



Technology Investment Council



State Of Delaware Technology Investment Council Meeting Minutes 6 November 2003

Technology Investment Council Attendees			
Name	Organization	Attendance	Represented By
Tom Jarrett	DTI	Present	
Russ Larson	Controller General	Present	
Valerie Woodruff	Dept. of Education	Represented	Theresa Kough
E. Norman Veasey	Chief Justice	Represented	Ed Pollard
Jack Markell	State Treasurer	Represented	Ann Visalli
Ron Coupe	Bank One	Absent	
Justin Kershaw	WL Gore	Absent	
Susan Foster	University of Delaware	Present	
Kris Younger	82 North, LLC	Present	

Call to Order:

Secretary Jarrett called the meeting to order at 9:03 am.

Introductions and Welcome:

Introductions were made; attendance was noted as shown in the above table. Members of the DTI Senior Team and their Team Leaders were present. Also in attendance were members of the IRM Council.

Old Business:

With the review of the meeting minutes from August, Secretary Jarrett asked for a motion to approve the minutes as written. Russ Larson made a motion and Susan Foster seconded the motion. With no opposition, the motion was carried.

New Business:

Kathy Dahl presented the Council with an overview of the DTI iTIC (internal Technology Investment Council) as it relates to the purpose, mission and the structure of this committee. Secretary Jarrett thanked the iTIC team for reviewing all of the submitted business cases and making the initial recommendations. He then opened it up for questions/answers.

Questions/Comments:

- **Russ Larson** - Great job - some projects are out there but not on the list - PHRST and 800 MHz.
Secretary Jarrett - In the process of doing a business case for both projects; this process continues on, as you know the Budget process continues through May.

Secretary Jarrett briefed the committee on the TIC voting procedures.

Questions/Comments:

- **Susan Foster** - What is the value of the conflict of interest section?
Secretary Jarrett - It is all based on perception....
- **Ann Visalli** - Can members vote by proxy?
Secretary Jarrett - Yes
- **Russ Larson** - If the TIC recommends 10 out of the 18 projects totaling 7 million and the Governor's budget is 3 million, how do we prioritize?
Secretary Jarrett - Ultimately, the Budget and Governor's office will decide. Because this process is on going, risk and business assessments are required.
- **PN Narayanan** - How do you break a tie if someone abstains?
Secretary Jarrett - We will have to research.
- **Ann Visalli** - Conflict of Interest question - I may gain from another agencies request; how will that be handled?
Secretary Jarrett - Again, this is a perception issue.
- **Ann Visalli** - Members have been appointed to this committee as they have a lot to bring to the table and want what is best for the State! All members should be given a copy of the State Code as it relates to conflict of interest.
- **Secretary Jarrett** - If there are no other questions and/or comments. I would like to make a motion to approve the voting procedures striking

out #1 – Conflict of Interest section and adjust #6 – Vote Count. Russ Larson made a motion and Susan Foster seconded the motion. With no opposition, the motion was carried as described below!

1. Eliminated
2. All voting TIC members will be able to cast their vote in person (or in abstention) prior to the established cutoff date for the final vote.
3. All TIC members will review the complete Business Case Application, the DTI Summary Recommendations and Q&A from TIC members that are available on the TIC Website prior to the final vote.
4. TIC communications with agency and organization personnel will go through DTI unless specifically requested by the TIC.
5. Recommendations to the Budget Office will require a majority vote on proposed IT spending request.
6. The vote count will be shown as:
 - For
 - Against
 - Abstain
7. IT spending recommendations to the Budget Office will fall into one of these three categories:
 - Recommended
(Is aligned with and meets all of the technical parameters established by DTI and has reasonable risk and return on IT investment.)
 - Not Recommended
(Does not meet some or all of the criteria established by the TIC.)
 - Conditionally Recommended
(Recommended to be partially funded until technical information is provided. A revised Business Case will need to be submitted and subsequently recommended by the TIC before additional funds are released by the Budget Office.)
8. Organizations that ultimately have approved spending requests will be required to submit interim status reports to the TIC in a format and schedule as recommended by DTI and approved by the TIC. The iTIC/TIC will review these interim reports and as required, provided additional recommendations to the Budget Office

Secretary Jarrett asked that we review the proposed “recommended /recommended conditionally” business case submissions.

Questions/Comments:

- **Russ Larson** - Video Phone project - did the agency that submitted this business case provide backup on where they saved 2.7 million?
Kathy Dahl - No
- **Russ Larson** - I disagree on the savings statement and ask that they agency provide additional information on the savings.
Kathy Dahl - iTIC will go back to the agency for that information
- **Kris Younger** - I agree with that, the proposed savings seems out of line.
- **Susan Foster** - Are any of these projects mandated by the Delaware Code and can we add this to the spreadsheet?
Secretary Jarrett - Yes, they are and yes, we can add that column to the spreadsheet!
- **Russ Larson** - Can you also add the dollar amount for the next fiscal year?
Secretary Jarrett - Yes
- **Mark Headd** - A couple of these projects all have potential revenue enhancements - can we add that as well?
Secretary Jarrett - Yes
- **Kris Younger** - I agree with that as we are dealing with big numbers here!
- **Kathy Dahl** - Would you like General Fund dollars or total dollars added?
Russ Larson - Total dollars added.
- **Ann Visalli** - Could you also include AFS?
Secretary Jarrett - Yes
- **Russ Larson** - COTS - in the review of this one is there anything that we can do to track the associated risks?
Lynn Hersey-Miller - We have had this discussion and the Chief Justice has recommended that a Change Management team to address these risks with the COTS management team.
- **Russ Larson** - The Chief Justice will not be here forever; this can change. Also, I have some concerns that the vendor may have underestimated their ability.
Kathy Dahl - We are concerned about that as well; this leads to the iTIC request that they come back for additional review after Proof of Concept!
Lynn Hersey-Miller - Any modification to this application needs to be brought to the Executive Sponsors.
- **Kris Younger** - I guess it is the ghost of Justin that requires me to state that we need to go in with full force regarding zero mods...it saves you big dollars.

- **Secretary Jarrett** - To Mr. Larson's point, this comment came from the agency and raised a flag for me. I ask that the iTIC go back and ask what this statement means.
- **Ed Pollard** - Questions raised are well deserved. Change Management is something that we the Courts are grasping. We would welcome any mandate on any reporting!
- **Kris Younger** - Because the agency is being honest and upfront, this provides a great opportunity for DTI to help!
- **Mark Headd** - With the nature of risks, it is fair to say that the TIC can look at DTI to help; however, this can all be limited!
- **Kris Younger** - I see that but DTI is the keystone for technology and should step in and assist!
- **Russ Larson** - COTS is the poster child for why the TIC was established. DTI can deal with the technology and I can deal with the money issues. TIC needs to be an active hand in monitoring and needs to specifically define conditions associated with a conditional recommendation! Also note that the JFC/Bond will take the recommendations of the TIC to heart!
- **Ann Visalli** - Business tech benchmarks were discussed earlier. Money is linked to these benchmarks; if you can't pass the benchmarks, you can't move forward!
Secretary Jarrett - Lynn, is it reasonable to go back and talk to the Courts about this project? Can we sit the conditions for this before the next meeting?
- **Lynn Hersey-Miller** - Yes!
- **Russ Larson** - I agree with that statement!
- **Russ Larson** - On this same issue, once again, I find it hard to believe that there is a decrease in costs as it relates to COTS! How do they propose that they will realize a 14 million savings over 2.6 years?
- **Russ Larson** - What is missing is all of the web based projects!
Secretary Jarrett - e-gov projects are out there!
- **Mark Headd** - They may not be asking for new money as well!
- **Russ Larson** -If there are projects out there that are big ones, the TIC should see them!
- **Susan Foster** - Question on the DataMIL - different costs in the summary and business case - this is new money for this budget cycle?
Kathy Dahl - Yes
- **Secretary Jarrett** - Can we change that?
Kathy Dahl - Yes
- **Russ Larson** - Are there drop down costs for DTI?
Secretary Jarrett - Yes
- **Russ Larson** - Again, a great job!

- **Kris Younger** - Question on #219 - I understand this to be a study; have they already submitted for out year costs?
- **Kathy Dahl** - We have asked that they come back to the iTIC after their study to evaluate the results and proposed technical solution!
- **Kris Younger** - We would like to see what the study shows!
- **Russ Larson** - Tom, when we recommend these projects, we are recommending that these projects are sound and valid projects, correct?
Secretary Jarrett - Yes!
- **Susan Foster** - Question on #242 - the summary states this project for \$295K and the business case states \$400 K - why?
Kathy Dahl - We need to update the summary as this didn't get back to after revisions until 4:30 on 5 November!
- **Mark Headd** - This project is to relocate the system; this is currently residing on a test system!
Kathy Dahl - This is one of these cases that actually includes money for FTE's both in DGS and DTI!
- **Kris Younger** - Is there an alternative to this?
- **Susan Foster** - This is currently a production system that is running in a test environment; it is not on any desktops, however, needs to be in a production environment! It is used by citizens as well as state employees and agencies!
- **Mark Headd** - The framework that makes this up is run by data that is provided by State Agencies!
- **Russ Larson** - Tom, when we recommend these projects, we are recommending that these projects are sound and valid projects, correct?
Secretary Jarrett - Yes!
- **Ann Visalli** - In the past, we could request money for a study to do a project that we thought would cost say \$1 million; when the study came back and said \$20 million, the projects were already approved and just ran on and on. Now the TIC can say can you give us an idea of what this study will give us before they recommend proceeding with conditional recommendations and studies.
- **Ann Visalli** - Can you give us an idea of what this study will give us?
Secretary Jarrett - On the DTI side, we can take a shot on getting conditions together for the next meeting!
- **Kris Younger** - Question on #218 - I don't understand this project!
Kathy Dahl - There isn't anything technical in here; evidently it is an effort to study automation of returns for partnership and fiduciaries!
- **Secretary Jarrett** - Can we take this question back to Revenue to get an "English" explanation?
Kathy Dahl - Yes

- **Kris Younger** - Question on #216 - are they running both DB2 and Oracle? Does the state generally have 2 licenses?
- Randy Hultman** - This is actually a technical issue of getting rid of IMS and eliminating the cost of maintenance, support, and licensing it. There is no additional charge for DB 2 as it is already in place.

Secretary Jarrett reviewed the action items as it relates to the above!

- Changes to the spreadsheet to include mandates and revenue.
- Change to summaries.
- #0219 - move this project into the “conditional”

He also asks that Kathy Dahl post today's presentation on the TIC website for review by members that were unable to attend!

Secretary Jarrett asked that the TIC continue to review and send any questions to Kathy Dahl on or before 12 November! He also asked that everyone attend the next meeting as this will be the most important TIC meeting to date!

Dawn Hill scheduled the next meeting for 17 November to start promptly at 9:00. This meeting will be held at Legislative Hall in the second floor Senate Hearing Room.

Adjournment:

With no further business to be conducted, Secretary Jarrett adjourned the meeting at 10:46 am.

:dlh