



DRAFT
Minutes

Thursday, June 23, 2011

Enterprise/Collaborative Applications Governance Workgroup

Room 119, Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)

2300 West Broad Street, Richmond, VA 23220

Attendance

Members present

Linda D. Foster
Richard D. Holcomb
Belchior Mira

Cathy Nott
Ernest F. Steidle

Members absent

None

Others present

Jerry Simonoff, VITA
Dave Burhop, DMV
Janice Akers, VITA

Call to Order

Jerry Simonoff called the meeting to order at approximately 3:06 p.m. Mr. Simonoff asked Ms. Akers to call the roll. Ms. Akers confirmed the presence of a quorum.

Mr. Simonoff welcomed the committee members and thanked them for attending the first meeting of the Enterprise/Collaborative Applications Governance (ECAG) Workgroup. He began the meeting by first reviewing the Workgroup's Role and Output. He reminded the members that they have been tasked by the IT Advisory Council (ITAC), in concert with ITAC's assignment to develop a technology

business plan, to look for a model for ECAG, as there is no consistent model for governing such efforts.

MOA Matrix Review

Mr. Simonoff introduced Ms. Cathie Brown and Mr. Scott Hammer of North Highland Consulting as the volunteers who put together a matrix that matches the four example inter-agency agreements to the desirable attributes presented at the May 2 ITAC meeting.

Mr. Simonoff then asked each workgroup member who submitted an example agreement to give background and an overview of their agreement, as described in terms of the desirable attributes in the matrix.

Mr. Mira began with an overview of the DHRM-VCCS agreement. The agreement provides for an automated interface between any agency's HR application and the state's central PMIS system, reducing the need for double entries. Mr. Simonoff suggested this agreement could be more generically categorized as a "middleware solution". Mr. Steidle commented that the workgroup may want to refine the definitions of Enterprise vs. Collaborative. Mr. Simonoff agreed to bring the previously created definitions to the next meeting.

Ms. Nott then discussed the DCG-DHP agency agreement, which provided IT support for the MyLicense commercial software product. When DCG merged with Dept. of Agriculture, DHP continued to support DCG. The agreement is very specific to these two agencies. Ms. Nott pointed out that it could be duplicated but not used as-is. Mr. Simonoff suggested this agreement could more generically fall into an "application support" category.

Ms. Foster gave an overview of the TAX-VEC agency agreement, which establishes guidance and understanding between these two entities in the use of iReg, iFile and Web upload as shared online applications. Ms. Foster pointed out that TAX has the overall control of this agreement and is only reviewed as mutually agreed. Mr. Simonoff suggested this agreement could more generically be described as "shared services".

Dr. Steidle then described the DRS-VDA support agreement, which is similar to the consolidated administrative functions support agreements DRS has had since 1996 with four other agencies. Under these agreements, each agency remains autonomous while maximizing common business practices. Mr. Simonoff commented that these agreements have stood the test of time, and have caught the attention of the Governor's Commission on Reform and Reorganization. In terms of a generic categorization, Mr. Simonoff suggest this agreement could be categorized as "back-office support/joint application development".

Next Steps in Using the Example Agreements

Mr. Holcomb began the discussion by pointing out that agencies are limited in what information they can take-in and maintain based on federal and state laws, and that it would be nice to have a "one-stop" approach so that citizens would not have to enter the same information multiple times.

Mr. Simonoff pointed out that while each of the example agreements was fairly specific to a given situation, when using the four more generic categorizations he had suggested, they together covered a wide range of typical inter-agency agreements. He then suggested, as a next step, using aspects of the four reviewed agreements to draft a composite model agreement that would at minimum cover the four more generic categories. That composite model would then be distributed to the workgroup for further discussion. The workgroup agreed with this approach.

Desirable Attributes

Mr. Simonoff asked the group to review the document titled "Desirable Attribute of E/C App Governance" and to determine, based on the prior discussions, whether the listed attributes were still relevant. Ms. Foster suggested a customer-centric attribute be added to show the benefit of providing the service to the customer. Mr. Holcomb agreed and suggested also a customer-focused efficiency that would outline the internal and external cost-benefit.

Mr. Steidle suggested an Enterprise Business Architecture attribute be added to support consistency with those enterprise standards.

Mr. Holcomb asked the group to consider getting rid of the "Familiar" attribute. He said that to him it is the least desirable, and state government should get away from the "we've always done it this way" mentality. Mr. Mira responded that it is important to be familiar with the differences between agencies and how that impacts the systems they use. Mr. Steidle agreed that we need to consider those factors while not hindering new ideas.

Ms. Foster asked for the group to define the "Sustainable" attribute more clearly. Mr. Simonoff defined the attribute as not being subject to change because a new administration comes in.

Mr. Simonoff suggest that perhaps the workgroup rank the attributes in terms of priorities. Based on the group discussions, he felt that two of the high priority attributes were "Expandable" and "Flexible". Ms. Foster and Mr. Holcomb both agreed that the suggested new customer-focused efficiencies attribute was a high priority to them. Mr. Holcomb went on to point out that there is a new generation of users that want access to everything on their hand-held devices and that we need to account for that.

Mr. Simonoff then reviewed the workgroup's discussions and agreed to build a composite agreement, based on the workgroup's discussion of the four agency

agreements, as well as to revise the desirable attributes, based on the workgroup's input, for review at the next meeting.

Public Comment

Mr. Simonoff asked for public comment. Mr. Burhop suggested to the group that Security/Compliance be considered as a desirable attribute.

Next Meeting Date

The committee agreed to continue work before setting the next meeting date.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 4:35 p.m.