

TSB Portfolio/Policy Subcommittee

April 14, 2016; 10am-12pm
1500 Jefferson Street Building
Conf Rm 2208
Olympia, Washington

Members Present:

Michael Cockrill, Chair and CIO
Marcie Frost, Dept. of Retirement Systems
Bill Kehoe, King County
Kris Kutchera, Alaska Airlines (retired)
Butch Leonardson, BECU (retired)
Jeff Paulsen, Union Rep

Members Absent:

Paul Moulton, Costco
Senator Mark Miloscia

Staff Present:

Rob St. John
Angela Knight
David Walddon
Kathy Pickens-Rucker
Jim Hammond

Notes:

Risk/Severity Matrix Workgroup Update

Active group of staff from various agencies to help improve the matrix as a way to identify major projects. Simplify and make more effective.

Three major findings:

1. Add ability to score answers on a scale
2. Break apart groups of criteria
3. Add definitions

Triggers to bring projects before the board

Discussion around what criteria or principles should be met when we bring projects before the TSB:

- Risk level from status or quality assurance (QA) reports; get ahead of troubled projects before a project goes red, scope, schedule, budget, lose sponsor. Look at exec summary from QA prior to agency presentation; King Co criteria? Bill will share. David checking to see if we have it. If project is reporting green, but oversight reporting yellow or red, flag it.
- Projects that are named in the budget or proviso.

- Judgment by oversight consultants – triggers? – rely on them to look across enterprise for intervention. (Building trust now with better engagement, understanding expectations, seen as more of a partner).
- Budget threshold (over \$500K at Alaska).
- Impact project has on strategy.
- Risk of not doing the project, such as security.
- Amount of public/large group impact. KOMO/KING factor.
- Anything that impacts the entire enterprise or could involve multiple agencies.
- QA consultant judgment.

Additional discussion adjacent to convo around risk and severity – idea of the IT Investment Pool

Leg required technical and financial oversight.

This session, and part of the supplemental budget, some projects added to the IT Investment Pool or approved but put strings on them.

Something to think about: Combining financial oversight with technical oversight. Built into King Co. oversight process. Really more about project oversight, including sponsorship, good project mgmt practices – funding requests – done within IT and doesn't involve King Co equivalent of OFM.

There is intent behind the legislature creating the IT Investment Pool for oversight. It's a tool they'll continue to use to put more management over orgs they feel aren't as experienced or successful as other orgs. Based on the reputation of the agency and do they trust the agency's management.

We will be better off if we define the tool so that we don't end up with the downsides of the IT Pool. Not enough insight to understand the right weight.

Legislature was giving a message to agencies when they created the IT Pool. Is there something we can do to put some constraints around projects and apply them instead of wait for the legislature to tell us to do it.

Putting constraints in provides shared accountability between OCIO, OFM and the agency. Good shared accountability model would be to understand expectations, get mutual agreement on the tool, then put the tool forward.

Be proactive and give legislature some guidance on how we're meeting the budgetary oversight requirements. They may adjust based on that knowledge. May need to engage with influential legislative staff.

One challenge is that the oversight has been too subtle from an authorizing environment perspective. Need to be more diligent so they can see the proactivity.

Possible action: Send dashboard on a regular basis? Important for them to see activity. Ensure executive sponsor name is on the dashboard. Ensure executive sponsor is at any presentation of a project before the TSB.

Feedback: how are we doing in these meetings leveraging your time well? Did we get the right material to you for the conversation?

- Great job.
- A draft risk matrix to review? This will come to the next meeting. Just wanted to give you an update on where we are in the process for getting feedback. We will get it to you ahead of the next discussion.
- Provide QA exec summary prior to any project presentation.
- It's clear that input is taken and used and products reflect the conversations happening in the meetings.

No public comments.

Meeting adjourned.