The merit salary structure is the merit salary structure. Some of the agencies have been relying on the CAI/MSP contract to get their resources, and we are paying \$30 or \$40 an hour more for that resource. I think it is important to get the resource and then retain them on the project. They still need that skill set. It is the ongoing support that worries me the most, because having turnover like that – who is going to support the system on a go forward basis? This is what really concerns me. I think we will get through this with staff augmentation, but I think it is the ongoing support model that will hurt the State in the long run.

Matt Payne: A lot of the teams have a lot of contractor reliance, and the State folks have the older skill set and do not necessarily have the new skill set. I think when we are in the process of making a case of why we need to do these IT initiatives, we have to recognize that we might have to plan for an externally supported ongoing solution as opposed to the internal team actually maintaining the system. We also need to understand the cost associated with that and moving the risk to another partner, and then managing that partner. Reality is we are probably not going to be able to hire enough of the folks with the newest skill set and keep them on an ongoing basis. So when that doesn't happen, you end up bringing in contractors. When you start adding up the cost of all the individual contractors, at their rate, you might have had a better chance to actually work with a sourcing partner to take care of it, move the risk to them, and then have a more fixed rate because you know what that contract is with that source partner. That being said, you have to look at it on a case to case basis. You have to look at the individuals that are working in that area and ask how many of them are there, how many are really needed, and what is the realistic chance that they are going to be able to evolve their skill set from an older one to a newer one? There are a lot of pieces that go into it. I think the idea that I support it today and I am going to be able to support it in the future is something that is not necessarily accurate. Again my concern is, first and foremost, the ability to support the solution and then second from a budget perspective; if you cannot support it, we are going to wind up having to use the vendor. If you didn't include a vendor in your upfront costs and understand the impact to the State budget, then there is going to be a gap. I think a little bit more homework upfront to see how realistic it is for that team to support it themselves is important.

Midge Holland: We really have two issues: one, as Matt and the Secretary mentioned, is that going forward we have to be concerned about maintaining and supporting the application. The real issue for us now is the development process. There are not enough hands on deck on the State's team to be able to manage and vet from a technology perspective what my implementation vendor is doing. The implementation vendor has already bid for us a year of warranty, and they have included in their original firm fixed price a speculation of what it would cost to maintain it. So we could enter into a relationship with them when we move into maintenance, but before we get there, I need to

have enough trained and skilled people on staff to make sure they are delivering to us what we are paying for. That really is where my gap is right now.

Ann Visalli: The idea that you can't hire merit employees that have technical skills or that you can't pay them enough is not a new concept. This is why DTI looks the way it does, because this is something that we have been struggling with a long time. I do not want to commit to DTI, but I would not continue down that path. You are not going to be able to fix the problem, because even if you find the perfect person in the merit system, some other merit agency is going to take them away. We know that, it is not new, we can't fix it, and that is what happens. So I would spend your efforts on a different type of solution. Relate that to what Matt said and maybe even working with some of your vacant positions; potentially moving them to DTI and creating that ongoing support at DTI. That way you have State employees and not contractors; state employees that are more efficiently utilized out of this agency than they would be in your departments. It is just a thought.

Midge Holland: No disagreement there. At the end of the day, that decision is above my pay grade.

Steve Fletcher: I don't understand the details of the State's merit system, but is it a fool's mission to think we should be having a major initiative to deal with that, or are we saying that any new system we build we are going to have to turn it over to a contractor support? That just doesn't seem right. Why can't we fix the merit system?

Ann Visalli: It's neither; there is a hybrid option. The major initiative in the merit system was the creation of DTI. The DTI agency is exempt for the very reason Midge is describing. Even if you hire an employee in the State's merit system, the odds of them even being able to keep up their skill set as fast as technology changes, is unlikely. We wanted to create an agency that was exempt so the employees can be hired outside of the merit system and have a different pay scale. So they are not paid comparable to a merit employee, and they can be more highly trained, and those skills can be utilized in multiple agencies. So in other words, if Midge hired somebody who is very highly skilled and that person works for her on DASCES, than that person is not going to be assigned to any other projects to be used statewide. DTI is a central support agency, so if they hire someone with a specific skill set, they can deploy them as necessary. That model doesn't sound like it is being utilized here, so I don't think you have to be completely dependent on contractors, because the DTI employees are better trained to relate and manage contractors than a functional person in an agency.

Pat Griffin: It sounds like what Ann is talking about in a way is an internal contract situation, where it is cheaper than going outside.

Ann Visalli: That is why we created this agency [DTI], so that we can realign resources out of the agency, where they're merit, to DTI where they are going to be better leveraged.

Bill Hickox: And we are actually doing that with certain agencies right now. We have the ICSIS project where there are resources that are hired as DTI employees and as internal contractors. DOS is paying DTI, so we hired these positions, and those people are dedicated full-time to supporting that project.

Ann Visalli: That is the idea. You do not want me hiring those people, because I do not have that knowledge.

Matt Payne: The irony of the whole thing, per Bill's earlier update, is that this is the one area during the ITC process that they fight the hardest against. Everyone wants to keep their own developers and project managers, but it is the area with the biggest gap between the modern skill set and what the people actually have.

Ann Visalli: And odds are you are not going to win that fight, because if they are that good then some other agency will come along and offer them \$5,000 more.

Matt Payne: And it is not that the folks they have are that good, it is what they are used to. Even if it's all contractors, they still do not want to move them. It is very ironic, because you can see what is coming down the road, and you are trying to explain why it makes sense for their Project Management and Apps Development to be a part of the IT Consolidation in order to avoid these situations. It is the area of biggest contention.

Secretary Sills: We touch a lot of the major projects; we are going to review the list later. A lot of vendor firms have state resources that are assigned to work on the projects, and a lot of the state resources are actually part-time. What happens is that they are unable to check and challenge that vendor, and that is what we see a lot. So the vendor says we are going to do this, and we are going to spend this much money. The State resources only work on a major

initiative once every five to six years, and the vendor has been doing it every day, so there is a disconnect between what's happening in real time versus the state employee challenging that vendor in what they're doing. We view that as a risk, and we see that every day. We will say 'why did you do this', 'why did you do that', 'how come you didn't consider that?' In most cases, they just didn't know. I think there is a need to work closer together to make sure we are identifying all those risks. .Net is a very difficult skill set, so if there was a way to pull all those resources together in the State and have them to report to DTI, then we can deploy them back out to the agencies for some of these projects that would be something we would be willing to talk to Ann about to see if it is actually feasible. There is an increase in cost, so the agency would still have to make up that difference of what is being paid at the merit rate versus the DTI rate. We have been somewhat successful in hiring some .Net resources even though we did hire them from other agencies.

Midge Holland: There are a couple of strategies associated with that which I think we can really make happen. We are federally funded, so we can leverage 66% out of our fund to these positions as long as they are dedicated to Child Support. We have a model working in IRM right now for Telecom Desktop Support where they are keeping track of their hours then they charge back those hours to Child Support. We can formalize that in SLA's to make sure we have a model. I am not averse to having that work, because we really need to support that. I don't disagree that we need to work more closely together, but the one thing this project has, that some others don't, is that we are paying for the IV&V vendor who watches those things. They have done a review of the project structure and will also be doing a review of the code and the deliverables to make sure the State and our quality assurance vendor are keeping up and managing the risk, so we do have additional eyes on it.

"FACTS II" Family and Child Tracking System, II ~ Steve Fletcher

An important decision was made that the Data Integration Hub is going to be initialized through another project, and FACTS II will be still be utilizing that Data Integration Hub to share data throughout the State.

Secretary Sills: Matt can you please talk through what the Data Integration Hub is, what it meant to the FACTS II project, and bring everybody up to speed on this issue now that we have changed direction?

Matt Payne: It is a methodology, or design, on how you deal with your interfaces to and from the solution that is being upgraded with ways to implement it. The old school traditional version is what people consider to be Point to Point, which means if I have 100 interfaces, I am going to take all 100 interfaces and send the files to the new solution to potentially get the files back and forth. It is from point A to point B and back again. It could happen multiple times a day. Some data within those, let's say name and address, might be contained in all 100 files. The idea behind the Hub is you take all the data from all the different interfaces and run them into the Hub. The Hub has code and logic built in it to extract the data element that is needed by the application. You determine what is going to be updated; you pass it through the Hub, and back out again to the agencies. The concept behind it is the quality and consistency of the data, and any data element changes, down the road, would be modified in one place. The one time set up is to build the infrastructure for it. On the FACTS II project, the overall interface piece from the solution provider was approximately \$1.8M, and they wanted an incremental \$600K to build the Hub. Instead, what we are doing is using another project that is in the earlier stage and also has a higher percentage of federal funds. Therefore, the cost to the State is actually lower.

Ann Visalli: What project is that?

Matt Payne: I will tell you after the meeting, because they are still in contract negotiations. The same vendor is involved in multiple efforts.

Matt Payne: That is the concept behind it – it is more how to go about doing it. It is a newer way in terms of dealing with interfaces. Why we think it is important for the State is the number of projects that we have going on at one time, and the number of these point to point interfaces that take place for every one of them is excessive. Every time you have to do an upgrade of that particular software, all that has to be redone every single time, times the number of projects that we have. It makes for a much more extensive and challenging way of doing it than integrating it into a Hub.

Steve Fletcher: Back when we started talking about this with the FACTS II project in November, it was a little difficult for us to get our hands around it. In the January, February time frame, it started to make a whole lot more sense to us and to the point now we agree this is the way to do it. This is absolutely the right thing to do for the State, to have a Data Integration Hub- there is no question about it.

Current project status: FACTS II is at the very tail end of contract negotiations. Optimistically, they will be wrapped up by the end of this month. An update will be sent to the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) for approval, which has 60 days to approve it. Once these items are completed by the end of April, the project will begin. A July 4, 2014 go-live/completion date is still being targeted. FACTS II is focusing most of its development efforts on accommodating and integrating Child Mental Health and YRS functionality into a transfer system. A year-long testing and training program has been laid out and overlapped on top of the development efforts in order to get to completion. Also, FACTS II has doubled the amount of time for User Acceptance Testing, because it was the biggest area of risk.

Li Wen Lin: What is the duration of time for testing?

Steve Fletcher: From 30 days to 60 days, and that is just the very tail end of testing. There are all kinds of unit testing, system testing, and stress testing that precedes all that. That is just the UAT itself.

Matt Payne: Do you want to talk about the technical lead and what you are trying to do?

Steve Fletcher: That is very complicated, and Laura is our expert on that. Basically our technical lead, Hal Miller, is on active duty until September. His active duty is in Alabama, and he is becoming one of the world's expert gurus on system networking. We have tried a number of times to get him replaced. We started off with a dual incumbent for a year position. We had five people that came back, and none were qualified. We expanded to two years, and we had two or three responses back; one of which looks like they marginally qualify. We are going through that evaluation process now, and we are investigating the possibility of turning that into long-term contract dollars. It has been very, very difficult for us. The delay is mitigating the issue, because Hal will be back by the time we get into the scope of the technology design. We really do need the extra help. That is the evolution. Lesson learned: the reality is these guys are really in demand, and don't even bother offering them one year - even two years is still hard. We have all been facing this in different ways. We are reviewing the final shot at the two year dual incumbency, and we are now in parallel with looking at converting the contract dollars. Not sure how successful we will be, but that is where we are.

This summer will be very busy. One of the biggest project risks is stretching the internal staff too thin on this project. The staff will step up to the plate. Laura Miles is leading the charge in an elaborate and detailed process where they can figure out ways to pay the staff overtime, so they can do their day time jobs and focus enough time on FACTS II project.

Ann Visalli: Just so the audience is aware, that request has come to OMB, and it has not been approved, and it is not going to be approved in its current form. We are going back and forth. So I don't want anyone who heard that to think you are going to get what you are asking for, because it is not a realistic proposal. It does not make any sense, so we are going back to Kids Department to have them rethink their request.

Steve Fletcher: Anything in particular in detail?

Ann Visalli: If it hasn't already gotten back to you, it should be, and I will be happy to follow up with you later today to let you know my concerns. The proposal was not realistic, and I have a series of questions.

The second area of risk is the CAI contract for the Change Management Specialist. ACF got very nervous and stated this was not a competitive procurement on behalf of the state of Delaware. FACTS II currently piggy-backed on top of the state of Pennsylvania. Through weeks of wrangling, ACF now understands that it was common, and they are following their strategy and collaborating with the state of Pennsylvania. FACTS II will be finalizing the DD&I vendor contract within the next two weeks.

"DCAP" Delaware Courts Automation Project ~ Marianne Kennedy:

Gary Gray replaced Dale Matthews as Project Manager of DCAP. He has extensive Project Management experience and experience with the Department of Justice. DCAP is working very closely with Software AG and the other technology vendors to keep moving on Portfolio 1 projects. There are resource issues in JIC, so DCAP is ramping up the support they need in the first year from Software AG. They have terminated their contract with ACS but will still be engaged in some customization efforts with them. For example, a few interfaces need to be built between the existing systems and an ACS system. DCAP is currently working on various levels of planning with the project, including the Change Management plan and the resource plan. There is a focus on technology and infrastructure needs, and Oracle licensing was recently renegotiated with DTI. Staff at JIC is being augmented. There were a number of vacancies and turnovers recently, which has been DCAP's biggest risk. New people have been hired; a new Database Administrator with Oracle experience and a Systems Architect. Another position that is being reconfigured is a Quality Assurance Support person.

The major portfolio items such as single view, eliminating case acceptance, and document management are being worked on and making good progress. The current budget is \$15.7M, and \$13.2M has been expended. This number has increased, because the payments to ACS were finalized. The biggest risk, at this point, is resourcing, addressing the staffing requirements for this project, and focusing on a new approach. DCAP is renegotiating their vendor relationship, because their initial quotes for some of the customization were high. An internal resource, an Oracle Developer, was also hired through CAI to make the program changes. There are two deliverables in the financial areas that were planned for August that may be delayed, if the changes are not in place. Progress is being made on the current portfolio, work is being done on the JIC reorganization, and there is an ongoing partnership with the National Center for State Courts. Jim Harris is the external reviewer, and he has extensive automation experience within the court environment. He comes in quarterly to oversee the project and is also involved in other meetings and teleconferences. DCAP has realigned their leadership for JIC.

Major Project Summary ~ Matt Payne:

The Major Project review is held quarterly and is held seven weeks prior to the TIC meetings. It is a much more extensive overview of the nine major projects. Themes and concerns are shared in the meeting. At the end of each review, their status is summarized; red, yellow, or green. If they are a yellow status, that means there are issues and concerns that require actions to be taken, and the projects may be reviewed at the TIC meeting.

Ann Visalli: Would you mind breaking out the dollars by either General Fund Other or General Fund ASF?

Secretary Sills: We can do that on a going forward basis; the Governor asked for that information also.

Ann Visalli: It helps manage expectations, because people will think it is all general funds.

Matt Payne: I think we also want to focus on the ongoing stuff. The real question happens after a year – what is the ongoing cost?

Ann Visalli: The only other thing I would suggest is some type measurement – the only thing it has is the implementation date. You can get to the implementation date and look back and say we never saw this chart – are we on track or not on track?

Matt Payne: What we try to do is use the color and put in the comments, but we will try to add in more detail.

Upcoming Meeting Dates:

Tuesday – June 12, 2012 (VTC)

Tuesday – September 11, 2012 (TBD)

Tuesday – December 11, 2012 (TBD)

Tuesday – March 12, 2013 (TBD)

Conclusion ~ Secretary Sills:

Secretary Sills thanked the members for their participation and informed the Council that the next scheduled TIC Meeting will be on Tuesday, June 12, 2012. It will be held in two video teleconference locations in the Dover and Wilmington.

Adjournment – Secretary Sills:

With no further business to be conducted, Dan Grim made the motion to adjourn, and Russ Larson seconded the motion. With no opposition, the motion was carried. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:37 am.

:iik