

☛ **05hr_JC-Au_Misc_pt22g**



☛ Details: Proposed Audit: Information Technology Systems Projects in State Agencies

(FORM UPDATED: 08/11/2010)

WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE ... PUBLIC HEARING - COMMITTEE RECORDS

2005-06

(session year)

Joint

(Assembly, Senate or Joint)

Committee on Audit...

COMMITTEE NOTICES ...

- Committee Reports ... **CR**
- Executive Sessions ... **ES**
- Public Hearings ... **PH**

INFORMATION COLLECTED BY COMMITTEE FOR AND AGAINST PROPOSAL

- Appointments ... **Appt** (w/Record of Comm. Proceedings)
- Clearinghouse Rules ... **CRule** (w/Record of Comm. Proceedings)
- Hearing Records ... bills and resolutions (w/Record of Comm. Proceedings)
 - (**ab** = Assembly Bill) (**ar** = Assembly Resolution) (**ajr** = Assembly Joint Resolution)
 - (**sb** = Senate Bill) (**sr** = Senate Resolution) (**sjr** = Senate Joint Resolution)
- Miscellaneous ... **Misc**

* Contents organized for archiving by: Stefanie Rose (LRB) (September 2012)

Highlights of Agency/Committee Comments on Server Consolidation Appraisal Report

The following comments were copied from the comments submitted by the various state agencies and governance or advisory committees. The Server Consolidation team reviewed all the submitted comments and selected these to represent the major themes. Both in selection of the included comments, and in Project Team Remarks, no one should feel that their input was unheard or disregarded. The team has asked for and received a huge amount of input and has striven to incorporate everything we can.

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|---------------------|---|----------------|--|
| Business Continuity | There appears to be commitment to business continuance. The next level of planning must provide that consolidated services will be capable of recovering and continuing after a disaster. Federal regulations (SACWIS, HIPAA) require this of DHFS. (BIS) | DHFS | Agreed, DET will develop a plan for the computing resources, but business continuance planning also requires significant effort from each business unit – it is not just an IT thing - this will be the agencies responsibility. |
| Chargeback | Some programs do not have detailed charge back mechanisms in place, so programs do not have to budget by specific resources on a "usage" basis so they have no idea of how much CPU seconds or DASD they use. How will DET assist programs in figuring out their budget in future years so they know what it will cost them? | DNR | This will be addressed as part of the Organization initiative and the development of the charge back/cost allocation methods. However, until there is actual experience with the new rates, everything will be based on assumptions. |
| Conceptual Design | The document does not mention the critical need for consulting for agencies using the consolidated servers and services. This is critical for business applications. Suggestion: Establish consulting services in appropriate MOU's and SLA's, and include these costs in the cost/benefit analysis. Agencies already do this internally, so DET will have to provide these services (and charge for them) in a consolidated environment. Thus these costs must be included in the cost/benefit analysis. | DOT | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Theme Conceptual Design</p> | <p>Comment</p> <p>In attempting to assess the potential line of business impact resulting from the server consolidation project, it's instructive to look at the last major statewide IT consolidation effort. The State embarked on a mainframe consolidation effort in 1991, which was also undertaken in the interest of reducing the cost of delivering IT services. The goal was to consolidate the workloads of the states mainframe data centers into a single facility that was to be managed and operated by the DOA. Key characteristics of the pre-consolidation environment included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 mainframes • 3 locations (all in Madison) • Same Operating Systems • Similar software suites and operating environments <p>Although DOA had overall responsibility for the consolidation effort, the three agencies whose center operations were to be consolidated handled most of the detail planning, and work necessary to move the workloads. Agency line of business staff were heavily involved throughout the entire process. The fact that the agencies owned the planning and cutover responsibilities was instrumental in ensuring a successful transition to a consolidated mainframe environment.</p> <p>Compare the above experience to the proposed server consolidation effort. The goals and objectives are virtually identical. Reduce the cost of providing IT services by centralizing multiple server machines located throughout the state into a single location managed and operated by the DOA. The pre-consolidation environment is vastly different, however.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 2400 servers • More than 500 locations (statewide) • Multiple Operating Systems • Dissimilar technical environments across agencies <p>This consolidation is much more complex in that it involves dissimilar operating environments, and major network upgrades throughout the state. Expecting to get this done in a one-year timeframe, while maintaining stable business service delivery system environments is unrealistic.</p> <p>Suggestion: Extend the implementation timeline</p> | <p>Agency / Group DOT</p> | <p>Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks</p> |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|---|

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|--------------|---|----------------|---|
| Cost Benefit | Budget instructions do not allow credit to agencies for EASI initiative position losses. What is the impact on an IT shop that has been directed by its agency to cut positions in this situation? | Commerce | This is understood, but we have clarifying information at this time. |
| Cost Benefit | Its important to note that agencies moved to distributed servers to avoid the high cost of centralized mainframe services. Consolidated services need to be competitively priced to prevent creative avoidance by the agencies. | DATCP | Understood. |
| Cost Benefit | Virtualization and blade servers: This technology will not be useful for many applications due to proprietary software and hardware and application co-existence problems For example, some blade servers will not be compatible with certain SANs, and some applications will not run on blades or be virtualized at all. The cost savings in the Cost/Benefit Analysis (page 4-6) are overstated. (BIS) | DHFS | |
| Cost Benefit | Assumptions. The report assumes agencies amortize server costs over 3 years or in other words have a 3-year replacement schedule built into their budgets for servers. The report estimates savings over 3 years for the 722 fewer servers. This is not an accurate assumption and savings are thus overstated. Server equipment replacement is more like 5 years and even then the equipment is recycled into less demanding areas. (BIS) | DHFS | Agreed. Crowe has been asked to change this in the next version of the CBA. |
| Cost Benefit | The expected saving from operations, while not insignificant at a level of several millions of dollars per year, need to be viewed in perspective. The total annual Enterprise savings are estimated at a level that is less than half of the annual transaction and storage fees currently paid for one system (CARES) operating at DET today. When viewed from the perspective of the entire budget, the annual savings are almost "statistically insignificant." Therefore, more emphasis needs to be placed on the non-fiscal component of the project to provide justification. Central management and design of the Enterprise infrastructure may provide the most compelling reason to proceed. (DHCF) | DHFS | The SC Project team agrees that we have under-emphasized the softer benefits of server consolidation. We stuck with objectives of lower cost and as good or better service for consistency. We will better emphasize these other benefits as we move forward. |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|--------------|--|----------------|---|
| Cost Benefit | The Cost-Benefit Analysis does not indicate what metrics will be used to track project progress. Metrics to measure costs and savings need to be established now, tracked through consolidation, and verified at selected intervals. (BIS) | DHFS | These will be established in the startup phase of the initiatives. |
| Cost Benefit | For agencies that have recently entered, or will soon enter, new MLPs for resources, such as servers, how will you mitigate the overall cost impacts so that the agency does not end up with MLP payments + payments for services to DET? By paying both, agencies will see a de facto increase in their overall costs, and will have to cut other programs. | DNR | Understood. Not sure what we can do, but will raise to attention of CIO. |
| Cost Benefit | If all license costs cannot be mitigated, resulting in DET having to buy licenses while agencies must continue to pay for licenses they no longer need, the state expends more money overall. Is this included in the cost/benefit analysis? If agencies must continue to pay license costs and then pay a proportionate share through rates for DET licenses they are paying twice and their costs are increasing | DNR | For software that continues to be used, the license maintenance costs will be covered in the next biennium by DET through the revenues it collects from the agencies. Unused software should be dropped from maintenance. |
| Cost Benefit | The first and primary goal for this architecture should be to rationalize service to internal and external customers. The costs and benefits as defined are too preliminary upon which to base the project, and the ROI as stated is unlikely to be achieved within the timeframe. Failure to meet the stated goal could cause un-necessary criticism for the program. | DOR | These are risks; we are working to mitigate them and believe we will be successful. |
| Cost Benefit | The overhead of VMware, clustering and merging applications into a shared environment needs to be factored more heavily into the cost when compared with installing separate servers. The amount of virtualization that can be practically realized may be over-estimated | DOR | |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|--------------|---|----------------|---|
| Cost Benefit | <p>Economy of scale can easily be overtaken by the complexities of managing the more complex environment and providing a level of service required by this new environment. Agencies will likely demand some significant guarantees of service through SLAs that cost more than the service level that currently exists, which will drive up the cost. Better service can be achieved, but lower cost shouldn't be projected. Agencies may be more willing to operate 'on-the-cheap' when it is their own operation, but demand more guarantees of service when buying the service externally, which will increase costs.</p> | DOR | <p>Agreed. It will be addressed through offering tiers of service, priced appropriately. The agencies will be asked to help develop these service levels since they are intended to meet agency needs.</p> |
| Cost Benefit | <p>It would be extremely beneficial for the taxpayers of Wisconsin if a 3rd party consultant, the LAB, or Fiscal Audit Bureau review the CBA and assumptions before proceeding with these projects. If the projects proceed based on Crowe's recommendation (Crowe has \$6.4 million to gain by proceeding and they are making the recommendation to proceed) and does not turn out to be cost beneficial this could have serious implications.</p> | DWD | |
| Cost Benefit | <p>There are currently no costs for server hardware and associated items in the Costs section of the investment analysis. The \$742K savings is an inaccurate portrayal of the initial costs to build the consolidated server environment since servers, routers, switches, SAN ports, the SAN itself, etc. will need to be purchased in the first year. After the first year savings may start to be realized, as agencies no longer need to purchase servers since they could deploy applications in the consolidated environment.</p> | DWD | |
| Cost Benefit | <p>New Data Center: Space costs for the data centers should be included in the CBA and compared to the costs needed to modify the existing DOA data center to accommodate server consolidation. If the consolidation does start to go through and agencies free up space in existing computer rooms, couldn't we save some money and use an existing site as an alternate site rather than building another building? New data center costs could also be validated with data center providers.</p> | DWD | <p>A new data center is an existing project that predates Server Consolidation. It is an outgrowth of the previous '2nd site' projects. A separate cost/benefit analysis is being done for that project.</p> |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|--------------|--|----------------|---|
| Cost Benefit | It appears that personnel savings are predicated on reducing staff but not managers (48 in operations, 110 in server support). If staff are reduced this substantially, what is the impact on managers? Note that the DBA count includes managers. (assuming numbers in inventory are correct). | DWD | The cost savings from a reduced management count were not included because they were too difficult to predict. While the exact staff reduction approach is not yet worked out, it is assumed for now that each agency will make decisions on management reductions. |
| Cost Benefit | The level of detail, especially the support of conclusions and recommendations, and the omissions of costs is not commensurate with a 13+ million dollar taxpayer supported project. Since the project is being recommended based on a projected cost savings to the state as a whole, care should be taken to make sure that costs are estimated as accurately as possible and this is not the case. | SPD | The intent of the analysis is to assist the CIO in determining how to move forward. The level of detail for this purpose is adequate. |
| Cost/Benefit | The tables indicate that staff cuts may occur just six months into the project, but there is no indication of how to successfully accomplish this goal. Agencies need a 6-12 month staff and budget transition plan to understand how staff will be reduced, how operations will be impacted and how new or changed systems become operational. The transition plan should also consider how productivity is to be maintained and existing critical systems and services are to be impacted. | DOT | These are some of the major issues that need to be worked out in the Organization initiative. |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|--------------|--|----------------|--|
| Cost/Benefit | <p>A) Staff cost savings are optimistic. One could argue objectively for an opposite affect. As hardware costs are reduced by reducing the number of physical servers, the number of server administrators per physical server might increase, if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such servers require increased attention for performance monitoring, tuning and security because of application conflicts. • Updates to hardware (box turnover) are more complex, because multiple workloads are affected. • Design so as to balance load, design for failover and conflicting availability requirements increase complexity • Constraints imposed upon change management based on multiple agencies sharing servers • A consolidated environment will require a fair amount of remote administration, requires additional time and skills. <p>B)- All of this presumes a single centralized data center. If that cannot be provided, and administration must be done remotely, regardless of tools, administrator productivity may decrease, and additional support ("hands and eyes and ears") will be required at the remote site, cutting further into the savings.</p> | DOT | |
| Federal \$ | If a person working part time on EASI is also providing support to a critical agency project with mandated deadlines, and both cannot be met with available resources, will DET priorities take precedence over agency priorities? If so, what happens if funding is lost, such as federal funding? | DNR | This is a balancing act and each instance will have to be dealt with individually. |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|---------|---|----------------|--|
| General | <p>The impression most state staff have of this consolidation is that it is a decision already made and there has been little detail provided, communication has been superficial and feedback/involvement from the agencies will be ignored unless it is to the benefit of DOA/DET or includes monetary/staff commitment. How will communication and involvement be changed to bring agencies into more of a decision-making and fully aware roll in the enterprise process and projects?</p> | DPI | <p>We can't dispute that some or many people feel uninformed. But in comparison to many other enterprise projects, this one has been very well communicated and will continue to be so. To learn more, visit http://serverconsolidation.wi.gov or contact Dana Perry, DET. Agency feedback has been instrumental in the implementation approach developed. The original DET and Crowe assumptions have been radically changed due to this input.</p> |
| General | <p>DET has not outlined how priorities will get set for projects and problem resolution. Will the new service based organization do portfolio management? If so, this should be outlined. Will the new service organization be able to handle all initiatives required and will they be affordable? Technology infrastructure rates are more difficult than mainframe data center rates. IT strategic planning, priority setting and portfolio management activities will increase exponentially. The project plans going forward should include how project priority will be set and how knowledge transfer of the staff moving the consolidated environment will occur.</p> <p>Currently, each agency has a relationship with their divisions and is aware of their business needs. How will knowledge of each agency's business needs be transferred to the new support teams without the quality of service suffering? With reduced numbers of staff and limited resources how will we work on the consolidation, support the current systems and start up the new consolidated support system?</p> | DWD | <p>Portfolio management, like many aspects of IT management, are not specifically in-scope for this project, nor should they be. Nonetheless, portfolio management is recognized as one of the best practices that needs to be re-instituted at DOA.</p> |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|------------|---|----------------|--|
| Governance | <p>The proposed project structure has two critical flaws:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Several consolidation projects do not fall under this management structure and are key to the success of overall consolidation as well as this project. 2. The 10-12 additional management groups proposed, in addition to all the advisory and implementation enterprise groups that already exist, significantly exceed the State's capacity to staff and coordinate. <p>What to do about it? <i>Consolidate the management of enterprise "change" first!</i> Simplify and streamline the coordination and advisory groups that have sprung up.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institute the projects as outlined and have them report directly to the Initiative Oversight Committee (IOC). - Raise the bar for the IOC; give the IOC authority over "all" consolidation-related projects and decision-making groups. This means chartering the IOC as an Enterprise group rather than a Server Consolidation project group. - Consolidate all advisory groups under the BLC and TLC domain structure, and construct the IOC to use those advisory groups. - Eliminate duplicate management or advisory groups. For instance, eliminate the BST and use the BLC instead, and eliminate the TST and use the TLC instead. (BIS) | DHFS | Agreed. These issues are understood and changes are being discussed. |
| Metrics | <p>Overall comment: A baseline needs to be established from which to assess the outcome of the project. As changes are made to inventory and as comprehensive analysis is done agency by agency, the CBA should be updated with new info. At least quarterly or at major milestones the updated CBA should be published. Agencies should be given an opportunity to comment on the updates to the CBA and surveys should be conducted to monitor customer satisfaction.</p> | DWD | The costs of this project will be monitored. The details of this will be worked out in the project initiation phase. |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|-----------------------|--|----------------|---|
| Network Consolidation | <p>This recommendation surfaces in many places in this document and others. From a cost perspective, it makes more sense to roll network support consolidation into the Badgernet 2 project scope. To centralize under the current environment will cause additional expenditures for toolsets and infrastructure changes. It would be more cost efficient to roll them into the Badgernet 2 design.</p> | DATCP | <p>No decisions have been made on consolidating network functions, so an implementation approach has yet to be worked out. This will be taken into account.</p> |
| Network Consolidation | <p>The section on consolidation of network services does not include benefits identified with respect to network consolidation. It is not at all clear why consolidation would lead to increased "operability and opportunity for scalability" other than in a minimal operational sense. While it may be worth <i>considering</i> the consolidation of network services, the report <i>recommends</i> consolidation, with insufficient information upon which to base such a recommendation.</p> <p>Suggestion: Remove consolidation of the network as a direct recommendation, and leave network consolidation as "something to consider" after further analysis.</p> | DOT | <p>A full analysis of network consolidation will be done.</p> |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|--------------|--|----------------|--|
| Organization | <p>In thinking about the server consolidation initiative, one of the biggest obstacles seems to be a cultural shift that DET will need to make from an administrative-rule-based organization to a service-customer-based organization.</p> <p>Generally speaking, Crowe's recommendation proposes that DOA/DET take positions from the various departments and incorporate them into their organization. The flip side would be to instead create a cultural change at DET by assigning people from DET to various departments depending upon their speciality, the project and the department's, expertise.</p> <p>For example, instead of moving staff from various state departments to DET to accomplish the e-mail consolidation, moved staff out of DET into the departments to work on the project. In this way the staff from DET would need to adapt to new way of viewing service to customers. Thus facilitating the cultural change.</p> <p>When the consolidation plan is completed, a new service-customer based DET could be created from the the departments.</p> | DWD | <p>On a grand scale, good idea, but undoable since it is not the mission of the various agency IT shops to provide enterprise services. There are too many institutional barriers. However, this is being done on a more limited basis. At least GIS seems to be moving to something like this.</p> |
| Risk | <p>Implementation: Why not consider a phased implementation so success can be realized before the State's entire operation is possibly placed at risk? It seems consolidation could be proven in a test environment before actually staging the changes.</p> | Commerce | <p>The implementation is taking a phased, but not linear approach. The organization of new staff teams, creation of new IT practices etc. can only go so far before real project or support work is needed to flesh them out.</p> |
| Risk | <p>The project leadership must identify and develop a risk mitigation plan PRIOR to proceeding with implementation. The appraisal documents didn't address any of the risks. (BIS)</p> | DHFS | <p>The known risks have been separately identified in a document in existence since project start http://serverconsolidation.wi.gov/docs_all.asp?locid=21. Each initiative's project charter will detail that initiatives specific risks and outline a risk mitigation strategy.</p> |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|-------|---|----------------|--|
| Risk | <p>Hosting common applications is the safest, least risk approach and we believe that consolidating all shared applications should be accomplished before any agency specific applications are moved. The migration of agency-specific applications should be planned by the agencies, within an agreed timeframe. This approach will likely create an agreeable comprehensive implementation plan more quickly than having people outside the agency needing to become familiar with the agency operation and then putting together a plan that works. We should not commit to any specific ROI until the comprehensive analysis is completed and implementation plans are accepted.</p> | DOR | <p>These are good ideas. They will be in the mix as detailed implementation plans are developed (this will be done hand-in-glove with the agencies).</p> |
| Risk | <p>Several State agencies have Partners (local and County entities providing citizens with State services). DWD has about ~8,692 partners. These Partners rely on DWD and other agencies for IT direction and the implementation of new IT technologies. How will the business needs of local agencies/county partners be addressed when transitioning to and after the new State IT organization is in place? Without the partners, there would be no KIDS and CARES programs unless we added significant numbers of state staff. The analysis needs to take into account ALL customers. Local agency partners should be invited to have representation on the project teams.</p> | DWD | <p>DET will work in partnership with the agencies and their business partners to achieve this.</p> |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|----------|--|----------------|---|
| Risk | <p>The conceptual design points out the critical foundational work needed for DET to build a 'service organization'. This foundation is an essential requirement in maintaining quality services, and to insure state IT business in not negatively impacted by consolidation. At the same time, DET has started the email consolidation project without any of the base foundational work started. This takes on the appearance of 'business as usual' vs. service oriented organization. It would seem essential and logical that DET start this email consolidation project by building a new service oriented team as the first step. This would require creation of a new management team, with additional team leadership and project management staff added as well as the required technical staff. The management change is the most important facet of this planned organization change.</p> | DWD | This is what the Organization initiative will achieve. |
| Security | <p>Ref. Architecture. The strategy established for the data center "foundation" must take into account data security and privacy. There are certain data stores not routinely shareable as enterprise resources under any circumstances. Examples would include those that contain Personal Health Information (PHI) (e.g., the cancer registry) and those containing information that if inappropriately released would result in harm or threats of harm to service providers and patients (e.g., the induced abortion reporting system). (DHCF)</p> | DHFS | It is recognized that overall security is under emphasized in the report and the current project implementation plan. This will be addressed. |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| <p>Theme Security</p> | <p>Comment Security (including directory services, network, etc.) will be a major initiative in a consolidated environment. For instance, the use of native integrated security and directory architecture is necessary to enable vendor system integrated management capabilities for directories, security, servers, users, and services across all types of applications, deployment contexts, and sets of users.</p> <p>Crowe's analysis is incomplete because security is not addressed and no specific costs are allocated to it in any of the documents. In a consolidated environment, security will be more critical than ever. Today, if one agency gets a virus or has a major security breach, it likely only impacts that particular agency. In a consolidated environment a major virus could potentially take the entire state infrastructure down. The CBA needs to clearly identify the costs of security.</p> | <p>Agency / Group DWD</p> | <p>Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks It is recognized that overall security is under emphasized in the report and the current project implementation plan. This will be addressed.</p> |
|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| <p>Theme Security</p> | <p>Comment The Appraisal Report documents fail to even minimally address the increased level of security that will be necessary when the State of Wisconsin consolidates its server assets, applications, and databases in a central data center.</p> <p>While consolidating servers may produce operational savings, doing so increases the potential impact of a successful cyber attack. In the current distributed environment, the impact of a successful cyber attack or internal threat is generally limited to one agency, whereas in a consolidated environment, the impact is likely to affect all agencies and the general public who use many state applications. Such an event would likely result in very adverse consequences for the State. Redundancy and proper response and recovery procedures will be crucial in the consolidated environment.</p> <p>A consolidated environment demands an increased level of protection, including robust network perimeter defense, physical security, and security for applications and databases co-located on the same server. This will require not only software and hardware tools but also staff to monitor them. This needs to be a critical part of the foundation projects. The Conceptual Design needs to address the security architecture required for a consolidated data center and how an increased level of protection will be provided. The Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) needs to account for any additional costs to provide and support this increased level of security, as well as the potentially greater costs associated with a security compromise within a consolidated environment.</p> <p>We believe the conceptual design discussion must include initially at a high level:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The level of security that will be provided and how. 2. Security provisions during and immediately after the consolidation. 3. The role of the consolidated provider and the role of the agencies and how those roles will be coordinated regarding security. <p>The CBA needs to adequately assess the costs of providing the required security in a distributed server environment (current state) versus the costs in a consolidated server environment (planned future state) and any increased costs need to be factored into the CBA.</p> | <p>Agency / Group Information Security and Privacy Domain</p> | <p>Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks It is recognized that overall security is under emphasized in the report and the current project implementation plan. This will be addressed.</p> |
|----------------------------------|---|--|---|

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|----------|--|----------------|--|
| Security | <p>A substantive discussion of the proposed security model or models is missing from both the conceptual design and cost analysis documents. Security has been identified as a critical issue since many agencies generate and house information that is deemed private on some level (e.g. HIPAA, juvenile information, justice information, etc.). Meeting differing security requirements will incur costs that have not been outlined or included in the cost document. The fact that the documents are 'high level' should not be accepted as an excuse to omit estimates of known costs in order to skew the results of the cost analysis.</p> | SPD | <p>It is recognized that overall security is under emphasized in the report and the current project implementation plan. This will be addressed.</p> |
| Service | <p>We currently have a less than 30 minute response time to change requests and can schedule emergency changes on the same day requested. We also give developers hands on in the development environments – which give them instantaneous updates to their environment. This facilitates the development cycle. This type of immediacy needs to be built in to the consolidated environment to avoid negatively impacting development and testing times.</p> | DATCP | <p>We are very much aware of need to not impede the application development process. Solutions are actively being worked on DET, agencies, and the Application Domain.</p> |
| Service | <p>The success of a customer-focused support organization can be severely impacted by proximity to customers and perceived access. The first step of the organization development should focus on the functions required to support hosting the servers and serving agency system staff, and move beyond that to more application oriented services only as performance measures indicate. This change in orientation should be given the time that it needs in order to reduce risk.</p> | DOR | <p>If we understand this comment correctly, this is fundamentally how the project will be approached.</p> |
| Service | <p>One of the foundation projects is to substantially change DET to customer-focused service organization. Will other State agencies have input and say in how this is managed and what the eventual organization looks like?</p> | DPI | <p>DET will invite agencies to discuss their IT best practices.</p> |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|----------|---|----------------|--|
| Service | DPI has a small and very talented IT staff. It is highly unlikely that we will get the same level of service from DOA/DET that we enjoy now and, what we do get, will likely cost more. It's likely we will have a cut in service to our employees, management and our customers. Is DOA/DET willing to provide any assurance or guarantees (maybe including monetary compensation or consideration) if this effort results in decreased service levels or excessive increased costs? | DPI | DET management is working with the State Budget office to find ways of addressing this. Its still an open issue. |
| Service | The importance of customer focused service, sufficient staffing with the appropriate skill sets, performance including service level agreements, as well as, a reasonable price for the services are essential for the success of this project. | ETF | Agreed. |
| Service | The document points out that DOA/DET currently lacks key foundational components (service-oriented organization; network capacity; a data center strategy to provide safe, secure, and consistent service delivery) necessary to meet the basic requirements of the role DOA/DET intends to play in the proposed project. When the consultant was asked whether they considered the possibility of another entity providing data center services at the recent ITDC meeting, the response was they had not because doing so was not a part of their scope of services. What is the rationale for limiting the consultants ability to evaluate all available options for the provision of service when doing so results in limiting their ability to recommend the most cost effective and likely-to-succeed option? | SPD | At this point in time, data center management and server support are core competencies for the state. We believe these servers can best and most cost-effectively be delivered with state employees. |
| Staffing | Building a staffing model is extremely important to agency staff. There is a lot of disruption being caused because of the uncertainty agency staff members have about their jobs. | | Understood. It is a top priority. |

| Theme | Comment | Agency / Group | Server Consolidation Project Team Remarks |
|----------|--|----------------|---|
| Staffing | <p>The personnel impacts of server consolidation need to be clearly identified in the Foundation projects. This is currently not mentioned in the Organization bullet. State IT staff will be facing layoffs. Much work can be done in the short term to assist staff in finding jobs in the private sector. Skill sets of potential layoffs can be pre-defined and working relationships can be established with the private sector HR shops now. This can lay the groundwork for shortening the layoff cycle. Culturally, IT workers came to the state trading higher wages for benefits and job security. The clinical approach to layoffs does not address the cultural issues faced by state employees who will find themselves out on the streets.</p> | DATCP | <p>Understood, this is a top priority. This is one of the principal purposes of the HR advisory group to be formed.</p> |
| Staffing | <p>If PRS funded staff are required to work on the EASI project who will pay for them? PRS staff must be funded through revenue, and if not they are in danger of being eliminated. How will this be handled?</p> | DNR | <p>While a solution has not yet been identified, DET and the DOA Budget office are aware of these issues and are addressing them.</p> |
| Staffing | <p>If the staff working on EASI from an agency must be replaced by contractors while EASI is ongoing, who will pay for that? If the agency must pay they are subsidizing DET's initiatives while increasing their own costs, and must defer other support functions to pay for it.</p> | DNR | <p>While a solution has not yet been identified, DET and the DOA Budget office are aware of these issues and are addressing them.</p> |



| Agency/Committee Name Department of Natural Resources | | | | | | Today's Date 8/17/2004 |
|--|----------|-----------|----------|----------------------|---------------|--|
| Document Title | Page No. | Para. No. | Line No. | Category (check one) | | Comments |
| | | | | Critical | Subst. Admin. | |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | For agencies that have recently entered, or will soon enter, new MLPs for resources, such as servers, how will you mitigate the overall cost impacts so that the agency does not end up with MLP payments + payments for services to DET? By paying both, agencies will see a de facto increase in their overall costs, and will have to cut other programs. |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | Relative to the above, are you going to freeze or put a moratorium on future resources acquisitions, and potential MLPs, to avoid individual agencies spending money that may not prove fully useful in the future after you consolidate servers? If agencies continue to acquire new resources on an interim basis until EASI is complete state funding resources are being wasted or have negative value as future payments must still be made for resources that may no longer exist. |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | How will you mitigate support costs and staffing issues in agencies that do not have uniquely defined functions; e.g. data base administrators vs. data base designers having dual roles? If you transfer individuals in this category the agency loses a critical support function. If the agency has to maintain a position to do only half the job the value is diminished. In either case the agency costs may increase if contractor support is required. |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | At what point do the potential savings and costs indicate that the payback, in % or \$, no longer looks like an achievable benefit due to the risks inherent in a project of this magnitude over time? With minimal savings and maximum costs over an extended period of time the ability to achieve savings diminishes and the risk of project failure increases. |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | If network resources are to be changed, and agencies incur cancellation or other contractual costs, have those costs been included in the cost/benefit analysis? |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | Some programs do not have detailed charge back mechanisms in place, so programs do not have to budget by specific resources on a "usage" basis so they have no idea of how much CPU seconds or DASD they use. How will DET assist programs in figuring out their budget in future years so they know what it will cost them? |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | If PRS funded staff are required to work on the EASI project who will pay for them? PRS staff must be funded through revenue, and if not they are in danger of being eliminated. How will this be handled? |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | | | If the staff working on EASI from an agency must be replaced by contractors while EASI is ongoing, who will pay for that? If the agency must pay they are subsidizing DETs initiatives while increasing their own costs, and must defer other support functions to pay for it. | |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | | | If all license costs cannot be mitigated, resulting in DET having to buy licenses while agencies must continue to pay for licenses they no longer need, the state expends more money overall. Is this included in the cost/benefit analysis? If agencies must continue to pay license costs and then pay a proportionate share through rates for DET licenses they are paying twice and their costs are increasing. | |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | | | As DET supports more critical functions interactions between agencies and remote locations will increase as not all things can be done remotely. For things like meetings, travel, movement between buildings, etc. there is a cost. Is this included in the cost/benefit analysis? | |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | | | Your proposal indicates that network support, via the NOC, will manage all network components. This is not practical for every situation where personnel must be on site at locations for certain types of problems. How will DET handle these situations and is the cost of this in the cost/benefit analysis? Are local agency staff required to support these activities, and if so how will the agency be compensated for their time and expense? | |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | GEN | | | X | | | | If a person working part time on EASI is also providing support to a critical agency project with mandated deadlines, and both cannot be met with available resources, will DET priorities take precedence over agency priorities? If so, what happens if funding is lost, such as federal funding? | |
| Concept | 27 | | | | | X | | Applications Support: You indicate that many things are not in scope (code development, promotion, etc.), but say that project management and team leadership regarding tools, promotion of code, etc is in scope. This is not clearly understandable since those things that appear to be in scope conflict with some of the things you say are "not in scope". | |
| Concept | 26 | | | | | X | | Administrative DBA: You make it sound as if there is a distinction between Administrative and Development, but often the same people perform these tasks. How do you intend to segment these functions when transferring agency staff to DET to complete EASI? | |
| Concept | GEN | | | X | | | | How are you planning to manage the multiple major projects that will be initiated over the next few years - server consolidation, EMail consolidation, agency desktop upgrades (XP/Office 2003 and, likely, Longhorn (desktop and server?). All of these will place significant demands on IT staff resources in the agencies. How are they going to be prioritized and managed so the schedules and resource needs for each do not conflict in ways that could adversely impact them? | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----|--|--|--|---|--|--|---|
| Concept | GEN | | | | X | | | <p>The Statewide Enterprise Server Consolidation Project has so far inventoried what information systems and resources exist, but has not considered the security issues relevant to those systems or the security issues that would be created by consolidation. No inventory was made of the security needs of the information systems to be consolidated. This is similar to, but not necessarily the same set of information systems being considered for encryption. Different agencies have different security models. This was not inventoried. What are the costs/savings of consolidating the security model, or is it planned to keep those models separate? Different agencies have different development methodologies. They were not inventoried. Will methodologies be merged as well, and with what costs and risks? The costs/risks incurred to allow several agencies to share the same data center, different logical partitions/virtual servers on the same physical server, same database were not discussed.</p> |
| Concept | GEN | | | | X | | | <p>It is vital that there be a product to look through the Oracle email stores for virus which is just another name for cyber attack. I don't know of any that work with the Oracle Collaboration Suite. It is not enough to filter in coming/out going messages. Sometimes the email store has to be gone through.</p> |
| Concept | GEN | | | | X | | | <p>The New York exchanges found that one data center was not enough. They have constructed alternate locations with their own network connections and power. No power interruption can be allowed in such a consolidated environment.</p> |
| Concept | GEN | | | | X | | | <p>Dedicated computers and staff must monitor a consolidated environment 24 x 7. The speed at which an attack could spread is increased in a consolidated environment.</p> |
| Concept | GEN | | | | X | | | <p>Since DET will be establishing the consolidated environment they should define what the security standards for that environment will be. Agencies can then comment on whether that is adequate security for the applications they need to run in that environment.</p> |
| Concept | GEN | | | | | | | <p>There is discussion of "virtual" consolidation rather than real. Taking over management of the servers rather than relocating them. The installation of "client" software and the establishment of the "network" links to run the software will have an impact on the servers now isolated by agency.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> client software might impact performance installation requirements of client software may alter security configuration of servers (activation of snmp daemon) the client software / monitoring software interaction provides a conduit for "mischief" This process requires the establishment of conduits in agency firewalls (read holes) which need maintenance as servers are added or replaced. Holes can be exploited |
| Concept | GEN | | | | X | | | <p>Use of VM software creates new risk. If a virtual machine is successfully attacked what is the risk to the other virtual machines on the same server?</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| Concept | GEN | | | | X | | Consolidation implies that the centralized management will require access to servers across agencies, perhaps physically located at different agencies. The security implications of doing this have not been discussed. Are more stringent background checks of syst. admin staff required, increasing costs, by how much? Will out-of-band management channels be used? What risks/costs are incurred by using in-band management channels? | |
| Concept | GEN | | | | X | | If an incident occurs, it will affect more than just one agency. What are the incident response and disaster recovery plans/costs? How will we know who is affected by an incident? | |

Agency/Committee Name

Department of Financial Institutions

Today's Date

| Document Title | Page No. | Para. No. | Line No. | Category (check one) | | Comments |
|---------------------|----------|-----------|----------------------------|----------------------|--------|----------|
| | | | | Critical | Subst. | Admin. |
| Appraisal Inventory | 111 | 3 | 1 st sub bullet | | X | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 111 | 3 | 5 th sub bullet | | X | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Appraisal Inventory | 111 | 3 | 5 th sub bullet | | X | <p>Replace 6th sub bullet that currently reads: o Administrative Information System (AIS) is a homegrown Visual Basic application served to users through Citrix and is used to manage DFI's banking and credit union businesses. WITH Administrative Information System (AIS) is a homegrown VB application served to users through Citrix, and it is used to manage portions of DFI's banking, Savings, Mortgage Banking, Licensed Financial Services, and Wisconsin Consumer Act and credit union business areas. Add the following development tools under 'Python' PERL, .NET, & Visual Source Safe</p> | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 112 | 1 | New | | X | <p>DFI does not currently have any production installations of SQL Server 2000. Add "in the process of installation" to the end of the second bullet.</p> | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 112 | 3 | 2 nd bullet | | X | <p>Add ACH below under Future Initiatives: DFI is actively pursuing an ACH payment method through the DOA Controller's office. DFI plans to implement ACH via its existing and future applications using the DFI's on-line payment method modules which will call the DOA ACH solution for the customer dialog and payment processing specific to ACH only</p> | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 112 | 5 | New | | X | <p>DFI does not use Acorde to image UCC documents. Replace 4th bullet, 1st sub bullet that currently reads: "Acorde" software passes very large digital images from workstations to/from servers and requires a lot of document scanning (ex. annual corporation reports, UCC filings, etc.) During heavy scanning periods the bandwidth capacity is at near peak several times throughout the day. This demonstrates DFI's need for large bandwidth. WITH "Acorde" software passes very large digital images from workstations to/from servers and requires a lot of document scanning (ex. annual corporation reports, etc.) During heavy scanning periods the bandwidth capacity is at near peak several times throughout the day. This demonstrates DFI's need for large bandwidth.</p> | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 113 | 1 | 4 th bullet, 1 st sub bullet | | X | <p>DFI has 15 (NOT 16) MS SQL Servers. Change Count from 16 to 15.</p> | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 116 | 5 | 1 | | X | <p>Business and Office (GIS, Accounting Inventory, Reporting, ERP). Change Count to 0. PRINCE application was incorrectly coded in initial summary.</p> | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 116 | 1 | NEW | | X | <p>Add Purchased Solution, Count 1 for PRINCE application</p> | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Appraisal Inventory | 117 | 1 | 1 | | X | | Increase count for Homegrown applications to 113 | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 117 | 1 | 2 | | X | | Increase Development tools to 9 | |

Counts of staff (both permanent and contract are incorrect).
Use table below:

Department of Financial Institutions

Full Time
Part Time
Manager
Totals

Support Roles

Emp.
Cont.
Emp.
Cont.

Server Support

2.30
0.20
2.50

Operations

0.00

Admin/Office

0.00

Application Support

0.00

Network Support

0.75
0.20
0.95

Administrative DBA

0.20
0.20

Security

0.35
0.20
0.55

App Dev/SDLC

4.40
9.00
1.00
14.40

Project Management

0.50
3.00

Agency/Committee Name
DAIT

Today's Date
8/6/2004

| Document Title | Page No. | Para. No. | Line No. | Category (check one) | | Comments |
|---------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|----------|----------------------|---------------|---|
| | | | | Critical | Subst. Admin. | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 99 | 5 | 8 | | X | Under applications -- change working to "PROTECT also is tightly integrated with email (Outlook). |
| " | 99 | 5 | 8 | | X | Description of PROTECT Admin should be -- customize pick lists and user options |
| " | 99 | 5 | 8 | | X | Description of Statute Admin should be -- customize statute and charging language and add local ordinances |
| " | 100 | 4 th bullet | 2 | | X | Add to end of second sentence ...software and workstations for county staff. |
| " | 100 | 6 th bullet | 2 | | X | Add to end of sentence -- "for WIJIS model county implementations" |
| " | 100 | Add bullet under server | | | X | All staff required to complete/pass a criminal background check |
| Appraisal Inventory | 100 | 3 rd bullet under network | | | X | Change first work "some" to "many" |
| " | 100 | Network 5 th bullet | | | X | Change end of sentence to "security processes ARE documented" |
| " | 100 | Support | | | X | Change "Service Level Agreements" to "Memorandums of Understanding" |
| " | 100 | Last bullet | | | X | Change to "The only remote access provided to users is through Outlook Web Access. Several staff have VPN access for development and troubleshooting purposes." |
| Conceptual Design | 26 | Server Support | | | X | No specific note about whether the server support includes responsibility for remote servers. |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----|--|--|---|---|
| 26 | DBA | | | X | Same as above, does this include remote, distributed databases? |
| General Comment | | | | | |

| | Full Time | | Part Time | | Contractor | Manager | Totals |
|---------------------|-----------|------|-----------|----|------------|---------|--------|
| | Emp. | | Emp. | | | | |
| Support Roles | 1.5 | | | | | | |
| Server Support | | .75 | | | | | 2.25 |
| Operations | | .25 | | | | | .25 |
| Admin/Office | | | | | | | |
| Application Support | .5 | | | | | | .75 |
| Network Support | 1.0 | | | | | | 1.5 |
| Administrative DBA | | | | .5 | | | .5 |
| Security | .25 | | | | | | .5 |
| App Dev/SQLC | 2.5 | 1.0 | | | | | 3.5 |
| Project Mgmt | 1.25 | | | | | | 1.25 |
| Help Desk | .75 | | | | | | 1.5 |
| Desk side support | 1.0 | 1.25 | | | | | 2.25 |
| Other | .25 | | | | .5 | | 1.75 |
| Business Liaisons | 1.0 | 1.0 | | | | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| | | | | | | | 18.0 |

Just so that I don't forget to note this when it's relevant - one thing the organizational team will need to address is staff security requirements, background checks, etc.

Appraisal Inventory

It was difficult to determine staffing based on this chart because most of our staff needs to play multiple roles due to the small size of our team. I tried to determine the amount of time that each spends in these functional areas. We have a total of 7 staff (4 state employees and 3 contractors) that work in the following areas: Server Support, Network Support, Security, Deskside support, some application support and also some project management and physical layer work. No network staff is dedicated in one area.

The following updates are all related to the staffing chart:

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| Conceptual Design | Gen. | | | | | x | | | <p>The term "Best Practices" is used quite extensively and in reference to a number of different areas of consolidation. This is a very generic term that means many different things to many different people.</p> <p>My interpretation of this term is to attempt to achieve a base unit of measure for a group of related policies/procedures so a larger group can use the base unit of measure. When you achieve this base unit of measure, you give up any specifics that may have been done to achieve a better outcome specific to your group/agency. These specifics may address any one of a number of different factors such as reliability, performance, size, etc.</p> <p>Commerce attempted to design the Regulated Objects system using a best practice approach with the S&B and ERS divisions. What happened was a product that took 14 people approximately 3 years to develop that didn't satisfy any of the users of the product. Commerce has spent the last 4 years modifying the system to give it the individual division appearance and functionality that should have been developed initially. The customers have demanded this because they do the same types of functions however their individual business dictates that they do them differently.</p> <p>Will specified service levels be defined and agreed upon by agencies?</p> <p>The governance teams only advise the CIO and are not decision-makers.</p> <p>The Directory Working group of the Network Domain should be a part of the security governance.</p> <p>Building a staffing model is extremely important to agency staff. There is a lot of disruption being caused because of the uncertainty agency staff members have about their jobs.</p> <p>Versioning of code is not listed in the application support role.</p> <p>Does web design fall into the "other" category?</p> <p>Costs seem to be taking a back seat to the structure of the new consolidated environment. Nobody has asked our agency what we can afford to pay for consolidated services. If the structure is set first, you have very little opportunity to control costs. The price is what it is and agencies will have to pay it. Instead, it should be determined what we can afford and then see what we can build with that budget.</p> |
| Conceptual Design | 14 | 3 | 1 | | | x | | | |
| Conceptual Design | 21 | 1 | 1 | | | | x | | |
| Conceptual Design | 21 | 3 | 1 | | | | x | | |
| Conceptual Design | 23 | 1 | 5 | | | X | | | |
| Conceptual Design | 27 | 2 | | | | | x | | |
| Conceptual Design | 29 | 3 | | | | | X | | |
| Conceptual Design | Gen. | | | | | X | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Gen. | | | | X | | Was the cost of discarding serviceable equipment calculated in the analysis? Most agencies have been spending capital resources on servers on a regular basis. These servers won't be useable in a virtualized or blade environment. |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Gen. | | | X | | It would be appropriate for an independent group to verify the methodology and results of the cost benefit analysis. | |
| Conceptual Design | 26 | 6 | 1 | X | | Is GIS considered an Infrastructure Application? | |
| Conceptual Design | 24 | 7 | | X | | Many small and medium sized agencies only have 1 person in a role. It will be difficult to give that person up for 80-100% time during the course of a long implementation project and still conduct the business of the agency. It is also not equitable for the staff person in question in that their future employment opportunities in the consolidated environment would be enhanced by the chance to work on implementation projects. | |

Agency/Committee Name
DATCP

Today's Date

| Document Title | Page No. | Para. No. | Line No. | Category (check one) | | Comments |
|-------------------|----------|-----------|----------|----------------------|---------------|--|
| | | | | Critical | Subst. Admin. | |
| Conceptual Design | 2 | 4 | 2 | X | | Revise "each agency's infrastructure can be best and most cost effectively supported" Cost is the key issue for DATCP. We can't necessarily afford "best" - our internal IT practices are based on the best we can do with agency cost constraints. |
| | 2 | 5 | 1 | X | | Revise: "leadership roles and methodologies that focus on cost, planning and design first" The planning process must look at cost at the front end of the project if the project is to be successful. If the design is too cost prohibitive, DATCP will see reduced services due to its inability to pay for them. |
| | 3 | 1 | 1 | X | | At DATCP, staff responsibilities are not segregated by specific roles. One staff person performs many different job duties related to both technical and line of business functions. |
| | 6 | 4 | 2 | X | | This recommendation surfaces in many places in this document and others. From a cost perspective, it makes more sense to roll network support consolidation into the Badgernet 2 project scope. To centralize under the current environment will cause additional expenditures for tool sets and infrastructure changes. It would be more cost efficient to roll them into the Badgernet 2 design. |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|--|--|
| 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | X | It's important to note that agencies moved to distributed servers to avoid the high cost of centralized mainframe services. Consolidated services need to be competitively priced to prevent creative avoidance by the agencies. |
| 7 | 2 | 3 | X | The Microsoft EA agreement made additional tools available to agencies to ease server and desktop management. This requires no additional investment. | |
| 7 | 5 | 3 | X | Revise: "needs at an equal or lower price". Reasonable pricing for greater service may be much higher than a small or poor agency can afford. | |
| 7 | 4 | 4 | X | Add bullet: "Reduce individual agency IT costs" if DATCP does not see an IT cost reduction, server consolidation will not provide benefit to the agency. | |
| 11 | 6 | 7 | X | We currently have a less than 30 minute response time to change requests and can schedule emergency changes on the same day requested. We also give developers hands on in the development environments – which give them instantaneous updates to their environment. This facilitates the development cycle. This type of immediacy needs to be built in to the consolidated environment to avoid negatively impacting development and testing times. | |
| 13 | 3 | X | General comment – one of the advantages should be to lower the TCO. If this technology does not lower the cost of storage – DATCP cannot afford centralized storage services. | | |
| 14 | 3 | X | Again – "fair and reasonable" costs are not necessarily lower costs. While the service may be priced fairly – it could potentially cost more that DATCP is currently investing in that service. This comment applies to all occurrences of "fair and reasonable" or "fair and equitable" in the document. | | |
| 15 | 1 | X | The personnel impacts of server consolidation need to be clearly identified in the Foundation projects. This is currently not mentioned in the Organization bullet. State IT staff will be facing layoffs. Much work can be done in the short term to assist staff in finding jobs in the private sector. Skill sets of potential layoffs can be pre-defined and working relationships can be established with the private sector HR shops now. This can lay the groundwork for shortening the layoff cycle. Culturally, IT workers came to the state trading higher wages for benefits and job security. The clinical approach to layoffs does not address the cultural issues faced by state employees who will find themselves out on the streets. | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 15 | Last | 3 | X | | | | This needs to be moved up on the priority list. Agency management needs chargeback information to make informed business decisions on services. In a perfect world we would already have the information so we could use in preparing our biennial budget requests. |
| 16 | 3 | | | X | | | Data Centers – general comment – the development of the data center will require a substantial initial investment. The initial startup costs should not be buried in ongoing overhead costs – or it will be extremely difficult to drive down the cost of the centralized services. |
| 18 | 2 | 2 | X | | | | Is this an achievable goal? What is the methodology for determining current agency costs for services to compare against centralized services? What if the goal is not met for all agencies? How will costs be "subsidized?" |
| 19 | 4 | | | X | | | Network services – just a comment that several agencies are providing their own VPN services at a lower cost than the services currently offered by DET. DATCP estimates a 50% savings by providing its own services. |
| 22 | 3 | 4 | X | | | | DATCP's DBA provides both administrative and development functions. More than 60% of his time is spent on the development side. It will be detrimental to the agency to eliminate this position. |
| 22 | 4 | 1 | X | | | | Security and Application support require a high line of business knowledge in their implementation at DATCP. This should be addressed in the detailed agency analysis. |
| 23 | 2 | 9 | X | | | | Costs and service levels of existing services should be considered in the Comprehensive review and assessment of each agency. However the current cost of providing service is only significant if the cost of the centralized service is also assessed at the same or greater service level. |
| 24 | 1 | 1 | X | | | | This advisory panel must be created immediately to develop and plan a strategy for staff reductions. Given current civil service rules and contract obligations it is imperative that the state convene a panel of experts to craft a workable plan. |
| 26 | 3 | 3 | X | | | | This section states that the Administrative DBA would handle database security (access to tables, views, and objects). At DATCP developer have the right to set their own security in their development databases. This is especially true for development of new systems (new tables, stored procedures, etc.) If developers do not have that right it will severely impact (slow) our ability to meet our customer needs in a Business timely manner. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|-------|--------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| Cost Benefit Analysis | Gen | | | | X | | <p>General comments: The estimated annual savings by itself does not seem to justify the investment cost of consolidated services. To further support the recommendation for consolidation, the intangible and long term benefits of server consolidation need to be clearly identified.</p> <p>Some conversion costs missing from the analysis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the cost of business disruption or lost opportunities to agencies during the consolidation process the cost of establishing enterprise standards, policies, procedures related to individual agency operational needs (i.e., production control, operations, change control) the staff cost to agencies in documenting processes in such a way as they're understandable to staff who do not understand the agency's lines of business | |
| | 6 | 5 | 1 | | | X | DATCP demotes servers rather than replace them. This results in a 5-7 year lifecycle. | |
| | 7 | Table | Space | | | X | Note: DATCP will continue to pay for its server room space and we assume we will pay for centralized server space. This increases rather than decreases our space cost. | |
| | 12 | 3 | First bullet | | | X | Crowe Chizek staff conceded that it is not cost effective to centralize print servers – which double network traffic (at a cost). File/print server locations should be assessed from a cost/performance perspective. Rationalization of remote server support from centralized staff still results in savings. | |
| Appraisal Inventory | Gen | | | | X | | Note: There are inaccuracies in DATCP staff allocations, server counts and services. These will be addressed when the agency participates in the next phase of the detailed analysis. | |
| Network Bandwidth Gap Analysis | Gen | | | | X | | From a cost perspective, the least amount possible should be invested in the interim network infrastructure. If this requires a virtual rationalization of server resources for the short term – it's a small concession compared to paying for bandwidth expansion twice (now vs. BadgerNet 2). Much can still be accomplished from a process and management perspective during the interim. | |
| | | | | | | | The methodology for calculating LAN network requirements is flawed. WAN statistics do not reflect the bursty nature of LAN file/print needs. This should be reviewed with the Network Domain –they can provide technical resources and appropriate methodologies for assessment. | |

| Document Title | Page No. | Para. No. | Line No. | Category (check one) | | | Comments |
|---------------------|----------|--|----------|----------------------|--------|--------|---|
| | | | | Critical | Subst. | Admin. | |
| General | Gen | | | | X | | Publish all comments from agencies on the project web site as received. Consolidation of all comments and the formal responses should be published too. (BIS) |
| General | Gen | | | X | | | DOA needs to address the HR/staffing plan for this consolidation immediately or the risk of technical services employees with highly specialized skill sets leaving state service in the near future increases significantly, especially as the economy/market improves. A majority of our technical services employees with specialized and current technology skill sets required to successfully run a service-oriented, consolidated data center have between 5 and 10 years tenure with the state and are already seeking employment outside the state. (BIS) |
| General | Gen | | | X | | | The project leadership must identify and develop a risk mitigation plan PRIOR to proceeding with implementation. The appraisal documents didn't address any of the risks. (BIS) |
| General | Gen | | | X | | | Clearly state the assumptions in all documents. (BIS) |
| Milestone Plan | Gen | | | X | | | Unable to review due to late publication. Please extend the timeline for accepting comments. (BIS) |
| Appraisal Inventory | 31-32 | | | | X | | It's not clear what source or criteria was used to list/describe DHFS Applications. Only applications hosted on the existing DHFS IT infrastructure are impacted by consolidation. Of those listed on page 31 and 32, only e-WISACWIS, Stellar/Solar, CASTII, and a portion of the Vital Records systems are hosted at DHFS—the others are hosted and maintained at EDS, UW DoIT, or DOA. The last sub-bullet on WISACWIS was already out of date when this document was published in July. The Vital Records systems are not "public." All that is available to the public is a form on the Web site citizens can print off and use to order specific vital record documents. The public does not have direct access to any of the Vital Records systems. This list of applications and the descriptions should either be removed or corrected/updated. (DHCF and BIS) |
| Appraisal Inventory | 33 | 1 st & 6 th Bullet | | | X | | References to the "AIX unit" and the "UNIX-AIX platform" are actually referring to a state-of-the-art IBM p690 system that hosts the Oracle MEDS data warehouse. Characterizing either the platform or the DBMS |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------|------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| | 34 | 4 th Bullet | | | | X | <p>maintained on it as "legacy" or "secondary" is incorrect. This comment also applies to the BSD unit which is hosting a new application (not legacy), the Ironmail anti-virus/spam filter. (DHCF and BIS)</p> <p>Use of the term "Self-Help Wisconsin" was not approved by DOA/DET. The approved name for this initiative is "ACCESS Wisconsin." (DHCF)</p> | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 34 | | | | X | | <p>It's not clear what criteria was used to list/describe DHFS Future IT Initiatives on page 34. Only application/system development initiatives that will result in hosting on the DHFS IT infrastructure are impacted by consolidation. None of the system initiatives listed will be hosted at DHFS. CARES is hosted at DOA/DET and the MMIS is/will be an outsourced system. All the initiatives listed except the desktop upgrade belong to one (DHCF) of our five divisions. They all have a number of IT initiatives not represented in this list—this is a very unbalanced reflection of the Department's IT initiatives. The list of system initiatives and the descriptions should either be removed or corrected/updated to reflect our entire Department. Also, the RFP to procure Fiscal Agent services and a new MMIS has gone out. Evaluation of vendor responses will begin during the week of 8/16/04. (DHCF and BIS)</p> | |
| Appraisal Inventory | 38-39 | | | | X | | <p>The DHFS IT staffing chart and notes are not current or correct. We supplied a more current version of this information to Crowe-Chizek and would like the information on these pages replaced with the current corrected information (sending as a separate attachment). (BIS)</p> | |
| Appraisal Analysis Reference | 16-17 | | | | X | | <p>The DHFS IT staffing chart and notes are not current or correct. We supplied a more current version of this information to Crowe-Chizek and would like the information on these pages replaced with the current corrected information (sending as a separate attachment). (BIS)</p> | |
| Appraisal Analysis Reference | 18-19 | | | | X | | <p>Ref. Application Servers. Planning will be needed relative to the timing of the server consolidation and the new WI Medicaid Fiscal Agent/MMIS contract implementation. The new Fiscal Agent vendor must assume responsibility from the previous vendor for managing, operating, and maintaining the MEDS server, software, applications, and database physically located in 1 W.W Rm B244. If the MEDS UNIX-AIX server has to be co-located, we will potentially co-locate it at the vendor's facility with the new MMIS. The DOA server consolidation report must have information about the special circumstances of MEDS--owned by the state but maintained by a contractor and the critical Fiscal Agent transition that will occur during the next 2 years. (DHCF and BIS)</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|------------------------|---|---|---|--|--|
| Conceptual Design | 2 | 2 nd Bullet | | | X | <p>Please define terms, specifically "Web and Internet hosting." Is this supposed to say "Intranet and Internet hosting?" Is it referring to static Web page/content hosting on an intranet or Internet site and the application hosting service will address all applications including Web-based applications? It is not certain as to what is stipulated by the term "Web" since the Internet is also referred to as "Web" and application hosting is a separate service. (BIS)</p> <p>The relative priorities of the recommendations are unclear. Appraisal documents discuss both server and services consolidations. Which will happen first, server or services? Technical services areas in each agency are highly interdependent. Care must be taken to avoid severely disrupting support at the agency and ensure complete support is provided in the new DET organization.</p> <p>Proposal: First, DET must organize its culture around providing services while agencies complete internal alignment projects. Comprehensive consolidation appraisals should focus on defining services in detail and address temporary staffing for those services immediately as part of developing the new DET structure. More permanent reassignment of State staff can occur as positions open. Infrastructure consolidation should be designed around services consolidation. (BIS)</p> | |
| Conceptual Design | 3-4 | | X | | | <p>Ref. Architecture. The strategy established for the data center "foundation" must take into account data security and privacy. There are certain data stores not routinely shareable as enterprise resources under any circumstances. Examples would include those that contain Personal Health Information (PHI) (e.g., the cancer registry) and those containing information that if inappropriately released would result in harm or threats of harm to service providers and patients (e.g., the induced abortion reporting system). (DHCF)</p> <p>Virtualization and blade servers: This technology will not be useful for many applications due to proprietary software and hardware and application co-existence problems. According to Gartner, "application co-existence is a significant, ongoing problem area for Unix and especially Windows environments. Partitioning will limit problems, but utilization and departmental concerns and politics remain. Many problems occur when attempting to rationalize servers by combining workloads in the same operating image." For example, some blade servers will not be compatible with certain SANs, and some applications will not run on blades or be virtualized at all. The cost savings in the Cost/Benefit Analysis (page 4-6) are overstated. (BIS)</p> | |
| Conceptual Design | 3 | 3 rd Bullet | X | | | | |
| Conceptual Design | 12 | | | X | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----|------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Conceptual Design | 15 | | | | X | Suggest including Enterprise Architecture (EA) as a foundational component. There are also dependencies server consolidation will have on a number of technical initiatives, such as security design (identity, authentication), directory design (forests, trees), etc., that should be identified. (BIS) |
| Conceptual Design | 15 | | | | X | <p>Ref. Organization. Organization initiative areas missed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification, training and focus on who the customer is. - Instituting a customer-satisfaction mindset. - Measuring and publishing measurements for customer satisfaction, on-time in-budget delivery, and meeting SLA's. (BIS) |
| Conceptual Design | 16 | 1 st Bullet | | | X | <p>Ref. Support Tools. To avoid redundant data entry in disparate problem tracking, change management, and inventory systems, a decision must be made for everyone to use a single system. DHFS currently uses Peregrine Service Center for these functions. It will be both costly and overly burdensome to implement a second system that duplicates functionality already available. Conversely, if the current system does not meet project goals, a separate priority project should be implemented to obtain a replacement for Service Center that does meet Enterprise needs. (DHCF)</p> |
| Conceptual Design | 18 | | | | X | <p>Ref. Storage Hosting. More detail is required to explain the cost model behind statements like "Storage can be provided 'as needed,' with an agency paying only for the storage used." Such detail should be provided in the form of estimates and forecasts based on experiential models <u>before</u> a final decision is made. It is often said "storage is cheap" these days, and it is. It needs to remain "cheap" at the conclusion of the consolidation effort. (DHCF)</p> |
| Conceptual Design | 25 | Chart | | X | | <p>The proposed project structure has two critical flaws:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Several consolidation projects do not fall under this management structure and are key to the success of overall consolidation as well as this project. 2. The 10-12 additional management groups proposed, in addition to all the advisory and implementation enterprise groups that already exist, significantly exceed the State's capacity to staff and coordinate. <p>What to do about it? <i>Consolidate the management of enterprise "change" first!</i> Simplify and streamline the coordination and advisory groups that have sprung up.</p> <p>Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institute the projects as outlined and have them report directly to the Initiative Oversight Committee (IOC). - Raise the bar for the IOC; give the IOC authority over "all" consolidation-related projects and decision-making groups. This means chartering the IOC as an Enterprise group rather than a Server Consolidation project group. - Consolidate all advisory groups under the BLC and |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|-------|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | TLC domain structure, and construct the IOC to use those advisory groups. - Eliminate duplicate management or advisory groups. For instance, eliminate the BST and use the BLC instead, and eliminate the TST and use the TLC instead. (BIS) |
| Conceptual Design | 25 | Chart | | | X | | | | The proposed 12 Crowe-Chizek (CC) staff appear to be 3 on the IOC plus one individual for each foundation and service area project. It really seems that "a true State initiative" means state staff will be doing all the work, and no significant CC staff are included to help make it happen. Significant staff augmentation will be required in the agencies to keep technical services running in parallel to support program areas while the consolidation is underway. (BIS) |
| Conceptual Design | Gen | | | | X | | | | Given the conclusions in the Network Bandwidth Gap Analysis document, overall project risk and program disruption could be best minimized by concentrating immediate efforts on upgrading the connectivity infrastructure prior to actual server consolidation or virtualization. It would be difficult, time-consuming, and costly to recover from a bandwidth capacity crisis precipitated by consolidating state operations on an inadequate infrastructure. (DHCF) |
| Conceptual Design | Gen | | | | X | | | | It is unclear whether the intent is to consolidate the separate roles of network administrator and administrative database administration into single individuals. Doing so would violate the industry best practice of preventing the concentration of virtually limitless power in the hands of a single individual. No staff member should have the power to do harm to a system and to cover his or her tracks. (DHCF) |
| Conceptual Design | Gen | | | | X | | | | There appear to be too many concurrent tracks in progress that have dependencies on one another. While the benefits of selecting and implementing a standard email and calendar system are obvious, it is less clear that server consolidation, security, administration, and support activities can (or should) be altered before the infrastructure can support it or even before the corporate culture in DOA/DET has demonstrably changed from "a back office" mentality to one of service orientation. (DHCF) |
| Conceptual Design | Gen | | | | X | | | | Network Support is recommended to be a service offering, but no supporting data is provided in the report documents to make a determination about whether to include it. Same for application support and security. (BIS) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 4 | | | | X | | | | Ref Server Support. "According to Meta group and other (un-named) industry sources the ratio of physical servers managed per administrator ranges from 10:1 to 50:1. IT shops employing best practices achieve ratios in the range of 30:1." The type of server/administrator |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | functions and services are dependent on the service levels required for complex applications, operations, and databases. These determinations cannot be made until service levels are identified. Therefore, the 30:1 ratio is arbitrary. Confirm Best Practice ratio with independent groups such as Forrester and NOREX. Identify references. (BIS) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 5 | | | | X | | | | "Operations" are specific to agencies, applications, and programs. Many legacy processes managed by agencies are not good candidates for server consolidation. The Comprehensive Appraisal should address these differences and reassess the degree of operations consolidation. (BIS) Ref. Administrative DBA: Per best practices, database ratios are as follows: SQL Server - 25 databases to 1 admin IBM - 21:1 Oracle - 18:1 Per the appraisal inventory, the state agencies have a total of 554 DB2 databases, 1051 SQL Server DB's, and 419 Oracle instances. The total number of database administrators is 35. Therefore, the current ratio (grouping all of these together) is 58:1. This simple calculation indicates DBA ratios are already above the best practice. How can the DBA staff be cut 10 to 30 percent? Consolidation of servers will not accomplish this as there will be the same number of databases on fewer servers. DB administrative tasks are based on the number of databases. It appears the reduction of servers was used to calculate the reduction of DBA's whereas the reduction or consolidation of databases should be used to derive this number. The plan does not mention consolidation of databases. (BIS) Source of best practice ratios: http://www.newsfactor.com/story.xhtml?story_id=22647 |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 5 | | | X | | | | | Under the paragraph on Servers, there is reference to analysis done to determine 722 or 30% of the servers in the field could be eliminated, but no explanation of the analysis performed. The Appraisal Analysis Reference breaks down the reduction of servers by agency by type but doesn't describe the logic or methodology used to arrive at the reduced numbers. The basis and criteria used to determine this should be disclosed in the report. Given the high-level of the information collected in the inventory, what methodology did Crowe-Chizek apply to complete this analysis and derive the 30% server-reduction figure? (BIS) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 6 | | | | | X | | | Assumptions. The report assumes agencies amortize server costs over 3 years or in other words have a 3-year replacement schedule built into their budgets for servers. The report estimates savings over 3 years for the 722 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | fewer servers. This is not an accurate assumption and savings are thus overstated. Server equipment replacement is more like 5 years and even then the equipment is recycled into less demanding areas. (BIS) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 6 | | | | | | | X | Assumptions. The amount of RAM in the assumed base server was probably intended to be 2 GB rather than 2 MB. (DHCF) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 8-9 | | | | X | | | | Clarify the source of funding for the new servers the enterprise must procure as a part of this project to complete server consolidation activities. It was not evident in the documents this was assessed. It appears costs are understated. (BIS) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 9 | | | | X | | | | Table. Staffing is indicated as 17 managers and 8 staff. Additionally, the table in the Conceptual Design document on page 25 proposes assigning 12 Crowe-Chizek staff, apparently most or all in lead/mentoring roles. <i>Who's going to do the work?</i> Eight FTE cannot possibly do the work required to consolidate all the state agencies in 2-3 years. Also, this staffing level does not seem to match the implementation strategy on page 25 of the Conceptual Design document unless nearly every role is filled by a part-time person; exceedingly risky for a project of this magnitude and importance. Our experience is it takes at least as many FTE to implement significant infrastructure changes as it does to administer/manage the technical infrastructure. This equates to between 81 and 112 FTE (server support plus admin DBA). If we redirect 75% of the resources by temporarily reducing technical services to the program areas, then about 20 to 30 additional FTE will be required during consolidation besides the managers and current staff. The costs for these additional staff must be included in the Cost-Benefit Analysis. Reference the North Dakota consolidation (StateTechMag.com, summer 2004, "Doing More With Less") (BIS) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 10-11 | | | | | X | | | The Investment Analysis tables front-load costs into the first 2 years even though the earlier discussion expects the transition to take advantage of already optimistic 3-year investment cycle savings. Besides inappropriately allocating costs and savings, this counts on 1/2 the staff reductions in the first year and the remainder in the second year. This is exactly when we most need additional staff to accomplish the consolidation project and maintain parallel technical operations at our respective agencies until the consolidation project is complete. A more realistic cost savings spread is 1/4 in each year 2 through 5. (BIS) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 13 | | | | | | | X | Include a note in the report that managers are not included in the people counts in the table. (BIS) |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 13 | | | | | X | <p>Add another column indicating the "total units considered." When comparing the "current total" and the "eliminated" column, it gives a false perception that the percentage that is being eliminated is smaller than it actually is. Example: Under "People," the "Current Total" is 851, and the total "Eliminated" is 56. One could perceive this as a 6.5 percent reduction. However, only 193 people were considered— indicating a 29 percent reduction. (BIS)</p> |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 14 | | | X | | | <p>Server consolidation indirect (soft) costs need to be noted, similar to the additional benefits of server consolidation. For example, the cost to define the enterprise architecture; the cost of time to do analysis of options and make recommendations on the many design issues, such as the email and IAMS platforms; and opportunity costs (the cost of foregoing higher ROI projects) due to deferred business changes during much of the consolidation. (BIS)</p> |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | 14 | 4 th bullet | | | X | | <p>The commitment to formalized training for staff to maintain or improve skill levels is not adequately accounted for in the document. Just stating that staff will have "opportunities for career growth" is not sufficient and needs a more comprehensive discussion to obtain credibility as a server consolidation benefit. (DHCF)</p> |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Gen | | | X | | | <p>The expected saving from operations, while not insignificant at a level of several millions of dollars per year, need to be viewed in perspective. The total annual Enterprise savings are estimated at a level that is less than half of the annual transaction and storage fees currently paid for one system (CARES) operating at DET today. When viewed from the perspective of the entire budget, the annual savings are almost "statistically insignificant." Therefore, more emphasis needs to be placed on the non-fiscal component of the project to provide justification.</p> <p>Central management and design of the Enterprise infrastructure may provide the most compelling reason to proceed. (DHCF)</p> |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Gen | | | | | X | <p>Experience would indicate savings from staff reductions are typically more than offset (diluted) by the costs of obtaining temporary contractor support. (DHCF)</p> |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Gen | | | X | | | <p>This Cost-Benefit Analysis should be analyzed by a State review body, such as the Budget Office / Fiscal Bureau and/or the Legislative Audit Bureau. Impacts across agency budgets as well as IT budgets need to be determined and weighed against other statewide initiatives. (BIS)</p> |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Gen | | | X | | | <p>While consolidation will undoubtedly save the State dollars, some agencies will reap savings while others will see costs go up. Agency budgets need to be adjusted for this in the Governor's Budget. (BIS)</p> |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Gen | | | | X | | | | | The charge-back rate structure is critical to agencies planning their next fiscal year(s) budgets. Include agency reimbursement of any equipment "donated" to the consolidation effort. To properly charge costs to programs and draw federal funds, the billings will need to contain sufficient detail for us to match benefit to program, comparable to the current billings from BIS. Additionally, the charges will need to be allowable under applicable federal regulations. This needs to become part of the Comprehensive Review or a closely coordinated separate project. (BFS) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Gen | | | | X | | | | | The Cost-Benefit Analysis does not indicate what metrics will be used to track project progress. Metrics to measure costs and savings need to be established now, tracked through consolidation, and verified at selected intervals. (BIS) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Gen | | | | | X | | | | Licensing costs and savings were not addressed. Both could be substantial. List assumptions. (BIS) |
| Cost/Benefit Analysis | Gen | | | | | X | | | | Staff Training is not addressed. Costs should be included since products, infrastructure, and scale will be changing and require training well beyond normal levels. (BIS) |
| Network Bandwidth Gap Analysis | 7 | | | | | | | | X | Define acronyms the first time used, i.e. POP's and MPLS. (BIS) |
| Network Bandwidth Gap Analysis | 14-36 | | | | | X | | | | The bandwidth analysis indicates 135 links may need to be upgraded. The cost-benefit analysis only discusses upgrading MadMAN. The cost of upgrading all the other links (most not related to MadMAN) must be included in the cost-benefit analysis. Costs of additional network equipment (to support a consolidated data center and to upgrade links) must also be included. These costs are substantial. Comment is also applicable to Cost-Benefit Analysis, page 8-9. (BIS, see Chris Buechler) |
| Network Bandwidth Gap Analysis | 18 | | | | | X | | | | Several errors exist in the information provided for DHFS site addresses in Appendix C. Bandwidth to some sites is shared with other agencies, and the bandwidth to 1 West Wilson should be listed as OC-3 fiber (156,000 KBps), rather than T1 (1,544 KBps). (BIS, see Chris Buechler for correct information) |
| General | Gen | | | | X | | | | | There appears to be commitment to business continuance. The next level of planning must provide that consolidated services will be capable of recovering and continuing after a disaster. Federal regulations (SACWIS, HIPAA) require this of DHFS. (BIS) |
| General | Gen | | | | | | | X | | Next level of planning should address the difference between security authorization (which should stay with agencies) and security implementation (which can be consolidated)? (BIS) |
| General | Gen | | | | | | | X | | To fulfill their security authorization role, agencies will need to monitor user access to consolidated resources. The next level of planning should address ways to |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----|--|--|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | provide agencies with this information. (BIS) | |
| General | Gen | | | | | X | | Next level of planning must address what form of written service agreements will exist between using agencies and the consolidated service provider. HIPAA may require a written agreement between DHFS and DOA that commits DOA to applying required safeguards on protected health information. (BIS) | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|-----------------|----------------------------------|
| Agency/Committee Name Department of Workforce Development (DWD) | | | | | | | | Today's Date 8/12/2004 |
| Document Title | Page No. | Para. No. | Line No. | Category (check one) <input type="checkbox"/> Critical <input type="checkbox"/> Subst. <input type="checkbox"/> Admin. | | | Comments | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|---|---------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Appraisal Inventory | 58 | | | X | | | <p>The DWD staffing numbers are not correct. They do not match those presented to DET/Crowe in the inventory collection process. The numbers provided to DET/Crowe in the inventory have been revalidated, and need to remain as originally submitted. The following errors need to be corrected:</p> <p>Server Support – alter 13 FTE + 1 contractor + 1 manager for 15 total to 8.2 FTE + 2.75 contractor + .35 manager for 11.3 total. The difference of 3.7 should go to other.</p> <p>Operations – alter 22 FTE + 7 contractor + 3 manager for 32 total to 2.56 FTE for a total of 2.56. The difference of 29.44 should go to other.</p> <p>Applications Support – alter 9 FTE + 1 contractor + 1 manager for 11 total to 3.3 FTE + .3 contractor for 3.6 total. The difference of 7.4 should go to other.</p> <p>Network - alter 6 FTE + 3 contractor + 1 manager for 10 total to 4.7 FTE + .5 manager for 5.2 total. The difference of 4.8 should go to other.</p> <p>We have identified many discrepancies in numbers and counts - will those be corrected to reflect the numbers submitted? For example, the DWD staff count in the appraisal is 45 FTE higher than we submitted. Updating these numbers will change the staff savings and could have a significant impact on the source of savings from this project.</p> <p>In general, the CBA is incomplete. We strongly recommend that it be updated to include all of the agency input. Critical assumptions are not documented and therefore not verifiable. At this point, it does not serve as a valid justification for moving forward.</p> | |
| Conceptual Design | 23 | 5 | 1 and 2 | X | | | <p>Best practice and experience identify that phased implementation is the most effective technique to minimize risk and achieve successful results. DWD recommends doing the foundation projects first, then email and/or DHFS/DNR. Evaluate outcomes in terms of customer satisfaction, cost, etc. Capture lessons learned and then make decision on whether to move forward.</p> <p>Also, please explain what is meant by "these agencies will be the starting points.....", specifically, the starting points for what?</p> | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-----|--|---|--|---|--|
| Conceptual Design | GEN | | X | | <p>Several State agencies have Partners (local and County entities providing citizens with State services). DWD has about ~8,692 partners. These Partners rely on DWD and other agencies for IT direction and the implementation of new IT technologies. How will the business needs of local agencies/county partners be addressed when transitioning to and after the new State IT organization is in place? Without the partners, there would be no KIDS and CARES programs unless we added significant numbers of state staff. The analysis needs to take into account ALL customers. Local agency partners should be invited to have representation on the project teams.</p> | |
| Conceptual Design | 1-3 | | X | | <p>The conceptual design points out the critical foundational work needed for DET to build a 'service organization'. This foundation is an essential requirement in maintaining quality services, and to insure state IT business in not negatively impacted by consolidation. At the same time, DET has started the email consolidation project without any of the base foundational work started. This takes on the appearance of 'business as usual' vs. service oriented organization. It would seem essential and logical that DET start this email consolidation project by building a new service oriented team as the first step. This would require creation of a new management team, with additional team leadership and project management staff added as well as the required technical staff. The management change is the most important facet of this planned organization change.</p> <p>Corrective action needed: DET should in the immediate future post a high-level and a mid-level management position, as well as an email team leader and email technical staff positions. This new organization should not report to current DET operational management staff. This recruitment should be for inter-agency or intra-agency transfer/promotion. No current DET staff should be assured a position, or the entire organization rebuild will be under question by most of DET's customers. Once recruitment has been completed, a detailed project charter and project plan should be created, and staff assignments made. In addition, all staff should be trained on effective teamwork and service oriented customer service. Please add to second to last bullet on this page "but not be implemented until the foundation projects are sufficiently in place."</p> | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------|----------|---|--|
| <p>Cost Benefit Analysis</p> | <p>GEN</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>Security (including directory services, network, etc.) will be a major initiative in a consolidated environment. For instance, the use of native integrated security and directory architecture is necessary to enable vendor system integrated management capabilities for directories, security, servers, users, and services across all types of applications, deployment contexts, and sets of users.</p> <p>Crowe's analysis is incomplete because security is not addressed and no specific costs are allocated to it in any of the documents. In a consolidated environment, security will be more critical than ever. Today, if one agency gets a virus or has a major security breach, it likely only impacts that particular agency. In a consolidated environment a major virus could potentially take the entire state infrastructure down. The CBA needs to clearly identify the costs of security.</p> | |
| <p>Cost Benefit Analysis</p> | <p>Gen</p> | <p>X</p> | <p>The cost/benefit assumes that technology infrastructure is a commodity service. At DWD, our technical staff do not simply do back office commodity work. They interact with their customers on a very regular basis including doing day-to-day support (the server team handled 340 user problems in the past 5 months = ~68 per month) and projects such as video streaming, mainframe connectivity for partners, file services, thin client, and network faxing. In fact, one of our divisions has achieved reductions of more than 500 positions (almost half of their staff) over the last 15 years while increasing responsiveness to an increasing customer base - through business process re-engineering and the application of new technologies.</p> <p>Will the consolidated infrastructure allow agility and flexibility to allow agencies to be innovative in their application of technology such that they can meet reduced positions and budget and still provide services to their customers?</p> <p>Reducing the number of IT staff that currently provide the services to be consolidated could have staffing level implications for other parts of the state. The number of program area staff may need to be increased, or may not be able to be reduced further through automation of business processes, due to time constraints on the IT staff that are consolidated. There may not be enough IT staff to take advantage of all the initiatives the business would like to pursue to save money and reduce program area staff.</p> | |