# IS Applications 3 Year Rolling Planning 2014/15 to 2016/17

## Proposal Suggestion Template

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Programme | *Infrastructure* | | Programme Priority | *1* |
| Portfolio | *ISG* | | Portfolio Priority |  |
| Proposal Name | *Procure - Implement monitoring solution* | | | |
| Proposal Sponsor | *David Smyth* | | | |
| Other Contributors | *Stefan Kaempf, Heather Larnach, Iain Fiddes* | | | |
| What it is | *This project follows the recommendations of the “Options appraisal on monitoring solutions” business case project. At this point it is not known if this project will procure a new monitoring tool or use already existing monitoring tools.*  *The main deliveries are*   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 will require implementation, as roles, access and process will have to be (re-)defined.* 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 components* * *Notification in case defined metrics are reached* | | | |
| Why it is needed / what the benefits are | *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.* | | | |
| When is it needed | *Start Year: 2014/15*  *Duration (No. of Years): 2* | | | |
| Type of work | *Compliance\* / Discretionary* | Funding Source | *Core Grant / Sponsor Funded* | |
| \*Compliance Justification | *Could this be compliant? As we need to replace or review existing monitoring such as Spotlight?* | Proposal Type | *New* | |

## Estimation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Estimation Type | *Procurement* | |  |
| Estimated IS Apps Days  (see additional guidance\*) | *L* | Estimated Business Partner Days | *N/A (no partner involvement required as internal IS Apps)* |
| Estimated Service Management Days | *N/A* | Impact on other Service area | *N/A* |
| Estimation Confidence *(delete as required)* | *Reasonably Confident (Similar to previous work)* | | |
| Estimation References | *Justification for the Estimated Days and Estimation Confidence. This section is also used to provide any other relevant information the proposal estimate. This may include:*   * *Assumptions about the project approach, scope or deliverables* * *Details of previous similar projects* * *Risks or other unknown elements*   *Record as many details as are relevant* | | |

**\*Estimation – Additional Guidance:**

For 1st stage/iteration of Red Line, the following standard estimation categorisations will be used,

* Small – 50 days
* Medium – 120 days
* Large – 250 days
* Extra Large – 500 days