OCIO 21-23 Supplemental Biennium IT Decision Package Funding Recommendation Report

Authorized by RCW 43.88.092 and 43.105.240

Table of Contents

Introduction: Navigating this document

The Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) is required by RCW 43.88.092 to evaluate proposed information technology budget requests and establish priority rankings of the proposals. Additionally, RCW 43.105.240 states "the office shall submit recommendations for funding all or part of these requests to the director of financial management."

This document provides both a priority ranking of proposed decision packages (DP) and funding, and gating recommendations for decision packages containing information technology (IT) budget requests for the FY21-23 supplemental biennial budget. For decision packages that contain both IT and non-IT costs, the OCIO recommendations apply solely to the IT portion of the DP.

Information on decision packages (DPs) prioritization is included in the Background and Methodology section along with a brief overview of the OCIO process. Details about the categories of funding and gating recommendations are also in the Background and Methodology section.

The report provides four tables presenting the results of the OCIO's review:

- Table 1 provides a list of the HHS Coalition DPs for the Coalition agencies.
- Table 2 provides the ranked priority list of decision packages along with funding and gating recommendations.
- Table 3 provides a listing of additional decision packages for which an IT Addendum was submitted but was not ranked. With few exceptions, the technology portion of these requests are for maintenance and operations (M & O).
- Table 4 provides a listing of decision packages which were not identified as having IT components and did not submit an IT Addendum but appear to include some IT costs. Generally, these costs appear to be associated with M & O.

The preliminary report identified decision packages and IT addendums contained in the Agency Budget System (ABS) as of September 28, 2021. This updated and final version of the report contains identified decision packages through November 30, 2021.

Background and Methodology

Screening DPs for prioritization

Agencies were asked to identify DPs with an IT component and to attach an IT Addendum. As part of the IT Addendum, agencies were requested to provide documentation of the IT portion of the decision package.

Of the 136 DPs with an IT component, there are many instances where the agency didn't complete an IT Addendum and/or provide an IT cost breakout. Responses in the IT Addendum provide a view into:

- Proposed investments that may include administrative and/or financial systems for evaluation of overlap with One Washington or other centrally managed, enterprise systems. Projects must be approved by the OCIO and OFM to move forward.
- Proposed investments in equipment or facilities in any agency data center. These investments would require policy waivers if valid or would have a "do not fund" recommendation.

- Projects proposed by Health and Human Services (HHS) Coalition agencies. This ensures that HHS governance processes have screened the submissions. Proposed investments that were not screened or endorsed as part of that process would have a 'do not fund' recommendation.

The IT Addendum contains questions used to screen IT DPs for prioritization and identify those that are clearly M & O. IT DPs that answered "No" to each of the following questions are not reviewed and prioritized:

- Does the decision package fund the acquisition or expansion of computer hardware capacity?
- Does the decision package fund the development or acquisition of a new or enhanced software solution or service?
    - Do you expect the proposed solution to exchange information with AFRS or the One Washington solution?
    - Does the investment renew or procure facial recognition service?
- Does the decision package fund the continuation of a project that is, or will be, under OCIO oversight?

Of the 136 decision packages, 70 involved IT projects or other investments that warranted prioritization.

There are two new non-scored sections in this report containing tables of the remaining DPs that were not prioritized:

- **M & O not scored:** These DPs request increases in existing licensing, increased FTEs associated with general work but not a specific project, ongoing project costs, etc. Included in this section are technology costs that are incidental to opening a facility.
- **DPs with no IT Addendum:** These DPs appear to have IT cost components and no IT Addendum.

In October 2021, the OCIO completed an analysis of DPs with an IT component submitted on or before the Office of Financial Management's (OFM) budget submittal deadline of September 13. The initial funding recommendation report in October, provides the result of that analysis. The OCIO worked with the OFM to identify any IT DPs submitted after the deadline or otherwise missed. The results of this analysis were delivered to the OFM for use in preparing the Governor's proposed biennial budget. While unlikely, it is still possible additional DPs will be identified for prioritization. The final report is provided to the Legislature soon after the release of the Governor's budget.

DP prioritization criteria and process

The criteria used to evaluate and prioritize proposed investments is broken into three major categories: Agency Readiness, Technical Alignment, and Business Alignment. The criteria listed in Figure 1 below correspond to questions in the IT Addendum. They are based on industry best practice, statewide technology policy and strategy and lessons learned from prior state projects.

Figure 1 – IT Decision Package evaluation criteria.

Agency Readiness	Technical Alignment	Business Alignment
Due diligence	Strategic alignment	Business driven technology
Governance and management	Technical alignment	Measurable business outcomes
Planning and readiness	Reuse and interoperability	

Each criterion was assigned equal weight: 12.5% of the final score. From a category perspective, the agency readiness and technical assessment categories each account for 37.5% of the total score while the business alignment category accounts for 25% of the score.

Each proposed investment was separately assessed for urgency.

Urgency				
Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Level 0
Investment addresses a currently unmet, time sensitive legal mandate or addresses audit findings. Or Proposed investment continues a project already underway and not anticipated to be at a logical stopping point at the end of the biennium.	Investment addresses imminent failure of a system or infrastructure and will assuage that issue.	Investment addresses an agency's technical debt of aging systems and provides an opportunity for modernization.	Investment provides an opportunity to improve services but does not introduce new capability or address imminent risks.	No response provided

The ranked list notes the urgency level assigned to each DP based on the content and Addendum.

Funding Recommendations

The OCIO made four types of funding recommendations surrounding these DPs. While a high score in the ranked list likely indicates a funding recommendation, this is not a hard and fast rule. Conversely, low scores do not automatically indicate a "do not fund" recommendation. The types of funding recommendations are defined in the list below:

- **Fully Fund as Written:** The agency has demonstrated adequate project planning in the DP narrative. The OCIO takes no issue with the project plan as proposed and it is likely to succeed if it is funded as written.

- **Fund with Considerations:** The DP contains most factors for success but may be lacking in key areas. DPs receiving this type of recommendation fit into roughly two categories:
  1. Packages lack sufficient funding in key areas, such as external quality assurance, resources, or project management.
  2. Packages that require additional detail to evaluate or would benefit from more project planning in the time leading up to securing funding. The OCIO still feels that these packages can succeed, but they need additional resources or planning to ensure success.

- **Partially Fund:** Packages with this recommendation have portions that can be easily implemented if funding is secured, or a smaller, more incremental approach has been recommended for funding.

- **Do Not Fund as Written:** Packages with this recommendation lack appropriate detail in the request to be successful or are proposing something so strategically misaligned that the OCIO cannot recommend funding them as they are written.

Within a DPs funding recommendation, the OCIO may include comments on how well an agency addressed these evaluation factors. The Office also provides any thoughts or concerns it may have about a proposal.

Gated Funding Recommendations

The OCIO made three types of recommendations for Gated funding surrounding these DPs. The gating recommendations apply only to the IT portion of a request.

- **Yes:** This investment is likely to benefit from the oversight process and a gated funding approach. These kinds of investments are generally projects such as feasibility or implementation efforts. These efforts tend to be higher cost and longer duration and generally moderate to high risk.

- **No:** This investment appears to be low risk and not otherwise likely to fall under oversight or where the value of gated funding and oversight is unlikely to offset the associated administrative overhead. Investments in this category tend to be one-time investments or short duration investments in existing systems or technologies.

- **Partially Gated:** Some decision packages bundled different types of investments together. The recommendation for partial gating is used where only a portion of the DP seems to be at a risk level that it would benefit from gated funding and associated oversight.

One Washington Considerations

One Washington must be considered the state's top business and technology priority due to the importance and scope of the program in transforming the states finance and HR processes and technology. In determining which decision packages to fund, the OCIO recommends hard questions be asked of the agencies on the current state of business and system readiness activities and the impacts of these funding requests on future agency readiness.

Decision Package Themes

Several themes were identified during the review of decision packages. These include multiple agencies proposing investment in:

- Solutions to address data and data management concerns. This highlights the near term need for development of an enterprise approach to data management.
- Data analytics, including in mapping and geospatial information systems. This indicates opportunity for more cross-agency or enterprise level collaboration on platforms and shared data.
- Movement to cloud technology. This is the preferred direction for the state and highlights the need for an enterprise approach (as proposed in the Enterprise Cloud Computing decision package) to enable coordinated, cost effective and secure.

- Continued efforts towards modernization of agency portfolios. This is closely tied to adoption of cloud-based technologies, and data platform needs. Most agency portfolios will require investment in legacy applications to migrate to the cloud, optimize in the cloud or develop more modern cloud-based architectures.

HHS Coalition Agency DPs

Table 1 lists the HHS Coalition DPs for the Coalition agencies. Based on established processes, decision packages have been screened to determine which would have Coalition governance and which would be governed by an agency. OCIO level oversight is determined by a separate process and not reflected in this Table.

The volume, size and complexity of the IT requests raise concerns around the ability of the agencies to be successful in a relative short period of time without further prioritization based on risk, strategy, and readiness factors. Some of the DPs may need to be pushed to a the 2023 – 2025 biennium.

Table 1 - HHS Coalition Agency DPs (blue shaded items are new)			
Agency and Decision Package Name	**Requested Budget**	**IT Budget**	**Comments**
DOH - HELMS Project Budget	6,257,000	6,500,000	Agency Governance
DOH -Maintain Core Public Health Systems	19,088,000	5,173,596	Agency Governance
DOH - Upgrade Drinking Water System	1,034,000	769,254	Agency Governance
DOH - Upgrade Medical Cannabis Registry	2,101,000		Agency Governance
DOH - WIC Food Insecurity & Infant Formula	6,178,000	5,609,000	Agency Governance
DCYF - IT Gated Pool Funding Transfer	1,471,000	1,471,000	Related to the Foster Parent Application Portal project which is governed by the Coalition and the Mandatory Reporter Online portal project which is governed by the agency
HCA - Electronic Consent Management	2,272,000	2,930,000	Coalition Governance
HCA - Trueblood Data	1,953,000	1,169,000	Agency Governance
HCA - Community Information Exchange	14,848,000	15,000,000	Coalition Governance
HCA - SEBB Maintenance and Operations	971,000	229,000	Agency Governance
HCA - EHR Expansion	12,770,000	12,770,000	Coalition Governance
HCA - Clinical Data Repository	2,052,000	3,000,000	Agency Governance
HCA - K12 Risk Pool	984,000	983,340	Agency Governance
DSHS - Critical IT Pharmacy Resources	1,587,000	850,000	Agency Governance
DSHS - Infra Improv & Cloud Migration	1,320,000	1,320,000	Agency Governance
DSHS - LTSS Trust	3,070,000	780,000	Coalition Governance
DSHS - ACES Stabilization	785,000	785,000	Coalition Governance
DSHS - ABD and HEN Human Trafficking	207,000	190,000	Agency Governance
DSHS - National Accuracy Clearinghouse	2,584,000	1,541,000	Agency Governance

Table 1 - HHS Coalition Agency DPs (blue shaded items are new)			
Agency and Decision Package Name	**Requested Budget**	**IT Budget**	**Comments**
DSHS - Integrated Eligibility System	16,285,000	16,285,000	Coalition Governance
DSHS - SILAS Leave Attendance Scheduling	10,631,000	5,827,000	Agency Governance
DSHS - PSRP Information Security	588,000		Agency Governance
DSHS - Fleet Management System	425,000	425,000	Agency Governance
DSHS - HCBS FMAP Priorities	324,490,000		Specific technology projects have not been identified
DSHS - Confidential Client Data Protection	609,000	609,000	Agency Governance
DSHS - IT Strategic Roadmap	1,185,000	1,185,000	Agency Governance
DSHS - Network Risk Mitigation	6,203,000	6,203,000	Agency Governance

Table 1 - HHS Coalition Agency DPs

Ranked Prioritization List

Table 2 provides the results of the prioritization activity and ranks DPs from 1 to 70. Following the table is a section that is grouped by the function of government categories and provides more details on the recommendations.

Table 2 - Ranked List of DPs with IT (blue shaded items are new)							
Agency and Decision Package Name	Score	Overall Rank	Funding Recommendation	Requested Budget	IT Portion of Budget	Urgency Score	Gated Funding Recommendation
CTS - Enterprise Cloud Computing	0.83	1	Fully Fund	4,333,000	4,333,000	Level 3	No
ELUHO - ELUHO New Case Management System	0.78	2	Fully Fund	145,000	145,289	Level 3	Yes
ECY - Improved Stream Mapping	0.77	3	Fully Fund	901,000	900,614	Level 2	No
LCB - Modernization of Regulatory Systems	0.77	4	Fully Fund	17,450,000	19,514,686	Level 3	Yes
DOH - HELMS Project Budget	0.76	5	Fund with Considerations	6,257,000	6,500,000	Level 3	Yes
PARKS - Outward Facing Website	0.75	6	Fully Fund	561,000	561,000	Level 2	No
DSHS - SILAS Leave Attendance Scheduling	0.75	7	Fully Fund	10,631,000	5,827,000	Level 4	Yes
ATG - Legal Case Management Infrastructure	0.74	8	Fully Fund	2,136,000	2,136,000	Level 2	No
CTS - Washington Enterprise Architecture	0.72	9	Fully Fund	1,153,000	1,153,000	Level 3	No
HCA - Electronic Consent Management	0.72	10	Fully Fund	2,272,000	2,930,000	Level 2	Yes
WSP - Operational Performance Reporting	0.71	11	Fund with Considerations	716,000	700,350	Level 2	No
DOC - Telepresence Services	0.70	12	Fully Fund	4,577,000	1,563,000	Level 3	No

Table 2 - Ranked List of DPs with IT (blue shaded items are new)							
Agency and Decision Package Name	Score	Overall Rank	Funding Recommendation	Requested Budget	IT Portion of Budget	Urgency Score	Gated Funding Recommendation
ECY - Hazardous Waste & Toxics IT Systems	0.70	13	Fully Fund	204,000	204,073	Level 3	No
PSP- Restore Salmon Runs	0.70	14	Fund with Considerations	2,576,000	235,272	Level 2	No
OFM - OneWA Business Transformation	0.70	15	Fully Fund	94,966,000		Level 3	Yes
HCA - EHR Expansion	0.69	16	Fully Fund	12,770,000	12,770,000	Level 3	Yes
DSHS - Integrated Eligibility System	0.67	17	Fully Fund	16,285,000	16,285,000	Level 2	Yes
DOH - Upgrade Drinking Water System	0.66	18	Fully Fund	1,034,000	769,254	Level 3	No
COM - SBO Digital Equity	0.66	19	Fund with Considerations	4,059,732		Level 2	No
HCA - SEBB Maintenance and Operations	0.65	20	Fully Fund	971,000	229,000	Level 3	No
DVA - Info Tech Security & Infrastructure	0.65	21	Fully Fund	442,000	50,000	Level 2	No
DOC - OMNI Sentencing Calculation Module	0.65	22	Fund with Considerations	5,658,000	5,658,000	Level 3	Yes
DSHS - ACES Stabilization	0.64	23	Fully Fund	785,000	785,000	Level 3	Yes
OFM - Statewide DEI Summit	0.64	24	Fully Fund	423,000	250,000	Level 2	No
SEC - Automating State Library Collection	0.64	25	Fully Fund	2,525,000	1,995,000	Level 2	No
DOR - WFTC Implementation Support	0.63	26	Fully Fund	3,026,000	1,743,000	Level 3	No
ATG - eDiscovery Capacity and Management	0.62	27	Fully Fund	2,065,000	1,871,000	Level 2	No
DSHS - Fleet Management System	0.62	28	Fully Fund	425,000	425,000	Level 3	No
HCA - K12 Risk Pool	0.60	29	Fully Fund	984,000	983,340	Level 3	No
L&I - LCAP Technology Budget Adjustment	0.59	30	Fully Fund	513,000	513,000	Level 3	Yes
ECY - Fix & Modernize WQ Permit Systems	0.59	31	Fully Fund	500,000	500,000	Level 3	No
ART - Replace Constituent Mgmt Software	0.57	32	Fully Fund	12,000		Level 2	No
WFTB - Career Bridge Modernization	0.57	33	Partially Fund	917,000	917,000	Level 2	Yes
DSHS - Critical IT Pharmacy Resources	0.56	34	Fund with Considerations	1,587,000	850,000	Level 3	Yes
SEC- Renovate Website and Hosting Serv	0.55	35	Fund with Considerations	258,000	258,000	Level 2	No
PARKS - Cloud Services	0.55	36	Partially Fund	168,000	168,000	Level 2	No

Table 2 - Ranked List of DPs with IT (blue shaded items are new)							
Agency and Decision Package Name	Score	Overall Rank	Funding Recommendation	Requested Budget	IT Portion of Budget	Urgency Score	Gated Funding Recommendation
L&I - Workers' Comp System Modernization	0.54	37	Fund with Considerations	15,943,000	15,943,000	Level 3	Yes
OFM - Enterprise Surveying and Analysis	0.54	38	Fully Fund	350,000	350,000	Level 2	No
DOC - Ombuds Liaison & Response	0.53	39	Fully Fund	975,000	148,000	Level 2	No
DOH - WIC Food Insecurity & Infant Formula	0.53	40	Fund with Considerations	6,178,000	5,609,000	Level 2	Yes
DOC - Custody Classification	0.53	41	Fund with Considerations	1,088,000	1,088,000	Level 3	Yes
ESD - WorkSource System Replacement	0.52	42	Partially Fund	4,843,000	4,843,000	Level 3	Yes
WWU- Student Retention and Success	0.52	43	Fully Fund	2,128,000		Level 2	No
WFTB - Integrated Data Sharing	0.51	44	Fund with Considerations	816,000	816,000	Level 2	No
DSHS - IT Strategic Roadmap	0.51	45	Partially Fund	1,185,000	1,185,000	Level 2	No
HCA -Clinical Data Repository	0.51	46	Fund with Considerations	2,052,000	3,000,000	Level 2	Yes
HCA - Community Information Exchange	0.51	47	Partially Fund	14,848,000	15,000,000	Level 2	No
DSHS - Confidential Client Data Protection	0.51	48	Do Not Fund	609,000	609,000	Level 2	No
DNR - Statewide Lidar Acquisition/Refresh	0.49	49	Fully Fund	3,481,000	3,481,300	Level 2	No
DOH - Upgrade Medical Cannabis Registry	0.49	50	Partially Fund	2,101,000		Level 2	Yes
DSHS- LTSS Trust	0.49	51	Fund with Considerations	3,070,000	780,000	Level 3	Yes
DSHS - National Accuracy Clearinghouse	0.47	52	Fund with Considerations	2,584,000	1,541,000	Level 3	No
DSHS- Infra Improv & Cloud Migration	0.47	53	Do Not Fund	1,320,000	1,320,000	Level 2	Yes
DSHS - HCBS FMAP Priorities	0.47	54	Do Not Fund	324,490,000		Level 2	Yes
DNR - Adaptive Mgmt Program Improvements	0.46	55	Fund with Considerations	680,000	185,000	Level 2	No
HCA - Trueblood Data	0.46	56	Partially Fund	1,953,000	1,169,000	Level 3	Yes
DRS - Implement Survivor Option Change	0.45	57	Fully Fund	93,000		Level 3	No
DSHS - Network Risk Mitigation	0.45	58	Fund with Considerations	6,203,000	6,203,000	Level 2	No
L&I - Plumber License Implementation	0.45	59	Fund with Considerations	560,000	560,000	Level 2	No
DFW - Salmon Recovery and GMA Integration	0.44	60	Fully Fund	1,297,000	72,188	Level 2	No

Table 2 - Ranked List of DPs with IT (blue shaded items are new)							
Agency and Decision Package Name	Score	Overall Rank	Funding Recommendation	Requested Budget	IT Portion of Budget	Urgency Score	Gated Funding Recommendation
L&I - Prevailing Wage Program	0.44	61	Fund with Considerations	2,990,000	2,363,000	Level 1	Yes
DFW - Building Salmon Team Capacity	0.42	62	Fully Fund	931,000		Level 2	No
OFM - Independent Investigations Support	0.41	63	Fund with Considerations	2,705,000	2,705,000	Level 3	No
L&I - Mental Health Claims	0.41	64	Fund with Considerations	1,137,000	851,000	Level 2	Yes
L&I - Apprenticeship Technology	0.38	65	Fund with Considerations	1,130,000	1,130,000	Level 2	Yes
DRS - Implement Roth 457	0.35	66	Fund with Considerations	609,000		Level 2	No
OFM - ECM System Support	0.33	67	Fund with Considerations	617,000	617,000	Level 2	No
DSHS - ABD and HEN Human Trafficking	0.30	68	Fund with Considerations	207,000	190,000	Level 1	No
DSHS - PSRP Information Security	0.24	69	Do Not Fund	588,000		Level 1	No
OSPI -Updating the School Funding System	0.22	70	Partially Fund	2,630,000	2,630,000	Level 2	Yes

Table 2 - Ranked List of DPs with IT

Human Services - Other

Health Care Authority – Agency 107

FD - Electronic Consent Management
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 10 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- This is a critical component for a modern, effective, health data exchange with providers and other health stakeholders and customers.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Consider a proviso that notes this investment as a foundation data exchange architecture and platform for the coalition at a minimum and develop a flexible architecture that can scale and support expansion.
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

DT - Trueblood Data
Funding Recommendation: Partially Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 56 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- The OCIO recommends this request be revamped to have an upfront Business Process Review / feasibility study, and a design and architecture phase that will feed an RFP process.
- The agency should place more emphasis on the information management/data plan, architecture, platform, and associated tools.

Other Funding Considerations:

- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

FG - Community Information Exchange
Funding Recommendation: Partially Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 47 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- There is insufficient information to support how the $12.25M costs for the professional services contract were estimated. Recommend funding for additional feasibility, planning, architecture, and design work

to provide clarity and solidify planning. There are concerns the FTE resources requested will not be enough to support the work associated with the rollout and ongoing support of this statewide system and program.

Other Funding Considerations:
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.
  .

FW - SEBB Maintenance and Operations
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 20 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- This DP adds resources to support SEBB operations but without specific outcomes and measures.

Other Funding Considerations:
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

HC - EHR Expansion
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 16 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- Strategically aligned 'as a service' concept and supports using an organization outside the state to manage.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Consider funding an overall strategic plan and Joint Powers Authorities (JPA) type charter/contract with the user of this service.
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

HV - Clinical Data Repository
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 46 out of 70

Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- None.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Recommend funding at a reduced level to support more upfront work on the business case to outline the benefits, value, outcomes and use cases. On the technical side, more architectural design work is needed to support an overall feasibility assessment and plan with a clear recommendation on the preferred solution. More emphasis on governance is needed to understand how the coalition will approach vendor management, sharing data and expansion of Medicaid data. Additional justification is needed to understand the capabilities of the "enclave" addition to the current platform and how that is better than procuring another solution/platform.
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

HW - K12 Risk Pool
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 29 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- This proposes updates to a legacy system to support a policy change versus a big strategic modernization.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Fund if legislation passes.
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

Department of Labor and Industries - Agency 235
LC - LCAP Technology Budget Adjustment
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 30 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- The project is currently under oversight and subject to gated funding.

Other Funding Considerations:
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

AR - Apprenticeship Technology
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 65 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- The IT portion doesn't show evidence of planning and appears to be largely homegrown, custom development rather than using modern cloud platform technology.
- How does this relate to the agency's prevailing wage program DP?

Other Funding Considerations:
- Consider funding only the business portion of this request or ask the agency for significant clarifications and plans on the IT portion.
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

BT - Workers' Comp System Modernization
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 37 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- This project has recently received limited approval to work on a specific set of activities using in-kind funding. It is unclear when or if this project will begin using currently gated funds, but it is likely that most of FY22 monies will not be used which will impact funding/authorization needed for FY23.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

MH - Mental Health Claims
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 64 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- The IT efforts, as described in the DP it, have not been well planned. More details should be required in relation to the request legislation activity.
- It is not clear whether there is overlap with the planned L&I WCSM project and how it relates to that scope.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Request legislation needs to pass.
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

PL - Plumber License Implementation
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 59 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- There is no modernization of base architecture or reference to alignment with the statewide technology strategic plan.

Other Funding Considerations:
- The request legislation would need to pass.
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

PW - Prevailing Wage Program
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 61 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 1

OCIO Comments:
- How does this relate to the agency's apprenticeship DP?

Other Funding Considerations:
- Consider funding the business portion of the DP only. The IT portion doesn't show evidence of planning.
- The agency has a significant amount of work requested and may need to prioritize this project against their project portfolio and make decisions on what projects they can handle.

Department of Health - Agency 303
M3 - HELMS Project Budget
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 5 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:

- The project is in the process of updating schedule and budget. This decision package does not match the last investment plan amendment. Questions should be posed to the agency regarding the validity of estimates.

Other Funding Considerations:

- With the number of modernization efforts being requested and the COVID work currently overtaxing their existing resources, the OCIO is unsure if there is capacity to be successful with all the requests this agency has submitted.

QE - Upgrade Drinking Water System

Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 18 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:

- Good justification to align with other states to a common system and move away from a legacy custom system.

Other Funding Considerations:

- With the number of modernization efforts being requested and the COVID work currently overtaxing their existing resources, the OCIO is unsure if there is capacity to be successful with all the requests this agency has submitted.

QF - Upgrade Medical Cannabis Registry

Funding Recommendation: Partially Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 50 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:

- Recommend funding some additional feasibility, planning, architecture, and design work.

Other Funding Considerations:

- With the number of modernization efforts being requested and the COVID work currently overtaxing their existing resources, the OCIO is unsure if there is capacity to be successful with all the requests this agency has submitted.

QG - WIC Food Insecurity & Infant Formula

Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations

Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 40 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- The DP is not clear on the technical solution proposed and thus it is difficult to gauge whether appropriate costs have been identified.

Other Funding Considerations:
- With the number of modernization efforts being requested and the COVID work currently overtaxing their existing resources, the OCIO is unsure if there is capacity to be successful with all the requests this agency has submitted.

Department of Veteran Affairs – Agency 305

P3 - Info Tech Security & Infrastructure
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 21 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Consult with Office of Cybersecurity to ensure greatest use of central services rather than potentially duplicating enterprise security and infrastructure at the agency level.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Department of Corrections- Agency 310

DX - Telepresence Services
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 12 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- Seems like the agency learned a lot during COVID and is well positioned for this investment.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

EA - Custody Classification
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 41 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- There is a lack of clarity in the DP and in the IT Addendum on what is encompassed in the technology solution and how it will be developed (e.g., use of existing tools or newly developed). As with the sentencing correction DP, the agency should consult with experts to ensure no bias is introduced in algorithmic decisions.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

EC - OMNI Sentencing Calculation Module
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 22 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- While the OCIO supports funding this request, the agency should consult with experts to ensure automated decisions are bias free.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

EH - Ombuds Liaison & Response
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 39 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- The IT portion of this request appears to be for IT position to support data management and technical support.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Employment Security Department- Agency 540

WS - WorkSource System Replacement

Funding Recommendation: Partially Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 42 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- Concern that due diligence has not been completed and an RFP is imminent. The associated costs are not explained sufficiently to understand what is being acquired and sufficiency of requested funding. Recommend funding for requirements, feasibility and planning to support a biennial DP.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Governmental Operations

Office of the Secretary of State - Agency 085

03 - Renovate Website and Hosting Serv

Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 35 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:

> The new solution appears to impact multiple divisions in the organization however there is not enough information to determine if backfill will be needed for this work. Accessibility is mentioned but it is not clear how it fits into the plan. It is also not clear how end users will be involved to support either way.

Other Funding Considerations:

- None.

08 - Automating State Library Collection

Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 25 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:

- Information provided doesn't indicate whether staff readiness and related impacts were considered in planning.

Other Funding Considerations:

- None.

Office of the Attorney General – Agency 100

MJ - eDiscovery Capacity and Management

Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 27 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:

- The SaaS product hosted in the cloud clearly aligns with statewide strategy and technology directions. Builds on a successful pilot.

Other Funding Considerations:

- None.

MI - Legal Case Management Infrastructure

Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 8 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Project to upgrade/replace system used for tracking and managing legal operations across the office.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Department of Commerce - Agency 103

B3 - SBO Digital Equity

Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 19 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- The requested funding level seems adequate for the dashboard but there are concerns that the data collection and data refresh components may be underestimated.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Office of Financial Management – Agency 105

1B - Statewide DEI Summit

Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 24 out of 40
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Look to make this as enterprise as possible so the solution can be leveraged statewide versus agency specific.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

1A - Enterprise Surveying and Analysis
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 38 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- This should be an opportunity for a tool that is truly enterprise and can be leveraged by others, including individual agencies.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

IJ - OneWA Business Transformation
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fun
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 15 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- This DP was expansive however it did not clearly identify the net new portions in the request.
- Recommend more information be provided on how the program will be governing and managing other agencies needing to do remediation or integration work and how all of that will feed into the overall activities including testing and go-live activities.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

1D - Independent Investigations Support
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 63 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- Recommend they confer with other CJIS-compliant agencies to determine if existing solutions are available to support this work.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Given the lack of clarity on scope, gated funding would be helpful to bring some discipline and planning.

1H - ECM System Support
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 67 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- The request is not being scoped as a project with the appropriate planning and governance discipline. There is a lack of detail and planning described in the DP.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Recommend funding be provided to perform additional planning and then come back at biennium to fund the work.

Department of Retirement System - Agency 124
RH - Implement Roth 457
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 66 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- The DP says no IT costs, yet there are allocations for IT staff, and this is an IT update for new functionality. It is not completely clear what technology the agency would be responsible for implementing/maintaining and what the record keeping service provider would do.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

SV - Implement Survivor Option Change
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 57 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- This adds to the previously approved plan with additional scope and resource needs which seems straightforward and justified to comply with federal regulations.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Department of Revenue - Agency 140

WF - WFTC Implementation Support
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 26 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- Adding scope to existing project. Would have liked to see partnership with other agencies and state data sources dealing with fraud mitigation when researching the DP.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Consolidated Technology Services - Agency 163

B6 - Enterprise Cloud Computing
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 1 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- Cloud adoption is a core component of the Enterprise Technology Strategic Plan. This DP supports deployment of the enterprise cloud strategy across state agencies. It funds the core building blocks such as hiring program staff, funding professional services to develop core elements of the cloud brokerage and center of excellence, enables enterprise cloud operations and tools, funds critical cybersecurity and network components, provides support for early agency migration pilots, and sets stage for longer term migration activities.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

B5 - Washington Enterprise Architecture
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 9 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
This work supports the development of statewide strategies and approaches in direct support of the Statewide Technology Strategic plan. Creates governance foundation which will enable increased data sharing between agencies, improve data safeguards and support development of associated technology roadmaps.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Liquor and Cannabis Board - Agency 195

B1 - Modernization of Regulatory Systems

Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 4 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- The project needs an independent review of the plan going forward and to adjust as indicated by this review. This project is and will remain under OCIO oversight.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Education

Superintendent of Public Instruction – Agency 350

A9 -Updating the School Funding System

Funding Recommendation: Partially Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 70 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Agency should do feasibility work to look for SaaS or PaaS options and more modern technology approaches.
- The agency did not provide information in the IT Addendum about due diligence and other planning. As a result, the only information available was from the decision package itself.

Other Funding Considerations:
- This work will need to align with the One Washington Program timelines in terms of remediation and readiness.

Workforce Training Board – Agency 354

CB - Career Bridge Modernization

Funding Recommendation: Partially Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 33 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- While the business case for doing something seems clear, it appears the agency is underestimating core project staffing needs, not planning sufficiently for external stakeholder involvement and needs more clarity on the technology approach.

Other Funding Considerations:
- There may be a case for funding the early usability and planning in order to support a biennial DP for implementation

DS - Integrated Data Sharing

Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 44 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:

- As described, this effort seems to overlap with at least one if not more HHS Coalition efforts. It is also unclear whether any of this work overlaps with activities proposed in the Career Bridge DP. It is unclear from the available descriptions whether efforts are appropriately resourced. The cross-agency governance required for this project is complex and does not appear to be in place yet.

Other Funding Considerations:
- The project is credible, however the OCIO recommends partial funding for FY23 to resolve overlap with HHS Coalition efforts, solidify governance and do more detailed planning.

Western Washington University – Agency 380
2C - Student Retention and Success
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 43 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- There is reference to system changes however identifies no specific project(s), just FTE.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Washington State Arts Commission – Agency 387
FS - Replace Constituent Mgmt Software
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 32 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Important need and approaching the problem with a feasibility study is the right solution.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Human Services - Department of Social and Health Services

Department of Social and Health Services - Agency 300

RZ - Critical IT Pharmacy Resources

Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 34 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:

- Business need is clear but not clear on whether appropriate due diligence and planning have occurred.

Other Funding Considerations:

- Recommend more detail before full funding on the upgrade and the performance of the vendor and contract term. Confirm if the upgrade plan the agency is following has been successful in other organizations.

3R - Infra Improv & Cloud Migration

Funding Recommendation: Do Not Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 53 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:

- Details reflect a lack of overall planning. For example, is this is a proposed lift and shift to the cloud or something else, workforce considerations are not reflected, existing portfolio considerations are not referenced. It assumes a cloud mandate that doesn't exist in statute. DSHS should consider engaging with the Enterprise Cloud Computing program to support a future ask.

Other Funding Considerations:

- If funding any or all of this decision package, consider a proviso to require close coordination with the Enterprise Cloud Computing program.

5E - LTSS Trust

Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 51 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:

- With the long list of new technologies listed in the narrative, more planning and architecture, design work is needed. The narrative notes that an online tool will be "developed" with no due diligence supporting this approach. Also reference Agency Contracts database with seemingly no awareness of One WA.

Other Funding Considerations:
- If funded, only the IT portion of the DP should be gated.

FL - ACES Stabilization
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 23 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- Needs to align with the agile re-development of ACES functionality.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Currently gated, should remain gated.

PM - ABD and HEN Human Trafficking
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 68 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 1

OCIO Comments:
- Agency did not complete all of the IT addendum so only the information contained in the decision package itself was used in prioritization. It was assumed the IT portion of the DP was to support changes to an existing system.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Dependent on request legislation passing.

PB - National Accuracy Clearinghouse
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 52 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- Fund discovery/feasibility work to confirm federal direction, obtain requirements, conduct any feasibility work to shore up estimates and submit an improved DP for biennium.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

PQ - Integrated Eligibility System
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 17 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- This initial project is in support of the longer-term effort and addresses a current need. It would deploy a cloud-based technology platform and several key components for future integrated eligibility and Coalition initiatives.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

KC - SILAS Leave Attendance Scheduling
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 7 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 4

OCIO Comments:
- Funding is requested to expand the implementation of System for Integrated Leave, Attendance, and Scheduling (SILAS) to other agency institutions. SILAS is an existing major IT project under oversight.
- Need to understand the status of conversations with labor and custom configurations of the system based on the various labor contracts and how that impacts the project scope.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

KS - PSRP Information Security
Funding Recommendation: Do Not Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 69 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 1

OCIO Comments:
- Fully support the goals of this DP and in concept the approach seems logical, but it isn't clear if the agency has done enough planning around the database and file transfer methods to ensure the desired outcomes will be achieved.
- Consult with the WaTech Office of Cybersecurity

Other Funding Considerations:
- An initial step might be funding the equipment which can be encrypted.

KP - Fleet Management System
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 28 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- DSHS found a solution that is utilized by other state agencies.

Other Funding Considerations:
- This might be an area where Department of Enterprise Services could pursue an enterprise solution rather than perpetuate multiple agency specific implementations.

DG - HCBS FMAP Priorities
Funding Recommendation: Do Not Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 54 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Linking DP to the IT work is near impossible. It is unclear what technology is proposed, it is not clear how any technology spend does or should relate to Coalition work.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Should the business portion be enabled, consider a proviso that would require the agency to work through the Coalition on all technology spend.

GJ - Confidential Client Data Protection
Funding Recommendation: Do Not Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 48 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- This DP doesn't appear to have been coordinated with the WaTech Office of Cybersecurity or reflect an awareness of enterprise SIEM service. DSHS has not been heavily involved in the statewide SIEM implementation efforts to date. Once that is rectified, it may be the agency will need to submit a DP for added resources but as it stands, this DP is for an amount that is higher than statewide costs and it is unclear what is driving estimates or costs.

Other Funding Considerations:
- In the weeks prior to the creation of the Governor's budget, the agency and Office of Cybersecurity should work to determine what of the agency request should move forward.

GK - IT Strategic Roadmap

Funding Recommendation: Partially Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 45 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Recommend partial funding and getting the agency to plan and commit to specific projects that can be started and/or accomplished during the fiscal year in question. With a core set of FTEs, the agency could begin with inventories, do stronger ties to Coalition initiatives and opportunities, investigate the Enterprise Cloud Computing office and generally plan better for a biennial DP.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

GD - Network Risk Mitigation

Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 58 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- The OCIO believes this is a needed effort.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None

Natural Resources and Recreation

Department of Ecology - Agency 461

KM - Fix & Modernize WQ Permit Systems
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 31 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- Recommend the team position itself for the future by looking to a cloud based (SaaS, COTS) options.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

KP - Improved Stream Mapping
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 3 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Good mentions of data minimization and security.

Other Funding Considerations:
- Obtain clarification on staff requests vs. use of contracted resources over the short and longer term.

KZ - Hazardous Waste & Toxics IT Systems
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 13 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- There is a strong, and documented equity perspective included here that stands out well. Good, explicit information on addressing privacy, security and open data. Would like to see more on the data/information management reporting and analytics functionality.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

State Parks and Recreation Commission - Agency 465

CS - Cloud Services
Funding Recommendation: Partially Fund
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 36 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Partially fund for the facility work. This DP contains three separate requests. The OCIO believes the facility related request should be funded. For the other two, items, while there is a good business case, it is not clear what the specific plan/approach is other than the cloud is the targeted location. For example, is the plan to implement cloud-based versions of existing tools or buy/implement new? What feasibility work has been done to answer that question? And depending on the answer, the staffing and implementation needs may be different. There isn't enough information in the DP or the IT Addendum to answer the question.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

WS - Outward Facing Website
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 6 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Good plan with a user centered design focus and strategic effort to improve resident engagement.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Department of Fish and Wildlife - Agency 477

SR - Salmon Recovery and GMA Integration
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 60 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Very small IT component in request to support the data and data integration.

Other Funding Considerations:

- None.

ST - Building Salmon Team Capacity
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 62 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- None.

Other Funding Considerations:
- There is no mention of a data platform, data warehouse, or data analytical tools so would suggest bringing in an outside contract firm and putting the data management plan and architecture in place as a first step. Recommend the team position itself for the future by looking to the market or cloud based (SaaS, COTS) options as well solutions that have been implemented in other states.

Environmental and Land Use Hearings Office - Agency 468

C1 - ELUHO New Case Management System
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 2 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 3

OCIO Comments:
- Project gated already and scheduled to complete by 6/23.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Puget Sound Partnership - Agency 478

02 - Restore Salmon Runs
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 14 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- None

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Department of Natural Resources - Agency 490
LI - Statewide Lidar Acquisition/Refresh
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 49 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- This is a very business driven program and supports all programs using lidar throughout the state (ECY and PSP with their DPs).

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

AM - Adaptive Mgmt Program Improvements

Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 55 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- Additional planning would be valuable to better understand if the requested amount is adequate to meet the business need. Since there are several solutions still being assessed, the OCIO believes it would be beneficial to think through the IT effort and ensure approach and amount requested are in line.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Transportation

Washington State Patrol - Agency 225

H5 - Operational Performance Reporting

Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 11 out of 70
Urgency Score: Level 2

OCIO Comments:
- None.

Other Funding Considerations:
- None.

Decision Packages Not Scored

M&O Screened Out

The DPs listed in Table 3 request are for M&O related items such as increases in existing licensing, increased FTEs associated with general work but not a specific project, ongoing project costs, etc. Also included are DPs with technology costs that are incidental to opening a facility.

Table 3 - DPs Screened as M&O					
Agency and Decision Package Name	**Funding Recommendation**	**Total DP Amount**	**IT Portion of Budget (if known)**	**Gated Funding Recommendation**	**Reason for Not Scoring**
AGR - Pollinator Health	Fully Fund as Written	$252,000		No	Incidental equipment cost.
CJTC - FTE Increase	Fully Fund as Written	$383,000	$120,000	No	Increase IT FTEs.
CJTC - Online Training Platform	Fully Fund as Written	$823,000	$750,000	No	Training subscription.
CTS - Sustain Enterprise Security	Fully Fund as Written	$17,893,000	$17,893,000	No	Ongoing licensing costs.
DCYF - IT Gated Pool Funding Transfer	Fully Fund as Written	$1,471,000	$1,471,000	Yes	Fund transfer for existing project.
DFW - Equipment Maintenance and Software	Fully Fund as Written	$1,022,000	$1,022,000	No	Ongoing hardware and software costs.
DFW - License Reduction and Alt Gear	Fully Fund as Written	$3,401,000		No	Incidental FTE costs (.3 FTE).
DFW - Meeting Increasing Recreation Needs	Fully Fund as Written	$3,518,000	$135,000	No	Improve existing IT infrastructure/GIS.
DNR - Investment in Agency Infrastructure	Fully Fund as Written	$350,000		No	FTE increase due to growth/demand.
DOC - Equipment Maintenance and Software	Fully Fund as Written	$1,128,000	$1,128,000	No	Ongoing software licensing and equipment replacement.
DOC - IT Reclassifications & Appeals	Fully Fund as Written	$296,000	$148,000	No	FTE related costs.
DOC - Leased PC's	Fully Fund as Written	$440,000	$440,000	No	Increased equipment costs.
DOC - Maple Lane Stewardship	Fully Fund as Written	$1,571,000	$113,000	No	Additional IT FTE.
DOH - Maintain Core Public Health Systems	Fully Fund as Written	$19,088,000	$5,173,596	No	Increases in software licensing, maintenance and support.
DOL - POLARIS Maintenance	Fully Fund as Written	$1,012,000	$1,012,000	No	Increases in software licensing, maintenance and support.
DOR - Bothell Field Office Relocation	Fully Fund as Written	$617,000	$185,000	No	Technology is incidental to facility build/remodel.
DOT - IT: DOTime Operating Costs	Fully Fund as Written	$804,000	$804,000	No	Ongoing solution and software costs.

Table 3 - DPs Screened as M&O					
Agency and Decision Package Name	Funding Recommendation	Total DP Amount	IT Portion of Budget (if known)	Gated Funding Recommendation	Reason for Not Scoring
DOT - IT: Program Software License Costs	Fully Fund as Written	$4,071,000	$4,071,000	No	Ongoing software costs.
DOT - Tolling: Cust Svc Center (Reapprop)	Fully Fund as Written	$2,758,000	$2,758,000	Yes	Reappropriation associated with a project.
DOT - WSF: IT Needs ADA/ORCA/Asset Mgmt	Fully Fund as Written	$394,000		No	Ongoing software costs and equipment maintenance and additional FTE.
DOT - WSF: Mukilteo Terminal Op Costs	Fully Fund as Written	$194,000		No	Technology is incidental to facility build/remodel.
DOT- IT: Support Hybrid Work Environment	Fully Fund as Written	$4,374,000	$4,374,000	No	Acquire/deploy equipment/software for mobile workforce.
DSHS – Leased PCs	Fully Fund as Written	$344,000	$344,000	No	Acquire, deploy and support equipment.
OST - Paperless Contracts & Agreements	Fully Fund as Written	$34,000	$34,000	No	Ongoing licensing costs.
SOS - Address Influx of PR Requests	Fully Fund as Written	$435,000	$435,000	No	Acquire temporary IT resources to reduce PR backlog.
SOS - Continuity of Critical Operations	Fully Fund as Written	$617,000	$617,000	No	Acquire and deploy mobile equipment for workforce.
SOS - Elections Security Operations Team	Fully Fund as Written	$613,000	$614,000	No	Continue funding for Security Operations Center.
WSP - Dedicated -Data Network	Fully Fund as Written	$472,000	$471,274	No	Ongoing network circuit costs.

Table 3 - DPs Screened as M&O

No IT Addendum

Table 4 contains DPs which the OCIO determined to have an IT component based on narrative in the DP but no IT Addendum. Given these had no IT Addendum, it is hard to validate the IT Budget. Most appear to be M&O type costs or where the IT costs are a fairly insignificant part of a business initiative. There are a couple of proposals that might not themselves be considered IT related but impact IT.

Unless otherwise noted, the OCIO recommendation would be to fully fund the IT portion assuming the entire DP is funded. None of the initiatives on the list would benefit from gated funding.

Table 4 - DPs with No IT Addendum (blue shaded items are new)		
Agency and Decision Package Name	Total Biennium Amount	Why categorized as IT
AOC – Upgrade AC ECMS	$200,000	Additional funds to complete the Appellate Court Case Management System upgrade.
AOC – Incr Access to Justice EFiling	$2,800,000	Provide electronic filing (eFiling) in district and municipal courts.
AOC – Implement Data Quality Program	$830,000	Hire 6 FTE positions dedicated specifically to resolving data quality issues.
DCYF – ICWA Notice Reason to Know	$3,923,000	Includes staff to support increased PDR support.
DES – Small Agency Cyber Insurance	$194,000	Cyber Security
DFW – Freshwater Monitoring	$2,617,000	.5 IT FTE noted.
DOC – Electronic Health Records	$990,000	Costs to prepare for EHR but work is not specifically IT.
DOH – Continue COVID-19 Vaccinations	$125,015,000	Includes support for IT systems (WAIIS, PrepMod).
DOH – COVID Contain Spread	$212,384,000	Includes support for technology solutions.
DOR – Penalties and Interest Provisions	-$1,500,000	Modifications to ATLAS solution.
DOT – Facilities Wireless Sites	$90,000	Increase funding for current wireless radio communication sites.
DSHS – IT & Land Use Contracts Counsel	$66,000	Increased staff for IT contracting.
DSHS – IT Security System Integrity	$658,000	**DO NOT FUND** based on content of the decision package. It is unclear how this relates to the DSHS Confidential Client Data Protection DP or how the Office of Cybersecurity was involved in the development of the DP and/or whether there is overlap with any enterprise services.
DSHS – TALX Wage Verification	$912,000	Subscription fees.
ECY – Abandoned Mine Lands	$352,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – Affordable Housing Cleanup Program	$330,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – Certifying Financial Responsibility	$287,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – GHG Assessment for Projects	$538,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.

Table 4 - DPs with No IT Addendum (blue shaded items are new)		
Agency and Decision Package Name	Total Biennium Amount	Why categorized as IT
ECY – Hanford Dangerous Waste Inspections	$138,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – Illegal Drug Ops Hazardous Waste	$1,583,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – Implement Climate Commitment Act	$2,306,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – Land Use and Groundwater	$407,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – Oil Spill Contingency Planning	$333,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – Pollution Prevention Assistance	$684,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – Prioritize and Complete Cleanups	$916,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – Protect State Waters from Toxics	$714,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – Reduce Nutrients in Puget Sound	$439,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
ECY – UST/LUST Inspection Cleanup Backlog	$1,757,000	Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.
Evergreen – Interdisciplinary Cybersecurity Certification	$454,000	Hire faculty to offer course.
EWU - Cybersecurity	$2,810,000	Add Cybersecurity degree programs, retrofit lab and acquire video conference equipment.
SAC – College Access Expansion	$932,000	Expands an AI texting service.
SAC – Predictive Modeling for Education	$400,000	Public facing modeling tool implies some IT.
SAC – WAVE Program Administration	$234,000	Indicates portions of IT FTEs needed & portal changes.
SOS – Digitize Legislative Records	$315,000	Technology to support digitizing audio records.
UW – CSE Expansion	$2,000,000	Build capacity at Allen school, portion of IT FTE.
WFTCB - Information Technology Equity	$5,781,000	IT related FTEs are noted in the package plus overall topic.
WFTCB – WA Award for Vocational Excellence	$429,000	Appears to be companion to SAC WAVE effort. DP will develop database to support award program.
WSP – Telecommunications fee Increase	$74,000	Increased user fees.

Table 4 - DPs with No IT Addendum