



Thursday, July 11, 2019

1500 Jefferson St. SE, Olympia / 1st Flr / Presentation Rm 1213

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Members present: James Weaver (WebEx) **Staff present:** Sue Langen
 Matt Boehnke (WebEx)
 Zack Hudgins
 Tracy Guerin
 Patty Kuderer (WebEx)
 Butch Leonardson
 Paul Moulton (WebEx)
 Jeff Paulsen
 Vikki Smith

TOPIC	LEAD	NOTES
Welcome and Introduce New Board Member	Jim Weaver	Jim joined via WebEx today. He introduced the newest board member, Representative Matt Boehnke, who brings an extensive cybersecurity background to the group.
Approve Minutes from May 9 Subcommittee Meeting	Jim Weaver	Minutes from the May subcommittee meeting were approved as written.
Project Status – Office of Financial Management’s One Washington Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pat Lashway, Executive Sponsor • Vann Smiley, Program Executive Director • Anna Brannen, QA, Bluecrane 	Sue Langen Pamela Davis-Taggart	Pam introduced Pat, Vann and Anna. Pam also reminded everyone the One Washington Program is the largest business transformation initiative the state has undertaken in years. The program will impact over 170 agencies, boards and commissions.

Since the last time the program came before the Board, the program has:

- moved forward with business readiness activities,
- submitted and received an approved investment plan,
- procured space for resources needed for the work,
- completed statements of work on anticipated contracts, and
- submitted a decision package to the legislature.

Anna provided the quality assurance status. Given the program only received 30 percent of its funding request, the scope and timeline will be affected moving forward.

Anna provided six fundamental questions that any option the program chooses needs to address moving forward:

1. How does this option reduce the scope and change the timelines both in the new and future biennia?
2. What are the business functions that the options include and do not include?
3. What are the short and long term costs?
4. What are the impacts to the cost savings and the efficiencies?
5. What are the expectations from the state agencies?

6. How does this option incorporate best practices from industry to support these long-term statewide ERP systems?

Vann explained where the program was at the beginning of the last legislative session that caused them to pause and look at a new direction:

1. Terminated contract with vendor so they could look at new changes in industry.
2. Lacked in their own program readiness.
3. Lacked multiple agency readiness.

The original biennial budget request was \$60M and the program actually received \$18.4M.

Approved budget requires significant modification to procurement strategy:

- Insufficient financial and human resources to implement the originally planned option
- Incomplete funding for consultant contracts
- Delays in selecting SaaS and systems integrator will place schedule for current strategy at significant risk
- Benchmarking study necessary
- Software and system integrator contracts

Current challenge is to adapt new budget to new scope, schedule and overall strategy.

Butch offered that it doesn't matter what technology you choose, you will fail if you don't have agency and program readiness and organizational change management.

Vann also reviewed three procurement strategy options:

- Option#1: Adapt by Leveraging an Existing Master Contract
(NASPO vehicle enables SaaS & Integrator selection much sooner)
- Option#2: Best of Breed
(Each business function gets best solution in the marketplace)
- Option#3: Stay the Course
(Execute IAW current approved Investment Plan and Technical Budget)

Paul gave feedback to try to eliminate the Best of Breed option, as it will be difficult to keep agencies on disparate systems. Any move towards the cloud and an enterprise-wide use of as few databases as possible is best option.

Butch followed up with a banking industry example where they are finding it's now less expensive and takes less time to

modernize their core systems, similar to what state government is doing.

Paul followed up again with feedback that technology isn't the issue, it's having to change old business processes to match new processes required in the new system. It's about change management.

Paul added that, at first, a new system is going to cost more for a period of time due to people needing to get used to the changes. That should be built into the budget and everyone's expectations.

Rep. Hudgins shared some thoughts that could help the program in future discussions with legislators:

- Show them what the program spent money on and how it was successful
- Tell them how agencies are preparing with a training program
- Tell them how you are standardizing business processes before choosing an integrator and solution
- Tell them how you are preparing for possible downturn in the economy

Jim asked how the program would handle a pause due to a recession, how it would affect agencies' costs, and would like to incorporate that plan into the next round of legislative conversations.

		<p>The program also asked for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Input on the adapted course of action • Help identifying allies (leverage tech expertise) • Access to members during interim; fellow member support during session • Budget and messaging support (regardless of adapted vs current strategies) on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Program readiness ○ Agency readiness ○ Organizational change management ○ SaaS subscription / system integrator costs <p>The program will come back to the December 10 full board meeting to provide an update.</p>
<p>GIS Program Update & Standards Review</p> <p>161.01 – Geodetic Control Data Standard – Update</p>	<p>Sue Langen Joanne Markert</p>	<p>Joanne began with a GIS program update to talk about accomplishments over the last two years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Migrated to the WaTech private cloud environment • Drafted change management procedures to stop data-structure breakage due to multi-agency changes • Created great partnerships with other agencies and organizations

<p>161.02 – Geospatial Metadata Standard - Rescind 161.03 – Hydrography Data Standard – Update 161.05 – Geospatial Application & Data Services Metadata Standard - Rescind 187.10 – Metadata Standard - Update</p>		<p>Geodetic Control Data Standard is being updated to clarify codes to use for geospatial data.</p> <p>Hydrography Data Standard is being updated to clarify language.</p> <p>Geospatial Metadata and Geospatial Application & Data Services Metadata Standards are being rescinded, and combined with 187.10.</p> <p>Metadata Standard is being updated to integrate 161.02 and 162.05, and simplify the implementation for agencies.</p> <p>The Subcommittee recommended the standards revisions move forward, as written, to the September 10 full board meeting for approval. The OCIO will follow up with Jim Weaver for interim adoption pending full approval.</p> <p>Meeting Wrap Up:</p> <p>The August 8 subcommittee meeting agenda will include results of the Plante Moran work to assess the project approval and oversight processes.</p>
<p>IT Project Gated Funding Process Overview</p>	<p>Sue Langen Derek Puckett</p>	<p>Deferred until next meeting. Other agenda topics took longer and there was insufficient time to cover this topic.</p>

Public Comment		No public comment.
-----------------------	--	--------------------