



Technology Investment Council



State of Delaware
Technology Investment Council Meeting Minutes
September 15, 2009

Technology Investment Council Attendees

Name	Organization	Attendance	Represented by
James Sills	DTI	Present	
Russ Larson	Controller General	Present	
Dr. Lillian Lowery	DOE	Represented	Dr. Mike Owens
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	Present	

Call to Order:

Secretary Jim Sills called the meeting to order at 9:00 am.

Welcome:

Jim Sills welcomed everyone to the second TIC meeting this year. This meeting was held by a multipoint video teleconference in three different locations. Introductions were given at each of the locations: Carvel Building in Wilmington, DTI Dover, and Haslet Building in Dover. Attendance was noted as shown in the above table. Others in attendance included DTI Senior Staff and Team Leaders, staff from the ERP Project, and representatives from the Courts, the Controller General’s office, OMB, DOC, DOS, and DOE.

Old Business:

Jim Sills asked if all members received and reviewed June 8, 2009 TIC meeting minutes and requested for a motion to approve them. With no comments or questions, Glenn Tascione made a motion to approve the minutes as written and Carlos Vieira seconded the motion. With no opposition the motion was carried.

TIC Membership:

Jim Sills recognized the newest TIC member, Ann Visalli, Director of OMB who was appointed to the TIC in accordance with Senate Bill 142 in July. Ann Visalli commented, “When the original legislation was drafted and passed, the Director of OMB was specifically omitted from TIC. Because of the fact that the technology process should be vetted and approved and the important part of the process should be the funding of the project, the OMB Director shouldn’t be influencing the success or failure of a technology project. I am happy to be here but I will be sure to stay in the wings and try to add value and I will not be controlling.”

IT Consolidation Update ~ Bill Hickox:

IT Consolidation is the result of the Government Performance Review the Governor directed on his second day in office. As DTI began the process, an initial assessment of all the agencies within the state government was performed. DTI has over 200 employees and the IT employees throughout the rest of state government are more than three times that number. Only 20-25% of the IT employees are within a centralized agency so the probability exists for overlap and redundancy of services provided. This initial assessment was to determine if that was a true hypothesis. After conducting these assessments it became clear that in fact there were redundancies in services throughout the agencies. In order to move forward with the IT Consolidation, DTI has pulled together an assessment team of subject matter experts within DTI. This team will be performing a full in depth assessment of each agency's IT operations. The first five agencies being targeted are Department of State, Department of Labor, Department of Finance, DelDOT, and Department of Education. DTI met with the leadership of these agencies to discuss the opportunity of consolidation. The five agency assessments are scheduled to be completed by the end of the year. At that time an implementation plan will be developed.

IT Consolidation Cost Savings Opportunities ~ Bill Hickox:

There are six areas of cost savings opportunities associated with the IT Consolidation:

- (1) Consolidation of like functions - Based on the initial assessment there is the opportunity to consolidate similar functions such as Help Desk. There are currently 22 Help Desks that exist in state government. We have already reached an agreement with DelDOT to absorb their Help Desk in the latter part of this year.
- (2) Contractors - There is an opportunity to reduce contractors within the IT area. We have discovered contractors doing the same critical function in an agency for 17 years. It is important that we achieve a transfer of knowledge to state employees to support these critical functions. Also, if we are paying a contractor in excess of \$200,000 a year versus paying a state employee much less, there is an opportunity for savings.
- (3) Virtualization of servers and storage – DTI pushed an effort to virtualize 300 servers. The concept of virtualization is taking stand alone servers and combining them into a single platform which provides the opportunity to utilize the excess capacity that normally exists in stand-alone servers. Significant savings can be achieved if 450 of the 900 servers could be virtualized.
- (4) There are enterprise opportunities for Software Licensing - DTI has successfully negotiated the enterprise licensing for ESRI (mapping software), VMWare (server virtualization software), and is currently negotiating with Microsoft for an enterprise agreement.
- (5) Reduction of application inventory – We have over 1,000 redundant applications in our inventory. As we consolidate and leverage existing investments, we can begin to retire some of these applications and save on hardware/software licensing and costs associated with system support.
- (6) Data Center Consolidation – DTI has William Penn and Biggs Data Centers and there are a number of agency data centers being paid for and supported throughout the state. All of these centers have significant maintenance and other costs associated with them; consolidating them offers the opportunity to save a considerable amount of money.

Based on the initial assessments we estimate the range of savings to be between seven (\$7M) and ten (\$10M) million dollars.

Ann Visalli: Is there a strategic benefit to not locating all the data centers in one location?

Bill Hickox: Yes, what we are looking to do is to consolidate in William Penn and leave Biggs Data Center as it is. Our long range strategic plan is to make William Penn Data Center a functional production data center for all systems and the Biggs Data Center would act as a redundant backup location located 55 miles apart. If in fact something happens in Dover, we do have a standing contract with Sungard for disaster recovery services if everybody gets wiped out.

DTI 2009 Top Priorities ~ Bill Hickox:

There are four areas of Strategic Focus for FY 2010-2011:

- (1) First and foremost is the IT Consolidation (concept of shared services) which has been designated a priority by the Governor.
- (2) Leveraging Existing Investments – if we enhance our governance and oversight of the activities that are happening, we need to leverage our existing investments.
- (3) Modernization toward a shared data model – there are multiple data bases within the state in which citizens reside. Modernization will allow us to get further mileage out of some of our legacy systems as we move forward.
- (4) Customer Experience – we are focused on the concept of citizen self service and enhancing our e-government options. This will reduce the amount of front desk services required at service centers in all agencies. We want to offer more e-government and self services to citizens through the web and on-line systems; this access reduces the burden on existing infrastructure and allows the state to redirect resources in those agencies that are providing that level of support.

Ann Visalli: On the priority of e-government, that is really, in my opinion a mission of the Government Information Center (GIC) and the Secretary of State's office. My question is does DTI as a technology support agency assist the GIC in their efforts in expanding government and the relationship with the customer or are you taking on a larger role in identifying...you know... I am just looking for clarification between the GIC and DTI.

Bill Hickox: I think it's actually both because number one we are absolutely a technology partner providing technology support. The other thing we need to do is bring solutions to the table for the GIC to be able to utilize from a content perspective. It's not just the GIC and the web; we are talking about IVR, Integrated Voice Response technologies, we are talking about a couple of different opportunities that if we are able to bring those solutions to the table, we are going to enhance their ability to meet their goal and benefit the whole state.

Pat Griffin: I have a question about the shared data model content: how would it work with the legacy systems? Would we have to develop interfaces?

Bill Hickox: It's actually been done in a couple of places; we've seen a couple of demonstrations and opportunities where it is really a front end web model that reaches into the legacy mainframe system and pulls the data and it's shared so as you view it, it's not necessarily that you are in all those systems. For example, if they are dealing with a child support enforcement issue and somebody is applying for WIC but doesn't have custody of the kids you will be able to view that information. They can see what this

person is applying for and what state services they already have across the enterprise... that is one side of it. The other side is one stop shopping for someone looking for state services.

Matt Payne: One of the projects we are looking at that leverages this kind of functionality is potentially partnering with the Benefits Bank. This would be a portal that could offer a number of different benefits to citizens. A data share would be part of the technology solution behind that, where we would be able to pull different pieces of data from a variety of sources, store that data, present data to different organizations to make decisions on whether or not someone is eligible and then take that data coming back from the institutions and storing it. That is one of the uses of the concept of the shared data model.

Jim Sills: Let me add a couple comments and go back to what Ann originally asked about where she sees DTI in terms of our role with the e-government applications. Bill Hickox and I met with the Governor a few weeks ago and we laid out a high level strategic plan. He wanted us to work very closely with GIC to help them develop more web based applications but also look at third party companies that may be able to integrate their apps within our environment. He feels strongly, Ann, that to reduce the size of government we need to have more web facing self service applications. He has asked us to partner with them and to examine this and come back with some real solutions very quickly. That is why we are taking it on. We are not going to take over GIC, they are the content providers. We are really looking at providing solutions and alternatives to applications that they cannot create so if there is a vendor out there that can integrate their applications in our environment we want to talk to them with GIC. Are there any other questions for Bill?

Jim Canalichio: I have a question for Bill. Looking at the minutes from last time I took note of the fact that the current infrastructure would only support what's going on at DTI for the next three years. This is a pretty aggressive IT Consolidation thought process, how does [the current infrastructure] fit into that process, and what does it do to the timeline as far as what's there.

Bill Hickox: The Data Center Consolidation...there is going to be a challenge associated with that. The last time I gave a presentation to the TIC in regards to where we stood with the Data Center initiative part...the state wide data center, I mentioned that by making some modifications, renovations we may have the ability to last another three years or so in the current environment. By looking at new technologies, different technologies, by consolidating servers in the virtual environment we are going to reduce the footprint. However, while we reduce the footprint, we increase the electrical requirement and the HVAC requirement. I mentioned Division of Corporations, DOE, DelDOT, DTC, and there are others over at DEMA for example; if we are looking to consolidate all those, the current floor space within the William Penn facility will not accommodate all those data centers. Will it accommodate five, will it accommodate three of the five...yes. Now there are other initiatives that are underway, things like Output Management consolidation. If in fact we can get Output Management consolidated within the state and from a parochial perspective have it move away from the William Penn facility, then that frees up about 2000 square feet of raised floor space. Again that would allow us to consolidate more of the data centers that I just mentioned. But again, our opportunity for growth and expansion would be significantly diminished. So that is going to be a challenge as we move forward, we are going to have to do something in regards to the hosting of our IT equipment within this state. There are a couple of things on the table, we have a couple of options, we've meet with DEDO and a few other things that are not developed enough to

discuss here today. This is a critical issue that is going to have to be addressed within the next three years and if you consider the critical path of construction and the timeline associated with it we don't have a lot of time.

Russ Larson: Are you referring to the new facility, the data center that might be funded with ARRA money?

Bill Hickox: Yes

Russ Larson: Are we still a go on that?

Bill Hickox: Well as we were developing the stimulus application, it became very apparent that the intention of the pot of money that was designated for the data center was designated for the private sector. The whole line of the application indicated how many more people really are served with broadband as a result of the construction of this data center. From our perspective the focus was on consolidation and reduction of costs which will allow us to then promulgate more services to the citizens in an indirect manner. The consultants we were dealing with felt very strongly that they didn't believe that was what the intention was. We decided to hold off in order to flesh it out further... hold off on that application until round two.

Russ Larson: If I am hearing this correctly, it sounds like right now we are a no go on that data center?

Bill Hickox: We are in a holding pattern from a stimulus perspective, however there is another option: we are working with a major, private hardware/software vendor that is potentially interested in locating in central Delaware which is why we have been dealing with DEDO and some others... there is a potential other option, we just have to flesh out more detail.

Ann Visalli: I just wanted to say that maintaining the infrastructure to support technology is critically important and I recognize that. The Governor has made it very clear he is committed to reducing the size of the state's footprint, both in people and in space. So the idea that we are going to be expanding our physical presence in terms of the state is not necessarily going to happen.

Bill Hickox: This again is why we are looking at an entirely different model...private.

Russ Larson: And this is why you shouldn't be on this committee.

Ann Visalli: I want to be very clear that we are working actively to reduce the size of the state government so unless you can find some savings elsewhere so that the net gain to the state is not positive then that is what you are going to have to do.

Bill Hickox: That is why if you look at the reduction in space at all the data centers that we talked about it is going to create a void in those state facilities which presumably will allow us to reduce leased space and consolidate into those spaces.

Ann Visalli: Right, it doesn't mean you cannot continue your current allocation of resources but total allocation in terms of purpose. I am not saying it's easy, that's the directive.

Bill Hickox: That's why this is a consolidation, it's not a growth and through that consolidation there are clear opportunities for cost savings.

Delaware's Grant ARRA Requests ~Mike Hojnicki:

The state of Delaware took the lead on the ARRA; primarily DTI and particularly on the Broadband opportunity. The goal was to support the funding of broadband restructuring in underserved areas, getting broadband out into the community, and encouraging the state wide adoption of these services. The grant application process was extremely competitive, oversubscribed, and had a very aggressive 45 day turnaround from announcement to application. DTI worked with Public Works and brought in stakeholders from the county government, higher education, and state agencies who helped solicit ideas. It was identified that there was approximately four (\$4B) billion dollars of funds available.

Out of our initial nine options DTI was able to get four of our ideas passed forward to complete applications. One of the major challenges to this application process was that the grants had to be fully certified by professional engineers ensuring that the plan was well thought out and developed. The three grants that DTI was able to submit were: (1) Broadband Mapping – which would provide for mapping of broadband services across the state of Delaware, (2) Broadband Expansion – which would expand broadband access to 18 public schools, 18 charter schools, and 17 other community anchor institutions throughout Delaware, and (3) Delaware State University (DSU) Technology Modernization – which would fund the implementation of a modern networking infrastructure at the DSU campuses.

DTI submitted the only grants from Delaware and we are currently waiting to hear from the federal government on the status of these applications. If the process continues as scheduled we anticipate hearing in late September and if we are successful, funding could begin as soon as November 1st. We are anticipating a second offering of approximately three (\$3B) billion plus funds to come out in late 2009 or early 2010. DTI is preparing for this next round by meeting with the stakeholders and scheduling a meeting with the Division of Libraries, which is one of the institutions that is likely to get funded.

Data Loss Prevention ~ Jim Sills:

There have been some major headlines about cyber attacks in the media where data within an institution's or organization's environment has been hacked. These hackers use very sophisticated tools and they capture data that is not protected or encrypted. DTI performed a Data Leakage Study early this year to determine the magnitude of the problem within the state in terms of data that is going outside of our state network. We focused on data that was nine digits mimicking a social security number or 16 digits that would mimic a credit card number. Our goal was to determine the amount of unencrypted data that was going outside of the state network. We determined that a few departments were sending highly confidential data outside of the state network that was unsecured/unencrypted. This data could easily be captured by hackers. Over the last 30 days, DTI has met with various Cabinet Secretaries of the larger agencies to alert them of this problem. The responses have been very good. We are in the process of implementing a tool that would allow us to encrypt all outgoing email that should be in place by the end of the year.

ERP Project Status ~ Matt Payne:

The scope of the ERP project has two parts; first is replacing a 35 year old DFMS mainframe system with a Distributed PeopleSoft system and second is upgrading four other PeopleSoft

modules to the most current release. There are many stakeholders involved with a very large scope of impact. DTI has had a good response and participation from all these parties. We have a great team with a lot of PeopleSoft experience and strong support from our business partners. We are currently in the Integration phase which is the last phase of testing and it is 65% complete. The overall project is 88% complete. There has been an extremely high success rate in the Testing. The amount spent on the project to date is \$61 million.

Some of the issues and concerns are that resources are stretched thin; we've had a few retirements and we are utilizing people to the maximum. Progress is being made although we are slightly behind schedule in terms of identifying ongoing support and training of the Financials Help Desk. Things are in excellent shape on the PHRST side. Plans, such as working from home, are also being made in case of unexpected absences. There is a training scheduling module being put together and roughly 3700 people will need to be trained. The challenges related to scope are change requests that are usually uncovered in testing, changes due to ARRA funding opportunities or GPR initiatives, and the issues that may arise when Interface Testing begins.

DTI visited with Dan Grim at the University of Delaware to review their lessons learned and experiences with PeopleSoft. We have plans to visit another company to see how they utilize PeopleSoft and how their migration is doing as well. Our next steps are the following: To keep moving forward and making sure we get our testing completed, to control the scope of any change requests and freeze those currently in development, to complete Integrated testing, to finalize resources for Helpdesk and training, to complete training material preparation and delivery planning, and to complete project closeout processes with vendor. DTI recommends that our executive sponsors continue to support to resource commitment and maintain strict adherence to the project schedule.

Russ Larson: How many people are dedicated to ERP right now?

Matt Payne: A hundred percent dedicated to it?

Russ Larson: Yes.

Matt Payne: Between 120 and 140 people.

Russ Larson: When this thing goes live, what does that number become?

Matt Payne: I can't talk to the business side but I can tell you on the technical side the teams that are supporting ERP right now. Let's say in the neighborhood of 30 people who support ERP on the PHRST and FSF side. We will probably drop that number down into the low 20's for ongoing support. There's also a list of post install items that needs to take place as well. On the business side I don't know if there will be anyone dedicated to the project any longer; people will go back into the business, some will go to the Help Desk and people will become the users of the system at that point.

Ann Visalli: Probably the idea would be that Financials and PHRST which have a lot of shared skill sets would become one integrated Project Management team under the Helpdesk with the net result of PHRST Financials being a savings. We also have dual encumbered positions we are trying to eliminate and find out whoever has to go back into the merit system again. We don't have an exact final number, we are looking at the

structure that combines those two together, but there will definitely be ongoing people supporting Financials that are not decentralized out in the agencies but rather on the Project Management team.

Russ Larson: I would have assumed that, but my question is for budgeting purposes; the theory is that when the project is completed some folks that were dedicated to the project don't need to be anymore.

Ann Visalli: And the people that don't have merit rights or are on contracts hopefully will be gone. We have people on loan for the project that will come back who are not full time now but there are certainly some full time people on the project who will stay on the project and become part of the ongoing budget. Strategically we've talked about it at the ERP Executive Sponsor's Meeting about what the organization structure would be if it came under one agency. No matter how you do it there will be some people that will remain on full time.

Russ Larson: I guess that is where I am coming from, prior to the ERP/PHRST where did this staff exist that ran the state's Financials?

Ann Visalli: Accounting, if you look back about ten years ago you had separate pay roll, you had PHRST, people on Benefits, Treasurer's Office, Finance, some DTI people that migrated over in the subject matter area to lend technology support. The idea would be that there would be a statement going forward once it becomes operational and have a budget to support that.

Russ Larson: If prior to all this, let's say ten years ago, you have a benefits group, you have an accounting group and now it is being consolidated into one, where do these folks and functions go? Do they go away?

Karen Field Rogers: Yes, I think what we are looking at, for example on the Financials area we've got the Division of Accounting, currently we've got a number of people still over there supporting DFMS. Some of those have retired but we are looking at the people that are remaining over there to try to figure out if they are going to have a role on the production of ERP Financials going forward. There are some people on the project right now that will go away. They will go back to either their organization or move to another project or area. We are currently trying to work through the combination of what happens to the Division of Accounting as well as what we need to support the ERP Project. We also have to make sure that is all in agency budget requests for FY11 so that we have the correct positions where they need to be in addition to trying to staff a large Help Desk to support Financials and PHRST.

Russ Larson: I just have visions based on what Ann was saying of a 2011 budget having this office of PHRST within OMB or within Finance or within wherever. This tells me we created another agency but we did it by distancing between several sub agencies or sub groups within agencies.

Ann Visalli: I wouldn't say new agencies but kind of a subdivision of an agency that is more streamlined and efficient... where the net result is pure.

Russ Larson: Right - got it.

ICIS Project Status ~ Matt Payne:

The ICIS (Integrated Corporations Information System) will upgrade and update the legacy mainframe imaging and workflow system responsible for supporting the State's Division of Corporations. It is a major revenue driver for the state of Delaware, generating approximately \$600 million in annual revenue. This project is also moving from a mainframe to a new distributed environment. The solution will be a .net based web application using an Oracle database. Our vendor and partner Alliance is working with DOS and DTI to develop the application which is a work flow and rules engine type system.

Currently the design and functional prototypes are being developed and built; some are completed and being reviewed by the business. There are six prototypes to cover the base functionality for the system; two are completed, a third is almost complete. We are on target for a first quarter 2011 install date. A meeting is scheduled for this fall with the external user community to view these prototypes.

The overall budget is \$12 million. The expenditures to date are approximately \$3.8 million.

This is a new technology for this agency. Currently the team that supports it is working in a mainframe environment. We are working with DOS to come up with the right staffing model for ongoing support for the project. Significant work is being planned to enable the application to be supported. Overall the ICIS project is currently on schedule.

The next steps are to continue successful processes for analysis and design tracks, to establish the environment inside the state to be transferred from vendor to the state for development, to present the process to the agent partners in a conference scheduled this fall, and integrate with DTI and leverage our skills to blend with DOS for the ongoing support of the project.

Deb Lindell: Will there be any opportunity to engage in web based education as we move forward? Will that be built into part of the project?

Matt Payne: Yes, that education is part of the project - we haven't really gotten too far in terms of the building of the education; that is a little farther down the road. We are trying to get them access to the prototypes early on.

Glenn Tascione: How many are there?

Matt Payne: I don't know the total number but it breaks up into groups. There are two partners that have the biggest part and they have a whole bunch of agents within those groups and there are about eight other partners that have a whole group of agents. Those ten to twelve groups make up two thirds of the community and the 100 plus other smaller groups make up the remaining third of the user population. So when we built all the different forms to have the ability to communicate back and forth we had to set it up with our Telecom group to support the 'mom and pop' shop which was two agents working out of the house, as well as the full corporation that had a whole large body of agents that can use it as well.

Carlos Vieira: There is obviously a lot of customization in the application. It seems like the biggest concern is going to be the ongoing support function and maintenance. It sounds like you have that plan written into the DTI plan.

Matt Payne: Yes, it is one of the biggest challenges because as you point out it is not a third party package like PeopleSoft that I can call up and get their feedback. This is something that is totally being built for the state, although there will be a contract with this person and the team that builds it. I was recommending that team be part of the install but that wasn't part of the original agreement with the vendor coming into the project. Right now there is a little bit of a push back but I am still trying to push that point to get some practical use.

COTS Project Status ~ Matt Payne:

The COTS (Court Organized to Serve) project also goes from a mainframe to a distributed environment. It is the software that supports all the Courts across the state. The project is broken into two pieces, Civil and Criminal.

The Civil piece which is almost complete is divided into two phases: (1) Phase 4a, Court of Common Pleas in New Castle and Kent Counties which was completed in November 2008 and (2) the final phase, Phase 4b, Superior Court in New Castle and Kent Counties which is on target to be installed in early October. The next steps are the implementation of Phase 4b scheduled for October 5, 2009.

Issues and concerns: The Criminal phase is more complicated than the Civil. Jim Sills and Matt Payne have met with the Chief Justice and all the judges which comprise the executive team of the project. They are looking for DTI to provide some guidance. A meeting is scheduled today with the vendor to discuss what happened with Civil and what can be done to create confidence in the system's ability to handle high volume caseloads. There are also some complicated interfaces with DELJIS that are critical to project success. There were discussions about having an evaluation of the Criminal side in order to gain confidence of the end user community working with the Courts. A solicitation to all the different Courts went out to determine what they wanted in order to feel positive about moving forward with the next phase. It came back with an unrealistically large scope and ultimately didn't make sense to pursue. Instead it was decided to meet with the vendor to continue development and to identify possible supplemental solution sets.

The COTS project has a budget of approximately \$15 million. It is a fixed price, milestone deliverable contract with the vendor. Currently the project remains on budget.

Glenn Tascione: Is the \$15 million inclusive of the Criminal Phases?

Matt Payne: Yes.

Glenn Tascione: What is the timeline that those phases were originally planned?

Matt Payne: The whole thing was originally planned I believe to be a four year effort but it has actually taken that long to do the Civil system.

Jim Sills: It's possible that moving forward with the Criminal Phase is going to elongate the project and cost additional dollars. Last week Matt and I met with all the Chief Judges for all the Courts and we had a really lively and interesting discussion about moving forward with Criminal Phase. We probably spent two and half hours discussing a go - no

go decision in terms of moving forward. It's my sense that the judges want us to continue to move forward and want us to address some of the issues that they were presenting to us last week. On October 15th we are going to give a report to all the Chief Judges on what we recommend, based on our findings and our discussion with the vendor ACS.

Matt Payne: A challenge for the people using the system is the learning curve. To get to the productivity level moving forward is pretty lengthy. There were a lot of lessons learned, in terms of roll out and just trying to get people staffed to deal with the fact they used to be able to deliver a certain amount of items per day and now it was taking them longer. We've done a lot of things since then, but it has been over an 18 month time period. They can't afford to go through that a second time. They are not staffed to handle that so there are a lot of very good questions and legitimate concerns that we have to figure out how to alleviate before we take charge of the next piece.

Deb Lindell: There are significant legal ramifications for us not being able to deliver the cases as quickly as we do the Civil. The Civil was an inconvenience; there were landlords that had issues with a timeline to get an eviction for example. But when someone's civil liberties are at stake, to be in prison, this is much more key. These things cannot happen, that is our primary concern. DOC has a definite interest in the success of COTS.

Pat Griffin: That concern is certainly shared from the police officers who come into the entry level JP Court and are focused on a time frame. Looking at the concept of moving from a customized mainframe system to the off the shelf can have its own delays and not be as consistent. I am very much appreciative of Secretary Sills' and Matt's involvement and assistance so that as we move forward we make sure that we're doing something that serves and works in the system and don't make these mistakes.

Russ Larson: When do we reach the point where we say let's hold this for awhile, until everything is straightened out?

Jim Sills: It's really on hold now. We met with all the Chief Judges last week and a few of the courts did not want to move forward with the criminal phase at all. We had a lively discussion about... do we move forward, what do we do, what are some alternative solutions. We have committed to come back to them by October 15th and walk through the solutions or alternatives. They are eventually going to have to get off of that mainframe based system. It makes sense to have the integration and formation of civil and criminal but we need a little more time to figure out what is the best approach. Like I said there are a number of Judges from the Courts that are adamant about not moving forward.

Matt Payne: The actual philosophy was that we were going to change our practices to utilize this canned system. In retrospect maybe that is what is going to happen. There are a lot of things to think through before we move forward on the Criminal. The civil piece is working, there are things that have to be modified and things that can be made better but it is very, very complicated. There are other opportunities for improvement but I don't think the 'we are just going to use this package exactly the way it is' is necessarily going to get anybody on board moving forward on the Criminal.

Russ Larson: You don't have to tell me which Judge it is. Did Myron, the Chief Justice make a comment on it?

Matt Payne: I am going to defer that question to Pat.

Pat Griffin: He did not make a conclusive decision on that; he is looking at the different Judges and he is concerned. He doesn't want the system to be worse off than it is currently in terms of ability and in terms of the public and that is where he is. He was listening to Secretary Sills' and Matt's comments about the importance of moving off the mainframe and if there is a need to do that what does that look like and how would you get there. There are still a lot of concerns but they are hopeful that a smart decision will be made from a technical perspective.

Jim Canalichio: What does effectively putting this project's next phase requirement on hold do with the relationship with the vendor that has already set out and worked this scope?

Matt Payne: We are going to be meeting with them this afternoon and have a discussion about that. I know there have been communications from the core team from the Courts area with the vendor and I think they are very familiar with exactly where we are and the concerns that have been expressed from the state.

Pat Griffin: Generally the vendor has worked well with us and they would like to have success in Delaware and create a fully integrated Court system.

IT Governance ~ iTIC ~ Mike Hojnicki:

The term IT Governance is helping to provide a better framework and clarity to the agencies as we move forward with the IT Consolidation. The iTIC is DTI's Internal Technology Investment Council. They review business cases for feasibility, risk and suitability, and overall compliance with the technical standards and guidelines. Mike Hojnicki assumed the role of management of the iTIC and business case process in July. In August a dialog began with Matt Payne's team through the Architecture Review Board (ARB) looking at the process and discussing how we can better align to support the IT Consolidation going forward. We are looking at the process as a whole; we started it as an internal discussion, we took it to the IRM Applications Committee, and the next step would be to recommend the process to the IRM Council. We are looking to improve our understanding of the agency business drivers and focus on early dialog and guidance. The outcome will lead to better defined project requirements and budget requests.

IT Governance ~ ARB ~ Matt Payne:

The Architecture Review Board (ARB) is led by the enterprise architect and it contains people from all different areas of technology. Their role is to lead the technology selection process by leveraging existing solutions and technologies, being knowledgeable of the IT industry trends and solution offerings, and understanding the State's IT strategic plans, standards, and policies. The ARB integrates the technology view with the business case process to ensure consistent use of technology. They also provide oversight in the deployment of new technologies to the State.

We are trying to move the ARB early on into this project life cycle. Once an agency puts together a business case they meet with someone from Mike Hojnicki's team which is the relationship management team for all the state agencies. Then a high level business case will be put together. In the past, we used to continue down that road and come up with a "how to" before getting the ARB engaged. Now we are moving the ARB very early on into the

process. The business case flow chart on slide 29 of the power point presentation reflects this change.

The Customer Relations Specialist will assist the agency in preparing high level business requirements (HLBR). DTI will then review the HLBR to match business need with technology and decide if there is a solution set available within the enterprise. The agency will then decide if they want or do not want to proceed. If they do want to proceed then we move to the next step of assisting them in developing detailed requirements. We have many agencies that do not have the depth of staff or ability to develop detailed requirements. We want to see how DTI can provide the assistance to help guide them to better define their requirements.

Glenn Tascione: Does DTI have the staff to do that?

Mike Hojnicki: Currently we are looking at our resources.

Matt Payne: We are definitely staffed for the ARB; we are not sure yet volume wise, whether or not we can interject ourselves on every project. We feel very good about the initial business case. We want to make sure we are working on the most important things.

Mike Hojnicki: It is important that the agencies are contacted to make sure they engage us far enough into the process.

Deb Lindell: As co-chair of the IRM Council, I am curious to know how you are going to sell this and educate the IRM on this new process to get them to engage early? In my agency we engage our CRS for everything. Some of the agencies will go all the way through an RFP and then go to DTI and ask them how they feel about it.

Mike Hojnicki: Our goal is to get out front and get them to understand the process. We learn from their frustrations. Our selling point with the agencies is, if we do our job upfront, their process will flow right through because now any solution they design will be based on standards and will be based on architecture. Their budget will be built based on this design versus the process we have today where we are assuming what our architecture is.

Glenn Tascione: Are you working on a service level agreement regarding how fast you'll turn around to the ARB or does that become something that they can live with for a week or a month?

Matt Payne: No, we have to meet the turnaround. It is actually an interactive meeting where they come to the table and we talk about it. It depends on what it is - some things we know right away what we need to do. Today, we don't get in this early. The way it works today, people come to the ARB and sometimes they already have the solution and they might be sent away with six or seven deliverables and then come back to the next ARB meeting. It really depends on how well we work together - have we've been integrated from the beginning. We are hoping we are going to improve that process a lot by changing this.

Mike Hojnicki: This is an ongoing process, our goal is a turnaround within 30 days provided all the details are there. As the budget process ramps up, we are going into

October with more and more agencies that haven't been in sync with the budget cycle. So it is an agreement that we will work to turnaround provided we have all the details.

Russ Larson: In listening to that whole conversation, I am trying to read between the lines, when you get the business case request do you look at it from a technological point only or if an agency comes in and says 'how can we get these widgets out quicker' or do you look at them and say 'you aren't even supposed to be doing widgets'?

Mike Hojnicky: We are looking at the whole process. Does it fit the business, does it fit the technical requirements, and can they successfully implement this and improve their efficiencies? We do look at it from a whole perspective; we are trying to get better clarity and better understanding. What we end up doing now is if we have to bring ARB in it's by teleconference or bridge line to further clarify those questions as they come up. If we come up with questions we will bring them on the phone with the full committees on line listening to the agencies discuss and clarify our questions around their business – why they're doing it and how they're doing it.

Russ Larson: So the business case really does encompass a lot more than just technology?

Mike Hojnicky: Yes, we already took the front sections and the whole two other flow charts that goes through the other review process which is the current process today, we just didn't want to show the magnitude of it. This is the detail that's changing but the business case process does look at the entire scope of the request. What is the driver and what is it you are trying to gain from implementing the solution.

Deb Lindell: Up until July, I believe DTI focused on primarily the technology itself. It was not DTI's role at the time to question an agencies desire to create 'widgets'. That process would happen more with OMB or funding issues. DTI's focus was not, 'are DOC, DHSS and Labor trying to create the same system from the same piece of software?' There is more of that happening today and I still think there is growth to be gained in synergizing our use of the software and synergizing what we are doing with different things. For example, the consolidation project about sharing data among agencies: We are already doing that today but we are just starting to integrate between, for example, Health and Social Services and Corrections, where we are sharing, "who are you serving that we are serving", who should no longer be on the rolls because they are incarcerated and vice versa, and who's coming out that needs your help. Those types of things are just getting under way and we hope to show great strides with their supporters to show where we are going with this.

Russ Larson: If I can follow up on that – that is absolutely correct. When TIC and DTI were created from the old OIS, the whole idea was to get our arms around this kind of redundancy, set up standards and those kinds of things. The idea of TIC was to say projects A, B, C and D are technologically sound and have a lot of validity. F, G, H and I are not really going to go from this technological perspective. All this gets submitted to OMB and eventually the General Assembly for approval and that's where you get into the value of doing it at all. One of the other groups are going to say, 'that's a nice idea we can't afford it' or 'that's a hell of an idea, let's move forward, we have DTI's blessing, we have TIC's blessing.' Philosophically do we agree with this project and then we fund it and move ahead. Anyway that's my two cents being one of the original people on this and the purpose of TIC. That's not to take away DTI's responsibility or the value of TIC, it's just to

evaluate the accuracy of a project from where it's going to go or how it helps the world. This isn't really TICs or DTI's area. It's more of a policy in OMB area.

Jim Sills: We are just in a different environment now. We still have this financial challenge. I had a conversation with OMB about this a few of weeks ago and it's incumbent on us working with the agencies to really strengthen governance. As Matt pointed out earlier, we have a thousand plus applications, 25 plus imaging systems, 80 different case management systems, 35 different CRM systems, 60 different kinds of reporting systems. With this, it will help us stop that bleeding and allow us to leverage technologies across the enterprise and leverage our buying power. What we are really trying to do is change what we are currently doing today and give additional insight and guidance before someone goes out and buys that 26th imaging system.

Russ Larson: I totally agree with you Jim. I didn't mean to sound like this is something that you shouldn't be doing. What you just described is exactly what you should be doing.

Jim Sills: We need to work closer with OMB so when they're getting a request, they're telling us and when we're getting a request, we're telling them. We have to stop the bleeding, we can't have the agencies going out on their own and buying this or trying to improve various widgets and processes. We all have to communicate more.

Russ Larson: Absolutely. I assume the person or team working for Markell on streamlining government - sort of a program evaluation approach to government is go into a Department of Labor or DHSS and ask 'what are you supposed to be doing by law, what do you really do and how many of those things did you decide to do on your own?' Those are the things from a policy point, OMB has to be or someone from my office has to be involved.

Strategic Planning Update ~ Mike Hojnicky:

The current Strategic Plan was developed for the period of 2007 through 2012. The Delaware Code requires the TIC to provide the Governor with an update statewide technology plan by October 1st. DTI recognizes we are not going to meet that date and 2009 through 2010 is a transition year for DTI. We have begun agency technology assessments, documenting the agency business needs, and monitoring the budget process and reviewing budget requests. Our goal is to provide an updated plan for the first quarter of 2010 after the recommended budget has been established.

Conclusion ~ Secretary Sills:

Secretary Sills thanked the members for their participation. The next scheduled meeting is on December 15th and will be by video teleconference again.

Adjournment – Secretary Sills:

With no further business to be conducted, Dan Grim made the motion to adjourn; Glenn Tascione seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:45 am.

:iik