*Text in italics is provided for guidance - please delete when proposal is complete*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **NAME** | Procure - Implement monitoring solution |
| **Sponsor** | Stefan Kaempf |
| **Portfolio** | ISG |
| **Programme** | Infrastructure |
| **Programme Owner**  | David Smyth |
| **IS Programme Manager** | Maurice Franceschi |
| **Authors (Business)** | n/a |
| **Authors (IS)** | Stefan Kaempf, Heather Larnach, Iain Fiddes |
| **Date** | 13-DEC-2013 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section One – PROPOSAL OVERVIEW** |
| IS Applications manage a large number of University priority services with 24x365 uptime 99.9% availability expectations. Over the last ten years the number of infrastructure components providing these priority services has grown to a level where manual checks are no longer feasible. In addition the number of non-priority services has grown over the same period.Not having a consistent or no automated monitoring in places strain on resources as manual work is required as well as puts services at risk. In addition there is very limited historic and statistical information available required to successfully manage services especially regarding capacity planning.Some level of automation and monitoring has been implemented, but not consistently both in term of coverage of services and depth of actual monitoring.This project follows the recommendations of the “Options appraisal on monitoring solutions” business case review performed under RDS. At this point it is not known if this project will procure a new monitoring tool or use already existing monitoring tools.Where possible the option of not procuring a new monitoring tool is chosen and instead existing monitoring tools are used. Only if current monitoring tools clearly do not cover business objectives new monitoring tools are being procured. Partial procurements or specific licenses may be required for existing monitoring tools to ensure business objectives are achieved. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section Two – DETAILS** |
| Not included in this project is the “Options appraisal on monitoring solutions” business case review as well as the definition and scope of establishing what to measure. Both these tasks are performed under RDS in advance of this project. |
| **2.1 Business Objectives**  |
| **No.** | **Description** | **How Measured?** |
| 1 | Monitoring across technologies and environments | One monitoring tool providing all details |
| 2 | Role based monitoring information | Ability to provide monitoring for at least three roles: System Admin, Application Management, Service Management |
| 3 | Provide both notification and on demand dashboards | Agreed notification and dashboard functionality implemented. |
| 4 | Provide historic data for trend analysing | Allow for all metrics to have historic data for at least five year. Acceptable to average data after certain time. |
| 5 | Provide current infrastructure status | Ability to see current position of measures. |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. **Deliverables**
 |
| **No.** | **Deliverable**  | **Scope Limitations** |
| 1 | Procure monitoring tool.  | If an already used monitoring toll is chosen, this delivery may require less work, but licensing and usage of the monitoring toll will still be required. |
| 2 | Implementing the monitoring tool. Both new and existing monitoring tools and ensure it is scalable and resilient.  |  |
| 3 | Configure the monitoring tool. This will include setting up measures, notifications, reports and dashboards as well as process how future services are added to the monitoring tool.The procured/implemented monitoring tool will provide:• Cross infrastructure and cross technology monitoring• Active status reporting of key metrics• Historic data for analysis and trending• Dashboard facility to provide information by service or technology componentsNotification in case defined metrics are reached |  |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. **Timescales – Milestones and Multi Year Proposals *Milestones***
 |
| **MilestoneDate** | **Description (including reason if Milestone Date is hard)** | **Hard (Y/N)** |
|  | Start Date: OCT-2014 | N |
|  | Delivery Date: July 2016 | N |
| **Financial** **Year** | **Breakdown of Work By Financial Year** |
| 2014/15 | Procure monitoring tool. If existing tool used, implementation of the tool can be performed.50% |
| 2015/16 | In case of procurement required, implement tool. Otherwise this no delivery for 2015/1650% |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. **Stakeholders**

*Stakeholders are people or organisational units who have an interest in the proposal. Stakeholders will include the sponsoring organisation, end users, suppliers, service providers etc. Any groups that will be impacted should be identified including those groups that will be consulted and/or will have a role to play in delivering the projects or subsequent services. It is preferable, wherever possible that stakeholders are informed of the proposed work before the proposal is submitted to ensure that any concerns are understood and can be reflected in the proposal.* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder Name and Role**  | **Concerns / Required Actions** | **Informed Y/N** |
| IS Applications - Production Management | Undertake requirements gathering and market engagement, working with ITI colleagues | Y |
| IS Applications – Development Services | Undertake requirements gathering and market engagement, working with ITI colleagues | Y |
| ITI  | Undertake requirements gathering and market engagement, working with Apps colleagues | Y |
| IS Helpline | n/a | N |
| Key Business partners | n/a | N |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. **Risks**
 |
| **No.** | **Description** | **Impact /Probability**  | **Management Approach and Actions**  |
| 1 | “Options appraisal on monitoring solutions” not delivered on time | High/Low | Need to ensure project structure in place for options appraisal  |
| 2 | Engagement from ITI | High/Low | Early engagement with ITI |
| 3 | Monitoring needs too diverse and difficulty to have all in one solution | Medium/High | Awareness of single solution may not be possible and ensure impact is understood |
| 4 | Cost for procurement, not meeting budget | High/Low | Ensure accurate initial assessment of initial costs, phased approach. |
| 5 | Do nothing | Inevitable/High | Disastrous Service failure  |
|  |  |  | As we increase estate overall mgmt. may get more and more difficult so we will encounter service degradation if we just do nothing |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. **Other Relevant Information**
 |
| Initial market review has been performed between May to July 2013 by IS Applications and IS ITI. This provided indicative costs and diversity of market place solutions acknowledge.Currently several monitoring tools are used: Oracle Grid, Spotlight, SCOM and Zenoss, but there is no overall structure and process in place. Nether are all services monitored or monitored consistently. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section Three – CATEGORY and STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT** |
| * 1. **Project Category**
 |
| **Project Category** | **D** |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. **Funding**
 |
| **Funding Source** | **CF**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section Four – PROJECT BENEFITS, COSTS AND PROCUREMENT REQUIREMENTS** |
| **4.1 Benefits (over 5 years)**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Tangible Benefits**  |
| **Description** | **Value (£)** | **Calculation Method and Assumptions** | **Benefits Realisation – Required Actions and Timing** |
| Reduce unplanned outages | 100,000 | Reduce outages by 5% with an average of 100 user per service and 50 services |  |
| Reduce time spent by Production Management to follow up automated notifications | 50,000 | Up to 1/3 of a staff in IS Applications |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Intangible Benefits**  |
| **Description** | **Assumptions** | **Benefits Realisation – Required Actions and Timing** |
| More openness |  |  |
| More responsive services (outage, performance) |  |  |
| Ability to spot and address service issues |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **4.2 Benefit and Cost Summary (over 5 years)** *This summary and should be taken from the Detailed Benefits and Costs Worksheet completed to accompany this proposal.* |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5 Year Summary** | **ISG**  | **CSG**  | **SASG** | **Colleges inc Students** | **External Costs** | **Total** |
| **Benefits** | £750,000 | £ | £ | £ | £ | £750,000 |
| **Costs** | £278,850 | £ | £ | £ | £465,000 | £728,850 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IS Apps Days** | 414 |
| **Benefit/Cost Ratio** |  1.0 |
| Note: costs and benefits are estimated based on an assessment of the information available at the time this proposal is prepared. The actual costs and benefits of the resulting projects may vary from these estimates. |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. **Funding/Resource Requirements**
 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement** | **Value (£)** | **Funding Arrangements and Provider(s)** | **Secured (Y/N)** |
| Purchase software | 250’000 | ISC Bid to be produced | N |
| License x 4 years | 50’000 | ISC Bid to be produced | N |
| Consultancy | 15,000 | ISC Bid to be produced |  N |

|  |
| --- |
| * 1. **Procurement Requirements**

*Where there are no external costs this should be stated as “Not Applicable”. Where procurement activity is required Procurement Office should be informed as early as possible so that they can assist with cost estimation and identify any assistance that may be required for procurement activities.* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Cost of Goods & Services****(over 4 yrs)** | **Description of Goods and Services to be procured** *(All procurement activity must be in accordance with the rules laid out Scottish Procurement Policy Handbook.* [*Guidance on Procurement*](http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/procurement/policies-procedures/spph)*)* [*Procurement Planning Guidance 2014/15*](http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/procurement/policies-procedures/planning-2014-15) | **Procurement Office Informed? Yes/No** |
| **< £50 k** |  |  |
| **> £50 k** |  | Y |