**IT Scenario Feasibility for the  
Business Case "TRILOEDIT"   
Trilogue Tables Editor PRJ-00001385**

**Purpose:**

The goal of this document is, to analyse the IT feasibility of the scenarios proposed in the Business Case.

The output should be an agreement between Business and IT on one scenario.
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# Evaluation of detailed scenarios

For each Business Case scenario, IT will perform an assessment to evaluate and select the best solution regarding the IT constraints (Budget, Resources, Time, Technical considerations, etc.).

An alternative scenario (non-existing in the Business Case) may be proposed if no business scenarios can be recommended by IT.

## IT Scenario 1: SC-01 – "Status Quo"

This scenario will not be evaluated because it does not have any impact on the existing IT requirements

## IT Scenario 2: SC-02 – "Desktop Hardware Upgrade"

This scenario will not be evaluated because it does not fulfil the Business Objectives with the exception of performance. Should the recommended scenario (SC-03) be rejected by Business, and Scenario 2 is selected, an analysis will be required to define the technical features of the desktops that will offset the performance issues reported by the users and a call for quote will be required by the desktop provider to evaluate the cost.

The section below needs to be filled in for each proposed scenarios.

## IT Scenario 3: SC-03 – "Custom Trilogue Software"

Key points: develop Custom Trilogue Software that will fulfil the majority of the Business Objectives and Requirements. The custom software will consist of a four-column Editor and provisions to securely exchange content among EP users and the Council counterparts during the negotiations process.

Technical key points:

* The new software will be using existing e-Parliament components, services and repositories based on the XML4EP standard
* Exchange of data between EP and Council will be handled through eTrustX
* Volume (files number, files size) is growing and performance is crucial
* Mobility cannot be guaranteed due to the nature of the editor (four columns) and the hardware restrictions (size of screens). Additionally, if mobility is pursued, certain, existing components (AT4LEX) cannot be reused increasing the implementation and maintenance costs and adding to the number of tools in the cartography of applications.

### Advantages and disadvantages

Except the business point of view, please take into consideration any criteria that are under IT responsibility to evaluate advantages / disadvantages.

| **Advantages** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| XML4EP standard compliance | The solution will use the XM4EP standard for the management, storage and exchange of the content |
| Compliance with e-Parliament program and inter-institutional exchanges protocols | The solution will be compliant with the strategic orientation of the e-Parliament program and the inter-institutional agreements for the format of the content exchanged |
| Reuse of existing components, Services and repositories | Existing AT4LEX components, DM-XML and EPS Services and the PURE-XML repository can be reused reducing the development effort and delivering a more robust solution without significant additional maintenance requirements |
| Performance improvement | The solution will be designed to cover the performance requirements of the users both in response time and in handling bigger size of tables |
| Content structure and reuse | The produced structured content can store and leverage additional metadata and it can be reused by other e-Parliament applications and components without additional processing and transformation |

| **Disadvantages** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| Development effort and cost | Implementing the solution will require additional development resources and costs |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Remarks:

### Business Requirements Packages

On basis of the BREQ file (see 4.3 – [2]), structure the Business Requirements into homogeneous packages.

| **Business Package** | **Business Package detail** | **Proposal implementation date** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Business Package 1 | * BR-A: Title * BR-B: Title |  |
| Business Package 2 | * BR-C: Title * BR-D: Title |  |
| Business Package n | * BR-E: Title * BR-F: Title |  |
| **Excluded** Business Package | * BR-G: Title * BR-H: Title | **N/A** |

### Impacts on IT environment

| **Server systems/Applications** |
| --- |
| 1. Java/J2EE application server |

| **Database** |
| --- |
| 1. Oracle Database |

**Remarks**:

### IT Risks assessment

This section list the various IT risks linked to the current scenario.

| **Risk category** | **Risk** | **Probability (P)** | **Impact (I)** | **Exposure Risk (P x I)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project | Time and cost of implementing the solution within the e-Parliament 2016-2019 roadmap | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Project | Project schedule must be aligned with the Council parallel project | 5 | 5 | 25 |
| Infrastructure | Future volume is unknown and will increase | 3 | 5 | 15 |
| Security | Confidentiality of delicate content: Exchange with the Council | 5 | 5 | 25 |
| Project | Compatibility of technical infrastructure and protocols: Exchange with the Council | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| Project | Mobility enabling solution | 5 | 5 | 25 |

Probability and impact are scaled as follows:

* 1: Very low
* 2: Low
* 3: Moderate
* 4: High
* 5: Very high

### IT estimated Costs and expected Benefits

The project IT cost estimation is based on the following assumptions:

* External staff
  + Work hours per year : 1750
  + Average cost per hour : 70 euros
  + All external staff is assigned full time to the project
  + Year 2016 staffing : 1 PM, 1 BA, 1 FA, 1 DV
  + Year 2017 staffing : 1 PM, 1 BA, 1 FA, 2 DV
  + Year 2018 staffing : 1 PM, 1 BA, 1 FA, 2 DV
  + The cost of the tester has not been included
* EP staff
  + The FTE of EP staff is calculated at 25% of 1 PM and rounded up for the occasional involvement of other staff
  + the hourly rate is 100 euros

Estimated cost per year for externals:

* 2016 : 129,920.00 euros
* 2017 : 612,500.00 euros
* 2018 : 612,500.00 euros

Estimated cost per year for EP staff:

* 2016 : 10,000.00 euros
* 2017 : 40,000.00 euros
* 2018 : 40,000.00 euros

Additional cost per year for licenses of the design tool (Team package - 3 users):

* 2016 : 297.00 euros
* 2017 : 1,044.00 euros
* 2018 : 1,044.00 euros

Total cost per year:

* 2016 : 140,217.00 euros
* 2017 : 653,544.00 euros
* 2018 : 653,544.00 euros

Total cost

1,447,305.00 euros

Overview of the IT costs and IT benefits (Copy/paste of the overview and detail in the Excel Sheet IT Scenario Assessment (ITSA), referenced in the 4.4).

# Business and IT Recommendation

The purpose of this chapter is to help the PMO Representative and the Business Analyst to come to a decision by an eventual consensus. The main arguments in favour of the recommending IT scenario are described below (cf. 4.4).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Scenario id** |
| **Business recommended scenario** | SC-03 |
| **IT recommended scenario** | SC-03 |
| **Decentralisation opportunity** |  |

### Criteria for decentralized projects

The selection of projects that could be carried out in decentralised manner should happen on the basis of clear and transparent criteria.

Excluded projects from decentralisation:

IT security

IT infrastructure

IT network

IT development projects which are considered to be critical or strategic in nature

**If a box is checked the project cannot be executed in a decentralized manner.**

Decentralisation should only be considered for projects with:

a limited scope (development time of maximum one year) which concern DG specific applications, i.e. applications which concern the business of only one DG

projects which concern more than one DG should in general not be considered, unless there is a clear delimitation to the business of the DGs concerned and a clear agreement between the DGs about the divisions of roles and responsibilities

**If a box is checked the project can be executed in a decentralized manner.**

Projects which concern applications that form part of a workflow, but where a single DG is clearly identifiable as being responsible for a specific part of the input and output within the workflow could however be considered.

It should be noted that decentralised applications should be hosted centrally.

Remarks:

# Annex - Document control

## Circulation

If the PMO representative and the Business Analyst disagree with the scenarios to be implemented (IT versus business), an escalation must be done. The final decider must be indicated in the first line of the circulation table and must approve the final decision (in the chapter **Error! Reference source not found.**).

| **DG or Company** | **Role** | **Name/Initials** | | **RACI[[1]](#footnote-1) code** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DG ITEC | Final decider (in case of escalation) | Steen EILERTSEN |  | **A** |
| DG ITEC | Senior Supplier | Olivier LEBOEUF |  | **C** |
| DG ITEC | IT Project Manager | Gianluigi ALARI |  | **C** |
| DG ITEC | IT Project Delivery Manager | Georgios KOUKLAKIS |  | **R** |
| DG ITEC | PROMS | Michal FEHERPATAKY |  | **I** |
| DG ITEC | IT Expert |  |  | **C** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Change history

| **Version number[[2]](#footnote-2)** | **Status[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Date** | **Initials** | **Summary of changes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0.1 | Draft | 16/09/2016 | GK | Initial draft document |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Applicable documents

Applicable documents are standards, specimen plans which need to be applied and whose application is verifiable.

| **N°** | **Document name** | **Description[[4]](#footnote-4)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [1] | Business Case (Word) | V?.? Final |
| [2] | BREQs (Excel) |  |
| [3] | ITSA (Excel) | IT Scenario Assessment |
| [4] | Business Case Review (Word) |  |

## Reference documents

Reference documents are a help or a support but are not directly applicable (e.g. software reference manuals, sample files from outside firms, meeting papers).

| **N°** | **Document name** | **Description** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [1] |  |  |
| [2] |  |  |

## Glossary

| **Abbreviation** | **Description** |
| --- | --- |
| BA | Business Analyst |
| BC | Business Case |
| IT Benefits | IT benefits encompasses:   * Saved time * Reduction in direct operating costs * Reduction in IT costs |
| BREQ | List of the Business Requirements |
| IT costs | IT costs encompasses:   * Development * Maintenance * Support * Training * ITO operations * Enterprise Architecture (POC) |
| PMO | Portfolio, Projects and Programs Management Office |
| IT Recommendation | IT recommended scenario by the PMO representative, to launch the IT project from the Business Case |
| SC | IT proposed Scenarios |

## Usage conventions

Where a chapter or section is not considered to be applicable, put "**NOT APPLICABLE**". Feel free to insert new sections (chapter, paragraph) as needed.

**Click on the Show/Hide  button in the toolbar to display/hide guidance.**

Guidance displayed.

1. **R**: Responsible, **A**: Approval, **C**: Contribution, **I**: Informed [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Naming convention: Procedure 'Program & Project naming convention' ([STANDARDS.net)](http://www.ismsnet.ep.parl.union.eu/ispnet/cms/Accueil/preconisations/P_Methodologie) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Status: Draft, Final, Approved [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Description: Note, summary, link, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)