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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 three tables presenting the results of the OCIO’s review:

- Table 1 provides the ranked priority list of decision packages along with funding and gating recommendations.
- Table 2 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 3 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.

This preliminary report identifies decision packages and IT addendums contained in the Agency Budget System (ABS) as of September 28, 2021. An updated and final version of this report will be provided subsequent to the release of the Governor’s budget. The final version will contain information about additional decision packages submitted and/or identified for prioritization after that date.

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 127 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 127 decision packages, 64 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. This initial funding recommendation report provides the result of that analysis. The OCIO will work with the OFM to identify any IT DPs submitted after the deadline or otherwise missed. These additional DPs will be included in the final report 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Readiness</th>
<th>Technical Alignment</th>
<th>Business Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due diligence</td>
<td>Strategic alignment</td>
<td>Business driven technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance and management</td>
<td>Technical alignment</td>
<td>Measurable business outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and readiness</td>
<td>Reuse and interoperability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

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

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Decision Package Name</th>
<th>Requested Budget</th>
<th>IT Budget</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOH - HELMS Project Budget</td>
<td>6,257,000</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH - Maintain Core Public Health Systems</td>
<td>19,088,000</td>
<td>5,173,596</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH - Upgrade Drinking Water System</td>
<td>1,034,000</td>
<td>769,254</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH - Upgrade Medical Cannabis Registry</td>
<td>2,101,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH - WIC Food Insecurity &amp; Infant Formula</td>
<td>6,178,000</td>
<td>5,609,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCYF - IT Gated Pool Funding Transfer</td>
<td>1,471,000</td>
<td>1,471,000</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - Electronic Consent Management</td>
<td>2,272,000</td>
<td>2,930,000</td>
<td>Coalition Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - Trueblood Data</td>
<td>1,953,000</td>
<td>1,169,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - Community Information Exchange</td>
<td>14,848,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>Coalition Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - SEBB Maintenance and Operations</td>
<td>971,000</td>
<td>229,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - EHR Expansion</td>
<td>12,770,000</td>
<td>12,770,000</td>
<td>Coalition Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - Clinical Data Repository</td>
<td>2,052,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Critical IT Pharmacy Resources</td>
<td>1,587,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Infra Improv &amp; Cloud Migration</td>
<td>1,320,000</td>
<td>1,320,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - LTSS Trust</td>
<td>3,070,000</td>
<td>780,000</td>
<td>Coalition Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - ABD Stabilization</td>
<td>785,000</td>
<td>785,000</td>
<td>Coalition Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - ABD and HEN Human Trafficking</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - National Accuracy Clearinghouse</td>
<td>2,584,000</td>
<td>1,541,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Integrated Eligibility System</td>
<td>16,285,000</td>
<td>16,285,000</td>
<td>Coalition Governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 - HHS Coalition Agency DPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Decision Package Name</th>
<th>Requested Budget</th>
<th>IT Budget</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - SILAS Leave Attendance Scheduling</td>
<td>10,631,000</td>
<td>5,827,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - PSRP Information Security</td>
<td>588,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Fleet Management System</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - HCBS FMAP Priorities</td>
<td>324,490,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specific technology projects have not been identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Confidential Client Data Protection</td>
<td>609,000</td>
<td>609,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - IT Strategic Roadmap</td>
<td>1,185,000</td>
<td>1,185,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Network Risk Mitigation</td>
<td>6,203,000</td>
<td>6,203,000</td>
<td>Agency Governance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - HHS Coalition Agency DPs

Ranked Prioritization List

Table 2 provides the results of the prioritization activity and ranks DPs from 1 to 64. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Decision Package Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Funding Recommendation</th>
<th>Requested Budget</th>
<th>IT Portion of Budget</th>
<th>Urgency Score</th>
<th>Gated Funding Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CTS - Enterprise Cloud Computing</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>4,333,000</td>
<td>4,333,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELUHO - ELUHO New Case Management System</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>145,289</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY - Improved Stream Mapping</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>901,000</td>
<td>900,614</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCB - Modernization of Regulatory Systems</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>17,450,000</td>
<td>19,514,686</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH - HELMS Project Budget</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>6,257,000</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS - Outward Facing Website</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>561,000</td>
<td>561,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - SILAS Leave Attendance Scheduling</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>10,631,000</td>
<td>5,827,000</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG - Legal Case Management Infrastructure</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>2,136,000</td>
<td>2,136,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS - Washington Enterprise Architecture</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>1,153,000</td>
<td>1,153,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - Electronic Consent Management</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>2,272,000</td>
<td>2,930,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSP - Operational Performance Reporting</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>716,000</td>
<td>700,350</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC - Telepresence Services</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>4,577,000</td>
<td>1,563,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency and Decision Package Name</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Overall Rank</td>
<td>Funding Recommendation</td>
<td>Requested Budget</td>
<td>IT Portion of Budget</td>
<td>Urgency Score</td>
<td>Gated Funding Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY - Hazardous Waste &amp; Toxics IT Systems</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>204,073</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP - Restore Salmon Runs</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>2,576,000</td>
<td>235,272</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - EHR Expansion</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>12,770,000</td>
<td>12,770,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Integrated Eligibility System</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>16,285,000</td>
<td>16,285,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH - Upgrade Drinking Water System</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>1,034,000</td>
<td>769,254</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM - SBO Digital Equity</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>4,059,732</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - SEBB Maintenance and Operations</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>971,000</td>
<td>229,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVA - Info Tech Security &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>442,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC - OMNI Sentencing Calculation Module</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>5,658,000</td>
<td>5,658,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - ACES Stabilization</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>785,000</td>
<td>785,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC - Automating State Library Collection</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>2,525,000</td>
<td>1,995,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOR - WFTC Implementation Support</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>3,026,000</td>
<td>1,743,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATG - eDiscovery Capacity and Management</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>2,065,000</td>
<td>1,871,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Fleet Management System</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;I - LCAP Technology Budget Adjustment</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>513,000</td>
<td>513,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY - Fix &amp; Modernize WQ Permit Systems</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART - Replace Constituent Mgmt Software</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFTB - Career Bridge Modernization</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Partially Fund</td>
<td>917,000</td>
<td>917,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Critical IT Pharmacy Resources</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>1,587,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC - Renovate Website and Hosting Serv</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>258,000</td>
<td>258,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS - Cloud Services</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Partially Fund</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>168,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;I - Workers’ Comp System Modernization</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>15,943,000</td>
<td>15,943,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC - Ombuds Liaison &amp; Response</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH - WIC Food Insecurity &amp; Infant Formula</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>6,178,000</td>
<td>5,609,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency and Decision Package Name</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Overall Rank</td>
<td>Funding Recommendation</td>
<td>Requested Budget</td>
<td>IT Portion of Budget</td>
<td>Urgency Score</td>
<td>Gated Funding Recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC - Custody Classification</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>1,088,000</td>
<td>1,088,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESD - WorkSource System Replacement</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Partially Fund</td>
<td>4,843,000</td>
<td>4,843,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWU - Student Retention and Success</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>2,128,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFTB - Integrated Data Sharing</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>816,000</td>
<td>816,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - IT Strategic Roadmap</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Partially Fund</td>
<td>1,185,000</td>
<td>1,185,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - Clinical Data Repository</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>2,052,000</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - Community Information Exchange</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Partially Fund</td>
<td>14,848,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Confidential Client Data Protection</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Do Not Fund</td>
<td>609,000</td>
<td>609,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR - Statewide Lidar Acquisition/Refresh</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>3,481,000</td>
<td>3,481,300</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH - Upgrade Medical Cannabis Registry</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Partially Fund</td>
<td>2,101,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - LTSS Trust</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>3,070,000</td>
<td>780,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - National Accuracy Clearinghouse</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>2,584,000</td>
<td>1,541,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Infra Improv &amp; Cloud Migration</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Do Not Fund</td>
<td>1,320,000</td>
<td>1,320,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - HCBS FMAP Priorities</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Do Not Fund</td>
<td>324,490,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR - Adaptive Mgmt Program Improvements</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCA - Trueblood Data</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Partially Fund</td>
<td>1,953,000</td>
<td>1,169,000</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRS - Implement Survivor Option Change</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - Network Risk Mitigation</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>6,203,000</td>
<td>6,203,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;I - Plumber License Implementation</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>560,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW - Salmon Recovery and GMA Integration</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>1,297,000</td>
<td>72,188</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;I - Prevailing Wage Program</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>2,990,000</td>
<td>2,363,000</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW - Building Salmon Team Capacity</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Fully Fund</td>
<td>931,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;I - Mental Health Claims</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>1,137,000</td>
<td>851,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;I - Apprenticeship Technology</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>1,130,000</td>
<td>1,130,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2 - Ranked List of DPs with IT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Decision Package Name</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Funding Recommendation</th>
<th>Requested Budget</th>
<th>IT Portion of Budget</th>
<th>Urgency Score</th>
<th>Gated Funding Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRS - Implement Roth 457</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>609,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - ABD and HEN Human Trafficking</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Fund with Considerations</td>
<td>207,000</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS - PSRP Information Security</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Do Not Fund</td>
<td>588,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSPI - Updating the School Funding System</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Partially Fund</td>
<td>2,630,000</td>
<td>2,630,000</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2 - Ranked List of DPs with IT*
Human Services - Other
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FD - Electronic Consent Management
Funding Recommendation: Fully Fund as Written
Gated Funding Recommendation: Yes
Position in Ranked List: 10 out of 64
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: 52 out of 64
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: 43 out of 64
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: 19 out of 64
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: 15 out of 64
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: 42 out of 64
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.

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: 27 out of 64
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: 60 out of 64
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: 34 out of 64  
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: 59 out of 64  
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: 55 out of 64  
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: 57 out of 64
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 64
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: 17 out of 64
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: 46 out of 64
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: 36 out of 64
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: 20 out of 64  
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 64  
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: 37 out of 64  
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: 21 out of 64
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: 35 out of 64
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: 38 out of 64
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: 32 out of 64  
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: 23 out of 64  
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: 25 out of 64  
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 64  
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: 18 out of 64  
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.

**Department of Retirement System - Agency 124**
**RH - Implement Roth 457**
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations  
Gated Funding Recommendation: No  
Position in Ranked List: 61 out of 64  
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: 53 out of 64
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: 24 out of 64
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 64
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 64
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 64
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: 64 out of 64
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: 30 out of 64
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: 40 out of 64
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: 39 out of 64
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: 29 out of 64
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: 31 out of 64  
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: 49 out of 64  
Urgency Score: Level 2

**OCIO Comments:**
- Details reflect a lack of overall planning. For example, is this 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: 47 out of 64  
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: 22 out of 64
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: 62 out of 64
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: 48 out of 64
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: 16 out of 64
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 64
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: 63 out of 64
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: 26 out of 64
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: 50 out of 64
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: 44 out of 64
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: 41 out of 64
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: 54 out of 64
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: 28 out of 64
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 64
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 64
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: 33 out of 64
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 64
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: 56 out of 64
Urgency Score: Level 2

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

Other Funding Considerations:
ST - Building Salmon Team Capacity
Funding Recommendation: Fund with Considerations
Gated Funding Recommendation: No
Position in Ranked List: 58 out of 64
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 64
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 64
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: 45 out of 64
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: 51 out of 64
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 64
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Decision Package Name</th>
<th>Funding Recommendation</th>
<th>Total DP Amount</th>
<th>IT Portion of Budget (if known)</th>
<th>Gated Funding Recommendation</th>
<th>Reason for Not Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGR - Pollinator Health</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$252,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incidental equipment cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJTC - FTE Increase</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$383,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Increase IT FTEs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJTC - Online Training Platform</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$823,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Training subscription.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTS - Sustain Enterprise Security</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$17,893,000</td>
<td>$17,893,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing licensing costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCYF - IT Gated Pool Funding Transfer</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$1,471,000</td>
<td>$1,471,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fund transfer for existing project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW - Equipment Maintenance and Software</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$1,022,000</td>
<td>$1,022,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing hardware and software costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW - License Reduction and Alt Gear</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$3,401,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Incidental FTE costs (.3 FTE).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW - Meeting Increasing Recreation Needs</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$3,518,000</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Improve existing IT infrastructure/GIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNR - Investment in Agency Infrastructure</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FTE increase due to growth/demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC - Equipment Maintenance and Software</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$1,128,000</td>
<td>$1,128,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing software licensing and equipment replacement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC - IT Reclassifications &amp; Appeals</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$296,000</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>FTE related costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC - Leased PC's</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Increased equipment costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC - Maple Lane Stewardship</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$1,571,000</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Additional IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH - Maintain Core Public Health Systems</td>
<td>Fully Fund As Written</td>
<td>$19,088,000</td>
<td>$5,173,596</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Increases in software licensing, maintenance and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOL - POLARIS Maintenance</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$1,012,000</td>
<td>$1,012,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Increases in software licensing, maintenance and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOR - Bothell Field Office Relocation</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$617,000</td>
<td>$185,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Technology is incidental to facility build/remodel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT - IT: DOTime Operating Costs</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$804,000</td>
<td>$804,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing solution and software costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3 - DPs Screened as M&O

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Decision Package Name</th>
<th>Funding Recommendation</th>
<th>Total DP Amount</th>
<th>IT Portion of Budget (If known)</th>
<th>Gated Funding Recommendation</th>
<th>Reason for Not Scoring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOT - IT: Program Software License Costs</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$4,071,000</td>
<td>$4,071,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing software costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT - Tolling: Cust Svc Center (Reapprop)</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$2,758,000</td>
<td>$2,758,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reappropriation associated with a project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT - WSF: IT Needs ADA/ORCA/Asset Mgmt</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$394,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing software costs and equipment maintenance and additional FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT - WSF: Mukilteo Terminal Op Costs</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Technology is incidental to facility build/remodel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT- IT: Support Hybrid Work Environment</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$4,374,000</td>
<td>$4,374,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Acquire/deploy equipment/software for mobile workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS – Leased PCs</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$344,000</td>
<td>$344,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Acquire, deploy and support equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OST - Paperless Contracts &amp; Agreements</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing licensing costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS - Address Influx of PR Requests</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$435,000</td>
<td>$435,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Acquire temporary IT resources to reduce PR backlog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS - Continuity of Critical Operations</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$617,000</td>
<td>$617,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Acquire and deploy mobile equipment for workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS - Elections Security Operations Team</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$613,000</td>
<td>$614,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Continue funding for Security Operations Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSP - Dedicated -Data Network</td>
<td>Fully Fund as Written</td>
<td>$472,000</td>
<td>$471,274</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ongoing network circuit costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Decision Package Name</th>
<th>Total Biennium Amount</th>
<th>Why categorized as IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCYF – ICWA Notice Reason to Know</td>
<td>$3,923,000</td>
<td>Includes staff to support increased PDR support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES – Small Agency Cyber Insurance</td>
<td>$194,000</td>
<td>Cyber Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW – Freshwater Monitoring</td>
<td>$2,617,000</td>
<td>.5 IT FTE noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC – Electronic Health Records</td>
<td>$990,000</td>
<td>Costs to prepare for EHR but work is not specifically IT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH – Continue COVID-19 Vaccinations</td>
<td>$125,015,000</td>
<td>Includes support for IT systems (WAIS, PrepMod).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOH – COVID Contain Spread</td>
<td>$212,384,000</td>
<td>Includes support for technology solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOR – Penalties and Interest Provisions</td>
<td>-$1,500,000</td>
<td>Modifications to ATLAS solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT – Facilities Wireless Sites</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>Increase funding for current wireless radio communication sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS – IT &amp; Land Use Contracts Counsel</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>Increased staff for IT contracting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS – IT Security System Integrity</td>
<td>$658,000</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSHS – TALX Wage Verification</td>
<td>$912,000</td>
<td>Subscription fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Abandoned Mine Lands</td>
<td>$352,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Affordable Housing Cleanup Program</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Certifying Financial Responsibility</td>
<td>$287,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – GHG Assessment for Projects</td>
<td>$538,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Hanford Dangerous Waste Inspections</td>
<td>$138,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Illegal Drug Ops Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>$1,583,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Implement Climate Commitment Act</td>
<td>$2,306,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4 - DPs with No IT Addendum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency and Decision Package Name</th>
<th>Total Biennium Amount</th>
<th>Why categorized as IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Land Use and Groundwater</td>
<td>$407,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Oil Spill Contingency Planning</td>
<td>$333,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Pollution Prevention Assistance</td>
<td>$684,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Prioritize and Complete Cleanups</td>
<td>$916,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Protect State Waters from Toxics</td>
<td>$714,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – Reduce Nutrients in Puget Sound</td>
<td>$439,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECY – UST/LUST Inspection Cleanup Backlog</td>
<td>$1,757,000</td>
<td>Staffing models contain a portion of an IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen – Interdisciplinary Cybersecurity Certification</td>
<td>$454,000</td>
<td>Hire faculty to offer course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWU - Cybersecurity</td>
<td>$2,810,000</td>
<td>Add Cybersecurity degree programs, retrofit lab and acquire video conference equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC – College Access Expansion</td>
<td>$932,000</td>
<td>Expands an AI texting service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC – Predictive Modeling for Education</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Public facing modeling tool implies some IT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC – WAVE Program Administration</td>
<td>$234,000</td>
<td>Indicates portions of IT FTEs needed &amp; portal changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS – Digitize Legislative Records</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>Technology to support digitizing audio records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW – CSE Expansion</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Build capacity at Allen school, portion of IT FTE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFTCB - Information Technology Equity</td>
<td>$5,781,000</td>
<td>IT related FTEs are noted in the package plus overall topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFTCB – WA Award for Vocational Excellence</td>
<td>$429,000</td>
<td>Appears to be companion to SAC WAVE effort. DP will develop database to support award program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSP – Telecommunications fee Increase</td>
<td>$74,000</td>
<td>Increased user fees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>