STATE OF INDIANA

OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY
Gerry Weaver
Chief Information Officer

Mitchell E. Daniels Jr., Governor

Indiana Government Center North
100 N. Senate Ave., Room N551
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 232 - 3171

TO: Jack Ross, Executive Director

CC: Patrick Cunningham
Julie Halbig
Laura Bauman
Jeff Papa

FROM: Gerry Weaver, Chief Information Officer

RE: Senate Enrolled Act 257 Section 2 Report

DATE: October 31, 2008

In compliance will Senate Enrolled Act (SEA) 257 Section 2, IOT worked together with state agencies to identify systems that were a "legacy high-volume, transaction processing system". As a result of this review, thirty-three systems were identified that met this definition. Questions detailed in SEA 257 were sent to the system owners for each of the systems identified. The thirty-three systems are managed by nineteen separate agencies. Based on the responses the following system demographics were determined.

Annual costs for system:

Annual Budget	Number of Systems
Under $500,000	7
$500,001 to $1,000,000	8
$1,000,001 to $2,000,000	3
Over $2,000,001	15

Year System went into Production	Number of Systems
1988	1
1992	1
1993	2
1994	1
1995	4
1997	1
1998	1
1999	1
2000	3
2001	6
2002	1
2003	0
2004	2
2005	0

2006	2
2007	6
2008	1

Additionally, six systems were identified that replacement or significant changes were desired by the agencies. Another five systems are in the process of being replaced or improved. The information provided by the various agencies was reviewed in conjunction with the State Budget Agency (SBA). Provided resources are available, the following systems should receive the highest priority for consideration for replacement or upgrades in the next 3-5 years. Additional study needs to be done to further understand the costs and benefits of requested replacement or upgrades. Each agency will be responsible for providing detailed justifications for any funding requests. IOT and SBA will continue to work with agencies and the Indiana General Assembly to identify funding to replace and/or upgrade systems in upcoming biennia.

- Upgrade of the Alcohol and Tobacco Commission's licensing system by moving to a currently supported licensing system that could meet ongoing changes in licensing requirements. Cost is estimated at $990,000 to $1,050,000.

- Department of Child Services replacement of the current Indiana Support Enforcement Tracking system to current technology improving collection of funds for Indiana families. Cost estimate for replacement is $50 million over a five to eight year timeframe.

- Department of Correction replacement of the Offender Information System to provide real time data in one location improving the quality of the information needed to make decisions to protect the safety of staff and offenders. Cost of replacement estimated at $12.5 million over five to seven years.

- Family and Social Services Administration replacement of the Indiana Client Eligibility System to current technology to improve support, facilitate changes to meet state and federal requirements, improve reporting and lower costs. Cost of replacement is estimated at $15 to $20 million.

- Replacement of the systems supporting the Public Employees' Retirement System and Teachers Retirement system, estimated combined cost is $45 million for hardware and software. New system would use current technology; improve data security and lower costs.

Response for each system identified is included in Appendix A.

APPENDIX A

Agency	System Name	Page Number
Alcohol and Tobacco Commission	ATC Licensing System	4
Alcohol and Tobacco Commission	Cody Systems Records Management Software (CODY)	5
Bureau of Motor Vehicles	System Tracking And Record Support (STARS)	7
Department of Child Services	Family Protection/Child Welfare (ICWIS)	8
Department of Child Services	Indiana Support Enforcement Tracking System (ISETS)	9
Department of Correction	Offender Information System (OIS)	11
Department of Education	Teacher Online License system (TOLS)	13
Department of Insurance	Licensed Insurance Producers (SIRCON)	14
Department of Natural Resources	Central Reservation System (CRS)	15
Department of Natural Resources	Point of Sale Licensing (iPOS)	16
Department of Revenue	Motor Carrier One Stop Shop (OSS)	18
Department of Revenue	Revenue Processing System (RPS)	18
Department of Workforce Development	Unemployment Insurance Benefits and Tax (Uplink)	20
Family and Social Services	AVATAR	22
Family and Social Services	Contract Management System (CMS)	22
Family and Social Services	Disability and Rehabilitation Tracking (DART)	23
Family and Social Services	First Steps	24
Family and Social Services	Indiana Advanced Information Management System (IndianaAIM MMIS)	25
Family and Social Services	Indiana Client Eligibility System (ICES)	27
Family and Social Services	Indiana Eligibility and Modernization Project (WFMS)	28
Family and Social Services	InSite	28
Family and Social Services	Indiana Rehabilitation Information System (IRIS)	30
Indiana Department of Transportation	Trns*port/ SiteManager (SiteManager)	33
Indiana Office of Technology	IN.GOV Portal (IN.gov)	35
Indiana State Department of Health	Agency Claims Administration Processing System (ACAPS)	37
Indiana State Department of Health	Indiana Birth Registration System (GENSIS)	38
Indiana State Police/JTAC	Electronic Citation warrant System (eCWS)	39
Judicial Technology and Automation Committee	Court Management System (Odyssey)	40
Office of Management & Budget	PeopleSoft Financials and Supply Chain Management (ENCOMPASS)	42
Professional Licensing Agency	Indiana Licensing System (ILS)	44
Public Employees Retirement System	Benefit Management System (BMS)	46
State Personnel	PeopleSoft HR	47
Teachers Retirement Fund	State of Indiana Retirement Information System (SIRIS)	48

Alcohol and Tobacco Commission

Agency	**Alcohol and Tobacco Commission**
System Name	ATC Licensing System
System Acronym (if applicable)	LS2000
When did the system go into production?	January 2001
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	The ATC has an old version of the Indiana Licensing System (ILS) supported by PLA (Professional Licensing Agency) and the Licensing Center of excellence, who function as our IT department through an MOU. It is primarily used for the licensing functions of the agency.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Under $500,000 (Annual cost estimated at $96,000, $87,600 in vendor support and licensing plus $8,400 in IOT support for hardware and storage.)
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	This is an old version of the Indiana Licensing System (ILS), which lacks the newer and better functions that would increase our efficiency, as well as ease support of the system. Our current system cannot handle on-line application processes.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	(a) Internet Services for Licensing (b) Data Sharing Capabilities
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	(a) Greatly Improved Service to Indiana Citizens and the General Public by providing Internet Licensing Services. (b) Improved State Government Regulation and Enforcement through improved data sharing capabilities within Indiana State Government Entities. (c) Improved ATC Administrative Staff Efficiency by implementing more extensive Automatic Microsoft Word Template Letter Creation and Mass Mailing Functionality available in the License 2000 General Release. (d) Improved ATC Administrative Staff Efficiency and Reduction in Record Keeping will be realized as an indirect benefit of this project, by capitalizing on the Licensing Center of Excellence Expertise when making Business Rule Changes.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	There are only a few vendors that offer a similar product without a lot of new development.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	The License 2000 Client/Server Application Software is written in PowerBuilder. All Microsoft SQL 2000 Databases are hosted at IOT on shared servers and networks. The software vendor is System Automation.

5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	Very limited technical support is available for ATC's current License 2000 Release and PLA's License 2000 General Release is no longer being sold by System Automation, Inc. Although, PLA's License 2000 General Release will remain well supported for the next five (5) years, System Automation's change in direction to a Java Based Web Architecture requires the State of Indiana Enterprise to begin the Strategic Implementation Planning Stages and to allot funding in order to remain current and migrate the State of Indiana Licensing Enterprise to the new MyLicense Office (MLO) product suite presently being sold and supported by System Automation throughout the United States.
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	$96,240 in annual savings plus one time savings of $82,800 for document imaging.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$990,000 to 1,050,000
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	More current technology, more design flexibility and ability to respond to ongoing needs.

Agency	**Alcohol and Tobacco Commission**
System Name	Cody Systems Records Management Software
System Acronym (if applicable)	CODY
When did the system go into production?	January 2007
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Law enforcement records management
1.1. Who does the system serve?	State Agency - Internal Agency Support or Tracking
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Under $500,000 (Approximately $35,000 in annual fees split between vendor and IOT support.)
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	The most positive aspect of the system is the thoroughness of the information being gathered. The most notable negative aspect is the steep user learning curve inherent to the system.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Interface with auditor office payroll; interface with new e-citation system (both are expected within two years).
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Streamline and consolidate processes
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	No
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Very - multiple vendors of similar software
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Oracle database; Dell server; field laptops and Verizon aircards
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No

6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	None - not feasible to replace
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	N/A
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	N/A
Comments:	This is a fairly new system, so replacing it with a new or improved system is not feasible at this time. Other available systems operate similarly, potentially at a much greater cost.

Bureau of Motor Vehicles

Agency	**Bureau of Motor Vehicles**
System Name	System Tracking And Record Support
System Acronym (if applicable)	STARS
When did the system go into production?	July 2006
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Registrations/Titles/Drivers Licenses
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Under $500,000 (There is not a budget line devoted just to the STARS system maintenance, but $100,000 is budgeted for server replacement.)
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Normalized database and web services allow for easy expansion beyond normal channels.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Upgrades to the system or enhancements would provide additional services or options for customers.
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Additional channels for customer choices. Customer choices are options presented to customers as alternate choices for conducting business rather than visiting a branch. Examples of additional choices we have added since this was first completed are registration renewal kiosks in Old National Bank locations and registration renewal services at Envirotest emission check centers. As we find more choices for customers we will add those options as services from the existing system.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Reducing customer wait times in the branches.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Not many off the shelf solutions; most are custom.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	VB.Net, ASP.Net, SQL Server
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No. Software is supported internally.
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	None
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$35 to $50 Million
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	There would be no benefit to replacing the system since it is less than three years old and is written with .Net technology making additional features easier to implement.

Department of Child Services

Agency	**Department of Child Services**
System Name	Family Protection/Child Welfare
System Acronym (if applicable)	ICWIS
When did the system go into production?	1995
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Child Welfare case management for child abuse, neglect, foster care, and adoption
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Public Service Recipients - Used to provide public assistance funds or services
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Functionally mature system providing for case management needs of Child Welfare. Very stable, available, and reliable system. System is using contemporary technologies with support staff readily available. Business requirements and rules are complex and require strong knowledge to maintain and enhance.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	The system is currently being upgraded to provide improved usability and functionality for regulatory compliance.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Improved efficiency for the end-user; more complete and accurate data on child welfare cases; compliance with internal policy, state regulations, and federal regulations.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Weak as child welfare systems are typically custom developed by states
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Microsoft Windows, Oracle RDBMS, Microsoft .NET, Sybase PowerBuilder
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	The technology conversion project is currently underway. The expected annual cost reduction is $2,200,000.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$15,000,000
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	See question 3.1. The system is being upgraded for usability, policy and process improvement, and state and federal regulatory compliance. A full replacement of the system would provide minimal additional benefits.

Agency	**Department of Child Services**
System Name	Indiana Support Enforcement Tracking System
System Acronym (if applicable)	ISETS
When did the system go into production?	1994
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	ISETS purpose is to support the efforts of the State Child Support Bureau and Elected County Clerks and Prosecutors in collecting and distributing child support payments. ISETS was developed to meet the Federal Family Support Act of 1988.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	The efficiency is that the system is collecting and tracking almost a billion dollars a year in child support collections and supporting over 600,000 Indiana families. The system is a federally certified system and receives 66% Federal Financial Participation. Some improvements are needed in the following: • architecture of the system • improved documentation of application • speed in the ability to make changes • ease of use, making it easier to learn the system • meeting more of users business needs and objectives networking capabilities with counties since majority of users are not State employees
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes, most child support systems have upgraded their document generation, imaging, and website portal capabilities of their system.
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Incremental modernization in order to manage the rebuild efficiently, control costs by phases and deliver specific functional and technical benefits while moving the system to a more modern architecture. (see response to question 3)
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	There are many but the main ones are: • increased collections to go to Indiana families • increased incentive money from the Federal Government • meet user needs and business objectives • lower maintenance costs quicker adaption to changes in Federal or State regulation
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	No, this is a cumbersome system with green screen technology.
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Right now only about five states have moved forward with major replacement or modernization of their child support system. They have all chosen different paths as some went with commercial off-the-shelf software, like SAP, some a mixture of State transfer systems, and others custom builds. No one is truly finished to gauge the success of the system. There are several companies shopping around a child support framework but the Federal Government has not endorsed this concept at this time.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No, ISETS was a transfer of Kentucky and Virginia systems that we customized to fit Indiana.

5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Cobol/CICS/Telon on the mainframe with DB2 database. However, the database does not use any of the relational features of DB2 since it was converted from an IMS DB. There is also a distributed environment where 92 AS/400s sit in the county with a copy of the application and county database. These AS/400s are connected to the State backbone with T1 lines paid for by ISETS.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	DCS is no longer paying for software maintenance for the AS400s but still have hardware maintenance through IBM. One of the first goals of modernization will be to remove the AS/400s from the current architecture.
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	There is an estimated savings of $5 Million a year. This is based on current yearly maintenance costs of $15 Million minus an estimated after modernization maintenance cost of $10 Million or less.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	Estimate of $50 Million over a 5 to 8 year period
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	There are many but the main ones are: • increased collections to go to Indiana families • increased incentive money from the Federal Government • meet user needs and business objectives • lower maintenance costs quicker adaption to changes in Federal or State regulation

Department of Correction

Agency	**Department of Correction**
System Name	Offender Information System
System Acronym (if applicable)	OIS
When did the system go into production?	1988
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	DOC uses the system to track all offenders, to provide a complete history of everything that happens to the offender and all activities they participate in during their stay with the Agency. Appropriate data from this system is shared with courts from all 92 counties, Family and Social Services Administration, Department of Revenue, Department of Education, Indiana Voter Registration and Immigration and Naturalization Service.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	State Agency - Internal Agency Support or Tracking
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Under $500,000 ($440,000 annually to support mainframe plus salaries of 1.5 to 2.0 support staff.)
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	The data that is collected is good, but it is extremely difficult to retrieve in a timely manner due to the complexity of the system and the fact that it is IDMS-COBOL on the mainframe. The system does not collect all data that is needed, therefore, a case management system was built in-house to cover fields that are now required but not in the old system; this requires an interface with the systems and results in data not being "real time" but a day behind.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Due to age and expense, DOC wants to look at replacing the system.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	See Above
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	No
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	There are 5 or 6 major vendor who offer offender information systems. Many vendors will build to our specifications.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	IDMS-COBOL - mainframe
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	Difficult to find programmers/analysts to do IDMS Cobol work. Very time consuming to make changes/enhancements.
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Approximately $400,000 per year. We are one of only two agencies that continue to use IDMS Cobol and therefore our costs are very high.

6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	For a state our size, cost would be approximately $12.5 million dollars and take 5 -7 years to implement. Most states become vendor dependent, which incurs hefty on-going costs plus loss of in-house expertise. A few states have opted to manage their own development, use contractors for specific jobs when needed as when doing a rewrite or major enhancement, thus keeping the expertise in-house.
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	We could combine the OIS system with the case management system which is in relational database and is web-based, therefore, giving users "real time" information. Information would be readily accessible; ad hoc reporting would be available. Managers would have the necessary information available to make decisions necessary to the operation of the Agency, safety of staff and offenders. Would be much easier to interface with other systems and provide information to other agencies. Maintenance and support would cost less.

Department of Education

Agency	**Department of Education**
System Name	Teacher Online License system
System Acronym (if applicable)	TOLS
When did the system go into production?	October 2007
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Online application or renewal of teacher/educator licensing
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Under $500,000 (TOLS is maintained in house by DOE and there are no direct costs associated with the system.)
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	This is a re-write of a legacy application. This version is meeting all of our expectations.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	No
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	None
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	N/A
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Every state has credential requirements for educators and systems are state specific.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Application is written in .Net on an Oracle 10g database. Runs on a web server.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	This is an in-house application IDOE provides all support
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	N/A
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$70,000
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	None

Department of Insurance

Agency	**Department of Insurance**
System Name	Licensed Insurance Producers
System Acronym (if applicable)	SIRCON
When did the system go into production?	April 1998
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Licensing and regulation of insurance producers, maintenance of all entities licensed or registered and regulated by the Department. Used to track revenue, continuing education, complaints, enforcement actions related to all of these entities
1.1. Who does the system serve?	State Agency - Internal Agency Support or Tracking
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Under $500,000 (SIRCON has an annual budget of $90,000)
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Centralized database for all of the Department data. The main negative for the system currently is response time could be faster.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Additional improvements are in processing electronic surplus lines and premium tax. Electronic surplus lines are companies that write high risk insurance, Lloyds of London is an example of a Surplus Line Co. The Sircon system does not include a module to process financial info electronically for surplus lines companies.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Timelier processing of monies received and completion of audits.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Not very competitive.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Web based application
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	None
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	Unknown
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	N/A
Comments:	This system is geared to the insurance regulatory environment with 16 states using the system. There is one other vendor that has a system servicing 8 states, but the services are not as complex or detailed as SIRCON provides. Other states have stand alone systems with custom software.

Department of Natural Resources

Agency	**Department of Natural Resources**
System Name	Central Reservation System
System Acronym (if applicable)	CRS
When did the system go into production?	December 2002
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	The system allows DNR customers to make reservations at daily and overnight facilities at DNR properties throughout the state
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$1,000,001 to $2,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Efficiency of the system allows our customers to make advance reservations for camping, and other facilities, prior to arriving at the property. The system has greatly reduced the amount of manual labor that was required by the old "first come, first serve" system (a huge reduction in paperwork.) A disadvantage that was initially recognized by implementing the system was the resistance met by customers (and in some cases property managers) to adapt and accept the "new way of doing things." This has since been diminished as users have become more familiar with the system.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Implementing a point-of-sale aspect to include all inventory items
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Reduced time spent on reconciliation of the accounting and revenue piece. Tracking of all inventory items sold, not just camping, etc. Integrating old cash register system into one stream-lined computer/accounting application
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	There are two or three major vendors that provide reservation and/or point-of-sale systems similar in nature in the United States.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Web-based software application, designed by vendor. Hardware includes PC's, printers, cash drawers, and battery backups. Decent internet connectivity is required to run the application.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Although a cost-analysis has not been performed at this point, upgrading from a central reservation system to a point-of-sale system would save countless man hours in reconciliation and reporting on the back end of sales and revenue tracking.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	Additional $400,000 per fiscal year

6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Reduced time spent on reconciliation of the accounting and revenue piece. Tracking of all inventory items sold, not just camping, etc. Integrating old cash register system into one stream-lined computer/accounting application
Comments:	The answers provided only represent a quick snapshot of a very large reservation system. Some of the details requested can not be provided in the short term without further cost analysis. Approximately $10,000,000 (ten million) dollars in revenue is run through the CRS, with the potential for several more million to be captured if a point of sale system were to be implemented. This is not "new" revenue, but would allow "all" revenue to be tracked under one accounting system.

Agency	**Department of Natural Resources**
System Name	Point of Sale Licensing
System Acronym (if applicable)	iPOS
When did the system go into production?	October 2004
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	This system tracks personal information and sales transactions as it relates to hunters and anglers purchasing licenses and/or hunting opportunities.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$500,001 to $1,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Efficiency greater than 900,000 transactions valued at $18.2M ($17.5M to agency) to 600,000 customers in Calendar Year 2007. Positives - Vendor is very responsive to changes mandated by customers and legislature. Real time data. Data allows for better analysis and reporting. Negatives - Under peak loads the system tends to bog down to a crawl.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	A. Some form of application clustering or load balancing B. Integration of other property revenue collections
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	A. Better performance during heavy load periods, resulting in a better customer experience. B. Reduction in errors in revenue reporting due to the current manual process.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	At last check, there were four known vendors, including the current vendor, in use by other states and the Canadian Provinces

4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Java front-end with a MS SQL 2000 back-end. We are currently working to migrate the back-end to SQL 2005. Retailers are using basic PC's with internet connectivity.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Without doing a feasibility study and an analysis of the current products available, this is impossible to estimate.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	This option has not been investigated, but a rough estimate would be $1.5M to $2M, based on the costs to develop the current version of the application. Cost could increase if additional hardware is required to support the retailers.
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Without doing a feasibility study and an analysis of the current products available, this is impossible to estimate. Some potential benefits could include functionality not currently in the system, as well as the features listed in 3.1b.

Department of Revenue

Agency	**Department of Revenue**
System Name	Motor Carrier One Stop Shop
System Acronym (if applicable)	OSS
When did the system go into production?	2000
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Administration of commercial trucking and commercial drivers
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$1,000,001 to $2,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Licensing and permitting operations of commercial carriers and drivers. Positive aspects: This system has enabled Indiana to become number one in trucking registrations (more trucks register their vehicles in Indiana than any other state); the system provides commercial trucking firms 24/7 access to manage their registration and permitting obligations. Negative aspects: None at this time.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Addition of automated processing for managing commercial drivers required physical examinations; and providing enhanced viewing information by roadside enforcement officers.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Enhanced public safety
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Few states have a system as integrated as Indiana's. We entertain three to four other state inquiries on our system per year.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Oracle data base, Oracle forms/scripts, Java - tiered architecture on Windows servers
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	DOR maintains the system with its own IT staff
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Parts of the system could save $300,000 annually if replaced.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$10 Million
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Increased functionality

Agency	**Department of Revenue**
System Name	Revenue Processing System
System Acronym (if applicable)	RPS
When did the system go into production?	2001

1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Revenue collection and tax processing
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	RPS is an integrated tax system that allows processing, viewing and handling all taxes for an individual or business in one place/one system. Positive aspects of the system include its ability for administration of tax laws for all taxpayers and stakeholders in one system; functionality to allow taxpayers to handle their tax obligations 24/7 year-round; and management of tax information covering the 1960s to present. Negative aspects involve the one-tier architecture within some portions of the system - this increases the maintenance cost.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Moving the system architecture to a three-tier environment.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Reduce maintenance cost and quicker reaction to the annual legislative tax changes.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	No
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Indiana is one of only approximately twenty states with an integrated tax system.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Oracle data base, Oracle forms, .Net/Unix AIX large Servers
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	DOR has its on IT staff to support operations of this system.
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	None - the replacement of this would cost in excess of $60 Million dollars. The better approach is to continue technology enhancements and additions to the current structure.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$65 Million
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	None - the replacement of this would cost in excess of $60 Million dollars. The better approach is to continue technology enhancements and additions to the current structure.

Department of Workforce Development

Agency	**Department of Workforce Development**
System Name	Unemployment Insurance (UI) Benefits and Tax
System Acronym (if applicable)	Uplink
When did the system go into production?	Uplink front end (data collection) was implemented in November 2006. The core portion will be fully deployed in late spring 2009.
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Handle all aspects of establishing unemployment insurance claims, payments, and oversight functions. Track collection of unemployment insurance tax from employers to use for future unemployment benefits. Also provide online services for the business community to file and pay quarterly UI taxes and review account information.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001 $3,455,959.00 for year 1 post implementation (staff, licensing and IOT charges). This cost is not included in the replacement cost.
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Integration of the tax, benefits and appeals for unemployment insurance into one system. Also the addition of imaging, data capture, workflow and internet self service applications for employers and claimants.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	No
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Once Uplink has been fully deployed additional identified enhancements will be prioritized.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Increased acceptance of the business community and improved tools for staff to perform operational functions.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Custom written for Workforce Development requirements.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Windows 2003 OS, Java, Web sphere, FileNet, Oracle DB, Rational, Spring and Hibernate.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	N/A
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$28 Million for a system for where both Tax and Benefits are combined in a single system. DWD is in the midst of replacing this application (implementation scheduled for April 6, 2009). The cost identified represents the contract costs for Haverstick/Tier (development vendors).
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Newer technologies enable easier maintenance, higher quality data and easier access to data and services.

Comments:	We are receiving requests from other states for the project artifacts and code.

Family and Social Services Administration

Agency	**Family and Social Services**
System Name	Avatar System
System Acronym (if applicable)	
When did the system go into production?	March 2008
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Client tracking including admissions, discharge, transfer and billing
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$500,001 to $1,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Permits single system across all State hospitals for billing. A negative would be the stability of the provider company.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Clinician Work Station (CWS) is currently being implemented.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	This provides an electronic medical record (EMR) providing an integrated view to critical client information.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Limited options
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Netsmart's product line is written in Java and uses InterSystems Cache. The system operates in a web-enabled environment utilizing Windows. The hardware is comprised of Dell servers and an offsite Disaster Recovery system has been implemented.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	This is a new system.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$2.5 Million
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Currently none

Agency	**Family and Social Services**
System Name	Contract Management System
System Acronym (if applicable)	CMS
When did the system go into production?	2000
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Provide the following information: 1. Tracking and reporting of 1099 reportable income 2. Tracking and reporting non-1099 reportable income 3. Meet eligibility system requirements 4. Eliminate duplicate services and payments

	5. Contract and claims payment system at the client level
1.1. Who does the system serve?	State Agency - Internal Agency Support or Tracking
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$500,001 to $1,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	System is based on older technology that has become increasingly inefficient and difficult to maintain.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	No
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	The CMS System is in the process of being retired over the next two to three years.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	The majority of the functionality is being replaced by the PeopleSoft Financials system. Retiring the system would provide a cost savings to the agency.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Enterprise financial systems are replacing home-grown AR, AP, and contracting systems.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	SQL Server, VB6, and VB.Net
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	VB6
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Approximately $500,000
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	Unknown
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Reduce FSSA systems support staff and IOT server costs.

Agency	**Family and Social Services**
System Name	Disability and Rehabilitation Tracking
System Acronym (if applicable)	DART
When did the system go into production?	1997
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Client File Storage and retrieval system. Assists staff with services determination, evaluation, and recording.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	State Agency - Internal Agency Support or Tracking
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Efficiency is good; but it is written in an old programming language and is difficult to change, enhance or upgrade.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Upgrading into an integrated case management system

3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	To better serve the users by having a system that is a one-stop shop; and to have one database to integrate various systems
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	No
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Limited Market
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Software is VB6 & SQL database; Hardware is IOT state-owned servers
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	System is to be upgraded with a reduction of individual systems which should have a 25% cost savings in the future
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$7 million for software and maintenance; $3 million for support
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Elimination of redundancy and duplication of databases in more than one system; centralized real-time system; improve database structure for increased security

Agency	**Family and Social Services**
System Name	First Steps
System Acronym (if applicable)	
When did the system go into production?	First Steps (FS) initially deployed the CRO system in the mid-'90's. However, EDS became the CRO vendor when the system was consolidated into AIM for claims payment processing February 1, 2006.
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	This copy of the FS/CRO database is utilized by the Agency for Federal and State reporting purposes. As the FS CRO, EDS enrolls and credentials First Steps providers, pays all First Steps claims, performs FS fund recovery processes, and is the repository for all family, child and case management functions.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Relatively inefficient, due to wide discrepancies in the business rules and federal programmatic requirements governing OMPP and First Steps. While the move to EDS projected reduced costs to the State via joint utilization of AIM for claims processing and provider enrollment functions, the afore-mentioned discrepancies proved, upon implementation, to be markedly inefficient. Great amounts of time and effort have been put forth by both the Program and EDS to remedy these systemic limitations, to little avail.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes

3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Regarding First Steps, the ultimate recommendation by the Agency was to go out for RFS to find a new vendor who will operate the CRO on the platform successfully used prior to the consolidation in 2006.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	System can again run in an environment which successfully marries its IT processes with Federal and State rule and law.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	The market for Early Intervention/FS data services is large, consisting of every State, many larger cities, and all US territories. There are only a handful of vendors now serving this market.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	The system's platform is windows, Unix, and Oracle using PowerBuilder, C, .Net, Java, LBMS and Cobol.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	The infrastructure of the IndianaAIM system is supported solely by the vendor. The infrastructure exclusive to the First Steps CRO will not be supported by EDS in the future, as they will be converted to a new vendor in late 2008/early 2009.
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Monthly operational cost with EDS (including mod pool) = $120,000/month. Monthly operational cost with New Vendor (including mod pool) = $107,000/month. Monthly savings for ops and mod pool =$13,000/month
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	Approximately $1,300,000
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	More time and bandwidth that EDS can devote exclusively to OMPP/AIM. Increased FS user/consumer satisfaction, reduced administrative overhead for the Agency, improved provider recruitment and retention, improved third party fund recovery (critical, as First Steps is a "pay-and-chase" program that depends upon fund recovery from Medicaid, TANF, TPL, family co-pays, etc.).
Comments:	The system is to be transitioned from EDS to Covansys by the end of 2008. Currently the First Steps Central Reimbursement Office (CRO) system is integrated into the IndianaAIM which has a separate document.

Agency	**Family and Social Services**
System Name	Indiana Advanced Information Management System
System Acronym (if applicable)	IndianaAIM MMIS
When did the system go into production?	February 1995
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	To operate the Medicaid program for the state of Indiana. This includes maintaining eligibility information of all individuals and information of all medical claims paid on their behalf.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Public Service Recipients - Used to provide public assistance funds or services

2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	As configured the system is efficient to the extent possible. Warehousing of data, accurate claims processing, and cost avoidance of claims are positives. Furthermore, the ability to make necessary changes to the system as needed is also a positive. As for the negatives, real time coordination of benefits cannot be implemented at this time. As for the negatives, real time coordination of benefits cannot be implemented at this time.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Improved ability to implement claims processing for multiple programs. Improved ability to make changes through configuration instead of customized coding. Replace claims processing LBMS engine with a Rules engine.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Cost savings to the state.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	The market has a finite list of competitors that traditionally bid on this type of business. EDS is the current vendor for the MMIS in the State of Indiana. EDS holds the major shares in the Medicaid program market and is considered as the market lead for Medicaid business.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	The system's platforms are Windows (using PowerBuilder) and Unix (using C, .NET, Java, LBMS, and COBOL). Oracle is the system DBMS.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	The infrastructure of the IndianaAIM system is supported solely by the vendor (EDS currently)
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Discussions have occurred regarding system upgrade from distributed windows desktop app to web app along with MITA compliance. Since IndianaAIM is a very complex and large system, further research and analysis effort are needed to provide high level and detail cost saving information.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	Not available at this time. Given the system complexity and wide range of business impact, the replacement effort will be very expensive.

6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	MITA compliance is to meet the CMS's intention to foster integrated business and IT transformation across the Medicaid enterprise to improve the administration of the Medicaid program. Through MITA initiative, IndianaAIM will be based on the national framework to better support improved systems development and health care management for the State of Indiana Medicaid business. Moving towards a web-based application will help to align with the service-oriented architecture framework at a thin client fashion. It will help to minimize the system maintenance effort resulted from the software upgrades. It requires little or no disk space on the client, upgrade automatically with new features; integrates easily into other web procedures, such as email and searching. They also provide cross-platform compatibility because they operate within a web browser window.
Comments:	Recently, EDS was awarded for a 6-year contract for MMIS system maintenance and modification. All access to, disclosure of, and uses of personal information maintained by OMPP and its contractors are subject to the federal requirements of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). OMPP has developed detailed policies and procedures and has trained all staff in these policies and procedures. All personal information is protected and can only be used for the functions necessary to provided health care coverage for eligible persons.

Agency	**Family and Social Services**
System Name	Indiana Client Eligibility System
System Acronym (if applicable)	ICES
When did the system go into production?	1992
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	ICES is a FAMIS certified, online, automated system which supports worker activities in administering assistance programs. ICES automates the five major public assistance programs administered by Indiana: TANF, Medicaid, Food Stamps, Refugee Assistance, and JOBS/IMPACT.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Public Service Recipients - Used to provide public assistance funds or services
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	The efficiency is based on the stable performance by the system. Positives: Stable, fast response time for the size, knowledgeable support staff, data accuracy Negatives: Older technology can be costly to support and enhance; the support base of older technologies is diminishing
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Replace ICES completely

3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Easier to maintain and support. Faster turnaround for enhancements Easier to implement new State and Federal programs or mandates Easier reporting Ample support staff available Support with fewer staff Lower infrastructure and mainframe costs
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	No
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	There is no market for this type of system.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	IMS-DC/IMS-DB, DB2, Cognos
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	At least a 20% cost reduction
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$15-$20 Million
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Easier to maintain and support. Faster turnaround for enhancements Easier to implement new State/Federal programs/mandates Easier reporting Ample support staff available Support with fewer staff Lower infrastructure and mainframe costs
Comments:	The process has begun to identify the strategy and technology to replace ICES. Tentative target to develop a roadmap is 1/15/09.

Agency	**Family and Social Services**
System Name	Indiana Eligibility and Modernization Project
System Acronym (if applicable)	WFMS
When did the system go into production?	October 2007
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	WFMS (workflow management system) used to facilitate process based case work rather than case worker based; also provides electronic case file creation
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001 - The system is part of an overall contract for services, so the exact cost for the system is not identified separately.
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	The system allows for process based case management, rather than by caseworker, as well, it allows for workload balancing across the state, electronic case files, and minute by minute data based productivity monitoring.

3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	All ICES non-core functions
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Ease of ICES migration, Better operations
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Limited
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	CURAM/DB2/WebSphere
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	N/A
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	N/A
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	There are none. WFMS has recently modernized business processes and enhanced a legacy system
Comments:	As noted, the WFMS system is not quoted discretely, rather is used to implement the Services contracted for.

Agency	**Family and Social Services**
System Name	INsite
System Acronym (if applicable)	INsite
When did the system go into production?	1993
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Client files storage and retrieval system. Assists staff with services determination, evaluation and recording.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$500,001 to $1,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Efficiency is good, but it is written in an old programming language and is difficult to change, enhance or upgrade. Negatives include the use of underlying FoxPro database it is not a real-time system requires data transfers from case management entities into the State's central system. A positive is that agencies and staff are familiar with its operation and are fairly efficient at completing their various case management tasks.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Upgrading into an integrated case management system

3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	To better serve the users by having a system that is a one-stop shop; To have one database to integrate various systems
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	No
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Limited market
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Software is Visual FoxPro; Hardware includes IOT servers and approximately 25 servers owned by case management entities.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	System is to be upgraded with a reduction of individual case management systems which should have a 25% cost savings in the future
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$7 million for software and maintenance and $3 million for support
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Elimination of redundancy or duplication of databases in more than one system; Centralized real-time system; Improved database structure for increased security and elimination of database size constraints

Agency	**Family and Social Services Administration**
System Name	Indiana Rehabilitation Information System
System Acronym (if applicable)	IRIS
When did the system go into production?	October 2001
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Client File Storage and retrieval system. System is used to fulfill federal statutory reporting requirements. Provides case management functions. Processes and tracks service provision and fiscal transactions. Provides management reporting for administrative decision-making; and reporting tools for all staff levels in performance of job duties.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$1,000,001 to $2,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Almost all data required for case management, reporting and fiscal processing is on-line, real-time. However, some data is received from external sources in paper form (such as medical records, etc.), requiring paper case files to be maintained. Also, documents with signatures are maintained in the paper case files. The external data could be imaged in order for it to be available on-line, and with proper approvals electronic signatures could be captured and the signed documents stored as images in the system, thereby eliminating the need for paper case files and associated records management functions and costs. The current paper-driven processes are fairly slow and expensive due to having to wait on and move paperwork for signature to various locations.

3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Document Imaging Storage and Application Program Interface (this project is in progress). Also, the conversion from unsupported VB6 to .NET should be completed, thereby enabling the system to become web-based. Currently, the system *appears* to be web-based to users, because it can be accessed via any high speed internet access web browser, but in reality it runs on Citrix servers.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	See item 3.1.b and item 2. Note that Item 2 costs will be high in SFY2009 because significant investments are underway to implement the improvements mentioned in 3.1b. These improvements will enable a 'paperless' system with significant per annum cost savings associated with the paper files and records management, and will realize major improvements in regards to streamlined business processes and data share opportunities with other FSSA partners.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	There are vendors who market commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) systems that are specifically built for Vocational Rehabilitation Services due to complex federal reporting requirements. There are also other COTS systems for case management that are more generic in nature. So, it is a fairly competitive market. The IRIS system is a COTS product specifically built for Vocational Rehabilitation Services.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	SW: database = SQL Server 2005, application language = VB6 + .NET hybrid and Crystal Reports 11. HW: The database has been on clustered database servers since 2001 allowing switchover capability if one server fails. The application runs on a farm of several Citrix servers, allowing for centralized executable release deployment and thin client (I/O). Both the database servers and the Citrix servers are now maintained by IOT.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	Yes, VB6 is no longer supported. Therefore, the VB6 code is gradually being converted to .NET and all new enhancements are implemented in .NET.
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Since the replacement system and its annual maintenance and enhancement costs have not been identified, there is no basis for comparison. The technology platform has not been an issue to end users, other than sporadic problems with sluggish network response time and very infrequent SAN outages, which are outside of the system's control. The costs associated with VB6 conversion to .NET would no longer be needed, but to date these costs have been minimal and are rolled in with other enhancements for the affected modules.

6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	Insufficient time is available to provide detailed analysis of replacement costs, but an estimated cost is approximately $5,250,000. The cost of the original base COTS and the modifications associated with the original implementation was approximately $2,500,000 in 2001. Significant additional enhancements have been made since that time which would be required in the replacement system.
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	For a straight system replacement for Vocational Rehabilitation Services only, there are no particular anticipated benefits associated with replacing the system other than the assumed removal of the remaining unsupported VB6 code and web enablement (though the only users are Vocational Rehabilitation Services staff). From the business perspective, it's anticipated that it would be difficult to replace existing functionality adequately and that current successful business processes would be disrupted and perhaps unsupported.
Comments:	A replacement system is not desired by the business unit at this time, as the current system provides robust functionality. Significant specialized functionality has been added to IRIS over the last few years which have realized millions of dollars of savings per annum in client service provision. These would need to be reconstructed in a replacement system. Likewise, the IRIS COTS which was purchased was written to meet Vocational Rehabilitations Services specific federal reporting needs, and these would need to be carefully reconstructed. The current system supports business processes which have undergone significant redesign in last few years, and it is unknown if a replacement system would do the same or if the reverse would be true and the business processes would need to be significantly modified in order to accommodate a replacement system.

Indiana Department of Transportation

Agency	**Indiana Department of Transportation**
System Name	Trns•port
System Acronym (if applicable)	TPLC/SiteManager
When did the system go into production?	Trns•port 4-1-1993 and SiteManager 7-13-2007
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Supported activities include management-level decision support, project cost estimate and proposal preparation, bid letting and award management, and construction contract management. This includes consultants, contractors and all other MPO/LPA's online with various modules of C/S. (i.e. 2009 SiteXchange to enables contractors to enter subcontractor information once a contract is awarded)
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$500,001 to $1,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Automation of the total contract management process has shown reduction in person-hours within the following business areas; accounting, material, contracts and construction. With the implementation of SiteManager, the follow year 2008-2009 should start showing return on investment in the close out process of contract, well below the 180 days required. The audit process for final payment to the consultants and contractors should significantly improve as well.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	No
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Web Trns•port is the name of a large initiative to move the Trns•port suite from a series of client/server modules to a web environment (web Trns•port). One of the major practical issues with the current client/server Trns•port system is that it requires programs to be installed on each user's computer, resulting in significant system management efforts.

3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Replacing the user interface tier with a web-based interface would be a valuable advance but requires a large effort and would have to be repeated in a few years as new requirements arise. A goal of the Web Trns•port initiative is to change the system to a services-based architecture that will result in a loosely coupled, more flexible system. This will make offering a web-based user interface easier and transitioning to future platforms easier. The Web Trns•port initiative is a multi-phased series of Agile development projects. This approach will deliver solutions that reduce agency Total Cost of Ownership as soon as possible. During the course of these projects, the web Trns•port architecture will be implemented and the business, data, and security models will be unified. Functional enhancements such as those previously envisioned for the rewrite of the BAMS/DSS module and expansion of materials management and field data collection capabilities will be considered under the umbrella of Web Trns•port.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	The market is not very competitive for this type of system.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes, forty- five other states use this system.
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Three tiered Client Server/PC base and Window NT server, moving to .NET
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	None
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$10 to $15 million dollars for joint application development
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	None

Indiana Office of Technology

Agency	**Indiana Office of Technology**
System Name	IN.GOV Portal
System Acronym (if applicable)	IN.gov
When did the system go into production?	1995
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	It is a central website through which a wide range of government services can be accessed. Many of the services are provided free of charge to the state and its constituents.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	The efficiency of the system is mainly the automation of a few hundred services. The positive is the system is a self-funded business model that allows government agencies to offer services without using upfront taxpayer funds. IOT collects a nominal transaction fee for a limited number of high-volume applications to cover the costs of building and managing online services.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Shared solutions leveraged by multiple agencies to improve services and reduce costs per agency.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	A single face of state government would have a very large impact on our constituents. It would increase transparency of state government to our constituents, decrease costs in agencies through automation of manual processes and increase revenue by making services and payment of services seamless.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Generally speaking not competitive for a complete solution. There are organizations that offer services that would handle different pieces of the service. There are three solutions providers; our current vendor is clearly the leader in this market.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	OS -->Unix mainly Solaris, Linux - Red Hat, Microsoft and Apache. Hardware--> Sun Microsystems, Dell, Neap, Barracuda, HP, Overland, CISCO, Gateway, F5 Applications --> Java and .Net, Asp, Asp.net HTML --> Red Dot
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	Firewalls and switches are managed by N-Frame
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Many of the services with the IN.gov portal could be managed internally or by another vendor. Some of the benefits would be financial, but an assessment would need to be completed to understand the real value.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$3 to $5 Million to make improvements to several older applications and add some solutions that integrate multiple

	agency functions.
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Improvement to service levels, more standardized applications available to system users.

Indiana State Department of Health

Agency	**Indiana State Department of Health**
System Name	Agency Claims Administration Processing System
System Acronym (if applicable)	ACAPS
When did the system go into production?	January 2004
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	• Eligibility tracking, • Processing and determination • Service provider enrollment and tracking • Accepting electronic and paper claims submissions, tracking and maintaining claims history • Processing claims for appropriate level of payment • tracking and issuance of prior authorization for claims • Automated system for submission of claim voucher to the Auditor of the State's office through the ISDH Finance Division • Administrative reporting system to support program operations
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$500,001 to $1,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Phase one web based automation system will handle the online claims direct entry, eligibility verification, claims status and print EOP. Phase two reevaluation completion, provider Status, provider Agreement, request new PA, inquiry PA status, general contract information, request /receiving information modules. The System has been designed and implemented in house for Indiana State Department of Health and will have less in maintenance cost.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Web based automation system to handle the online claims direct entry , eligibility verification , claims status, and print EOP
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Web based system will reduce the administrative costs overhead for the program
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Very Competitive
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Software : Oracle Application Server 10g R2, Oracle database 10g R2 , Oracle Database RAC environment, Oracle Apex, DRG Grouper Software, IBM WebSphere Transformation Extender, Teleforms, Swiftview, Quest Toad Software OS : Windows Advance server 2003. Hardware : Dell Servers 6850, 2690

5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	N/A
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$10 Million
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	N/A

Agency	**Indiana State Department of Health**
System Name	Indiana Birth Registration System (IBRS)
System Acronym (if applicable)	GENSIS
When did the system go into production?	January 2007
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	To register and track vital events in the State of Indiana and issue certificate request.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$500,001 to $1,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	The registration of Indiana births are being registered and received by the National Center of Health Statistics in nine days
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Interface with other computer based health systems and those agencies with a legitimate need for investigation.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	The impact would reduce the number of staff members needed to respond to data request and the manual process of providing copies.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	There are seven known vendors that provide electronic vital records registration systems including the ISDH's contracted vendor.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Oracle Database, VB6 and internet application in Windows
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	If this system was replaced by one developed internally the state could realize communication efficiencies and a probable cost saving but at an unspecified amount.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$1 Million
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Replacing the system with a system that the state would own would provide the opportunity to grant approved limited access to state and federal agencies.

Judicial Technology and Automation Committee

Agency	**Judicial Technology and Automation Committee**
System Name	Electronic Citation and Warning System
System Acronym (if applicable)	eCWS
When did the system go into production?	The laptop application went into production in November 2007. The Central Repository went into production in December 2007. The handheld application will be available in October 2008.
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	Used for law enforcement for ticketing and court case management of tickets. The Indiana State Police use eCWS. Excise, DNR and Gaming have also expressed an interest in using it.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	State Agency - Internal Agency Support or Tracking
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	$500,001 to $1,000,000
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	eCWS allows an officer to issue a 'legible' ticket in less time than a handwritten ticket. Up to four offenses can be put on one eCWS ticket. Officer and public safety is improved. Tickets can be filed electronically into the court case management system so that data is entered once and only once.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	JTAC will continue to add additional functionality to eCWS. An interface to IDACS is planned in addition to interfaces with other Record Management Systems used by local law enforcement agencies. JTAC also intends to add the Probable Cause Affidavit so that an officer can complete it without re-entering much of the same information. This document will then be sent electronically to the BMV instead of paper copy.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Both projects mentioned above would save officer time and would increase officer safety.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	The market is very competitive. eCWS was developed using several federal grants and is the reason why there is no cost for an agency to use it. The source code will also be offered to other states.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Microsoft technologies. The system is written in VB.Net and Internet Information Server and SQL Server 2005. The system is hosted on Intel based servers in IOT.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	N/A
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	N/A

6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	There are not benefits with replacing the system at this time. It is just in its first year of production use and is offered to all Indiana law enforcement agencies at no cost.
Comments:	The system name is electronic Citation and Warning System or eCWS. eCWS consists of three software applications. There is eCWS software that operates on a laptop computer, software that operates on a handheld computer and there is software that is called the eCWS Central Repository. The Central Repository manages the issuance of ticket numbers and after tickets are issued, they are uploaded to the Repository. From the Repository, the tickets can be e-filed to our Odyssey Case Management System or other record management systems in the future. JTAC owns all three applications.

Agency	**Judicial Technology and Automation Committee**
System Name	Court Management System
System Acronym (if applicable)	Odyssey
When did the system go into production?	December 2007 in Monroe County and Marion County Washington Township Small Claims Court.
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	System is for courts throughout the state for case management. The system also has a public access module that allows the citizens to look up court data. The system currently provides traffic case conviction data to the BMV and will exchange data with numerous other State agencies in the future.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	State Agency - Internal Agency Support or Tracking
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Odyssey is a feature-rich case management system. It is "person-based" and provides functions for chronological case summary (CCS), calendaring, reporting, forms, e-filing of traffic tickets and financials. It is web-based and uses many of the latest Microsoft technologies.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	JTAC is continuously gathering feedback from our users and working with our vendor to enhance Odyssey. Over the next several months Odyssey will be enhanced to better serve Probation Departments. The cost of these enhancements is included in our answer to #2.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	See 3.1b
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	The market is very competitive. Odyssey was selected through a competitive bid process in which ten vendors responded.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes

5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Microsoft technologies. The system is written in VB and C# for Internet Information Server and SQL Server 2005. The system is hosted on Intel based servers at IOT.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	N/A
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	N/A
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Odyssey is currently being implemented in counties across the state. It is provided to counties free of charge by JTAC through a case filing fee collected by the courts. Nearly all counties have purchased or written systems that can be replaced by Odyssey. Counties will therefore save costs associated with their existing systems. License maintenance fees for these existing systems can range from $20,000 to $150,000 per year. Effectively, Odyssey is the replacement system for numerous systems around the state.
Comments:	The system name is Odyssey. It is a Case Management System or CMS. It is owned by Tyler Technologies of Plano, Texas and licensed by JTAC. JTAC (a division of the Supreme Court and State Court Administration) provides the system for use by Superior Courts, County Courts, City Courts, Town Courts, County Clerks and Probation Departments.

Office of Management and Budget

Agency	**Office of Management and Budget**
System Name	PeopleSoft Financials and Supply Chain Management
System Acronym (if applicable)	ENCOMPASS
When did the system go into production?	The system is currently used by all State agencies except for the legislative and judicial branches, the Auditor of State, and the Treasurer of State. It is used as a subsidiary ledger by all other agencies, where it has been implemented beginning in fiscal year 2001 through present day.
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	This computer information system will become the State's official financial system and accounting records system. It includes the State's General Ledger, Accounts Payable, Accounts Receivable, and Asset Management functions. The implementation of this system to replace the Auditor of State's current system is underway. This system is designed to replace the numerous internal accounting systems that agencies have created over the years and continue to maintain.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	State Agency - Internal Agency Support or Tracking
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	It is a fully integrated, server based system. It will eliminate much of the duplication of effort and redundant systems that currently exist. It will ultimately reduce the amount of paper generated in paying the State's bills. It will allow the State to collect more accurate information about how it spends money, especially with respect to Federal funds. Due to the complexity of the system, the change associated with implementation is viewed by some as a negative.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	The current implementation needs to be completed before making further changes, but converting the Auditor of State's payroll system and implementing the Travel and Expense and Budget and Planning modules have been discussed as future projects.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	It would increase the degree of integration and move the State away from paper based, floppy disk based processing.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	No
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Very competitive - SAP and PeopleSoft (Oracle) are the primary vendors, but there are others.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	SQL Server

5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	No savings identified by replacement (system will save money by replacing duplicate agency systems)
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	Likely tens of millions of dollars
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	System is currently being implemented; no benefits identified from replacing the system at this time

Professional Licensing Agency

Agency	**Professional Licensing Agency**
System Name	Indiana Licensing System
System Acronym (if applicable)	ILS
When did the system go into production?	April 2000 (regular updates or enhancements)
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	To issue, renew, verify, discipline, maintain professional licenses from one of our 40+ boards, committees or commissions that we oversee as an umbrella agency. We are also providing the same services to divisions of several other state agencies.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	General Public - Used to provide or support services to the general public
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Under $500,000 (Annual maintenance fees to the vendor are approximately $181,000, in addition there are staff support fees and IOT support costs.)
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	Very efficient and flexible - fairly easy to set up new license types for PLA or other agencies - or respond to legislative changes.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Eventually we want to move to a Java version.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	More flexibility to meet changing technology and stay current with latest versions.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	There are only a few vendors that offer a similar product without a lot of new development.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	It is hosted at IOT on shared servers and networks. The software vendor is System Automation. The licensing software is used in parts of 24 states.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	This is hard to measure since there would be no personnel savings and probably no infrastructure savings. Of more concern is what happens down the road if we don't stay current.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	Some options for funding are already in place - but we estimate anywhere from $600,000 to $850,000.
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	More current technology/platforms - more design flexibility - ability to respond to ongoing needs for all state agencies.

Comments:	PLA operates as an umbrella agency administering many licensing boards (about 40) appointed by the Governor. The agency (PLA) and the boards handle about 230 different professional licenses (varies from realtors, accountants, engineers etc. to physicians, nurses and most other health related professions.) PLA also hosts the states "Licensing Center of Excellence" and assists divisions of five other state agencies with their licensing needs by sharing resources such as infrastructure and expertise.

Public Employees' Retirement Fund

Agency	**Public Employees Retirement System**
System Name	Benefit Management System
System Acronym (if applicable)	BMS
When did the system go into production?	2001
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	System is used to maintain all work history from enrollment to retirement and distribution of appropriate monthly pension payments for public employees and other funds handled by PERF.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	The efficiency is low. The unsupported technology translates to increased maintenance costs.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Upgrade to a modern technology. Increase the accuracy of the data. Automate interfaces. Encrypt the sensitive personal information.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Increase the data security for our members. Lower maintenance costs. Increase employee morale.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	No
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Moderate. Approximately 5-10 companies compete in the public pension industry.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	The programming language is Forte on a SQL Server database.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	The current version of Forte used in our application is no longer supported and no versions will be supported after 2008.
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Annual costs would potentially increase rather than decrease due to the ability for increased functionality.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	PERF and TRF are jointly working to replace the existing applications. The project is estimated to be $45M to replace software and hardware.
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Increase the data security for our members. Lower maintenance costs. Increase employee morale.

State Personnel

Agency	**State Personnel**
System Name	PeopleSoft HR
System Acronym (if applicable)	
When did the system go into production?	September 1999
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	System contains records on all State employees. The records preserve an employment history, including: qualifications, hire, employment status, classification, compensation, benefits, performance, and separation.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	The system provides for a single - enterprise wide - solution for all Personnel record keeping and data tracking. System provides integration between other state applications such as ENCOMPASS.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Additional Database support to improve performance.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Increase user acceptance and allow for the delivery of further self-service transactions.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	Yes
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Somewhat - PeopleSoft is a component of Oracle which is the leader in this and other enterprise wide solutions
4a. Are other states using the same system?	Yes
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	Microsoft SQL Server 2005, UNIX
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	No
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Unknown - The current system is at the leading edge of technology.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	$10 million dollar implementation cost and continuous support cost of $2.5 million annually.
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	No known benefits of system replacement at this time.

Teachers Retirement Fund

Agency	**Teachers Retirement Fund**
System Name	State of Indiana Retirement Information System
System Acronym (if applicable)	SIRIS
When did the system go into production?	Partially implemented in 2001 and a 2nd phase went live in 2003
1. What is the use of the system by state agency? (primary function)	System is used to maintain all work history from enrollment to retirement and distribution of appropriate monthly pension payments for teachers who are part of TRF.
1.1. Who does the system serve?	Limited Populations - Used for specialized services to qualified participants
2. What is the overall cost of maintaining the system? (Budgeted amount for Fiscal Year 2009 for system including enhancements, maintenance, etc.)	Over $2,000,001
3. What is the efficiency of the system? What are the positives and negatives of the system?	The efficiency is low. The unsupported technology translates to increased maintenance costs.
3.1. Are there additional services or processes that could be handled by the system if upgraded or replaced?	Yes
3.1b. What improvements to the system would you recommend?	Upgrade to a modern technology. Increase the accuracy of the data. Automate interfaces. Encrypt the sensitive personal information.
3.1a. What would be the benefit (impact) of those improvements?	Increase the data security for our members. Lower maintenance costs. Increase employee morale.
3b. Do the users of the system find it easy to use with a little training?	No
4. How competitive is the market for this type of system?	Moderate. Approximately 5-10 companies compete in the public pension industry.
4a. Are other states using the same system?	No
5. What infrastructure (software & hardware) is the system based on?	The programming language is Forte on a SQL Server database.
5.1. Are there any parts of the infrastructure that are not supported by the vendor now or will not be supported in the near future?	The current version of Forte used in our application is no longer supported and no versions will be supported after 2008.
6. The cost savings that could be realized if the system is replaced by other technologies? (estimated reduction in annual costs)	Annual costs would potentially increase rather than decrease due to the ability for increased functionality.
6.1. The estimated cost of system replacement?	PERF and TRF are jointly working to replace the existing applications. The project is estimated to be $45M to replace software and hardware.
6.1a. What are the benefits associated with the replacement of the system?	Increase the data security for our members. Lower maintenance costs. Increase employee morale.