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# Report Highlights

* Visit the DES [IT Contracts Reporting webpage](https://des.wa.gov/services/contracting-purchasing/policies-training/agency-contract-reporting/it-contracts-reporting) for directions and resources supplied to agencies including regular updates to the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document, points of contacts, and pertinent information regarding the reporting requirement(s).
* DES rolled out a new template this year to help agencies reduce rework. The template calculates the fiscal years based on the contract dates and uses conditional formatting to highlight errors, zeros, or blanks in columns that are required.
* Of the144 agencies required to submit an IT Contracts Report, 138 were successful, 6 agencies have either not submitted a report or submitted a report with incomplete data. Only 82, roughly 60%, of agencies met the DES due date of September 1. This final installment now contains 96% of agencies.
* Consolidated Technology Services provided Apptio data and an analysis by IT tower (types of services) and cost pools (categories aligned with state general ledger accounts) to include in this report. See details on pages 17 and 18.

# Background

The Information Technology (IT) Contracts Report is required by a proviso in section 149(4) [Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5092] of the [2021-23 Operating Budget](http://lawfilesext.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2021-22/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Passed%20Legislature/5092-S.PL.pdf?=dbc2f). The proviso requires the Department of Enterprise Services (DES) to receive, compile and submit a list of IT contracts for all state agencies and institutions of higher education to the legislative fiscal committees by Oct. 31 of each year.

Consolidated Technology Services (CTS) is now required by section 151(12) of the [2021-23 Operating Budget](http://lawfilesext.leg.wa.gov/biennium/2021-22/Pdf/Bills/Senate%20Passed%20Legislature/5092-S.PL.pdf?=dbc2f) to collaborate on this report with DES and provide Apptio data and an analysis by Sept. 1 each year for all agencies.

This is the third year DES is required to submit this report. This report provides a narrative and analysis of the state’s overall IT Contracts portfolio.

# Tools

DES revised the IT contracts reporting template this year to include conditional formatting that highlights errors, zeros, or blanks entered in required fields. The template also included formulas to calculate fiscal years for each contract based on the contract start and end dates entered. Additional tabs were added to the template workbook that list the

* IT master contracts and any associated cooperative with those contracts
* A list of the 2020 contractor names
* The list of agency numbers and names required to complete the report
* Examples of contract amount explanations
* Links to additional resources.

DES maintained and updated the FAQ document and training documents for agencies to reference as they were compiling their reports. It also supplied agencies with a list of IT master contracts and the vendor reported spend so they could more easily and accurately report their use of master contracts. All documents referenced may be found on the [IT Contracts Reporting Webpage](https://des.wa.gov/services/contracting-purchasing/policies-training/agency-contract-reporting/it-contracts-reporting).

In June 2021, DES held a training for both IT Contract Reporting and Agency Contracts Reporting. Approximately 125 people attended the training from agencies and institutions of higher education. This training allowed agencies to ask questions and DES to clarify expectations. It was communicated to agencies that for their reports to be accepted, the following criteria must be met:

* Fill out ALL required fields. Do not leave any blanks in the required fields.
* Report the DES master contract number for all DES master contract purchases.
* Fill in the amount columns for every year the contract is active. DES will be checking to see if the amount columns are filled in for the contract start and end dates entered in the report.
* Only report numerical figures in the amount columns. Any notes should be entered into the contract amount explanation field.
* The tower fields must be entered as percentages and the total percentage column must equal 100%.

# Challenges

There were three (3) main challenges agencies faced when meeting report requirements:

1. The deadline for agencies to submit their reports to DES was Sept. 1, 2021, to allow DES the opportunity to provide a more thorough report and analysis to the legislative fiscal committees. About 60% of agencies successfully met the deadline, which is a vast improvement from the 34% of agencies that met the deadline in 2020.
2. DES increased the rigor around acceptance of the reports, including requiring agencies to use a list of provided contractor names and using the DES master contract number for all contracts marked as a master contract purchase. While these efforts improved the time to scrub the data and complete the analysis, it did result in more reports being returned to agencies for corrections.
3. Agency submissions were not always able to meet the requirements due to individual agency systems not holding historical data.

# Data Integrity

DES required agencies to use the IT master contract number for contracts marked as DES master contract purchases and to use the contractor names provided in the template workbook. DES does not have access to agency contract databases so an audit of the report submissions was not possible, but there was increased rigor around acceptance of agency reports. For the 2020 report, if required columns in reports were blank — such as missing contract numbers and/or missing total contract amount —, DES rejected the agency submission and required resubmission. This year, DES reviewed each contract, the contract start and end dates, and also required complete information around the Fiscal Year Amount columns. If an agency did not provide amounts or an explanation for missing Fiscal Year Amount columns during the active dates of a contract, the report was rejected and DES required resubmission.

# Agency Responsiveness

DES required agencies submit their IT Contracts Reports by Sept.1, 2021. About 81% of agencies had submitted a report on or before the deadline. However, only 60% of the agencies’ reports met requirements and were accepted. The remaining reports had been returned for corrections. At the time of the initial submission of this report and analysis, 85% of agencies are included. This final installment now contains 96% of agencies. Agencies who did not submit a report or who did not report complete data are included in the updated list below.

Agencies not included in the report (updated):

**Bates Technical College (BATES)**

Housing Finance Commission, Washington State (HFC)\*

Pierce College (PIE)\*

**Renton Technical College (RTC)**

**Skagit Valley College (SVC)**

**Washington Higher Education Facilities Authority (WHEFA)**

*Key*

*(\*) = Agencies that submitted a report but were either missing information or were asked to clarify their information.*

***Bold******Text*** *= Agencies that did not submit a report.*

# IT Contracts Portfolio Summary

**Data from 2021 Agency IT Contracts Report**

The Total Contract Amounts reported by agencies and institutions of higher education in the 2021 IT Contracts Report is $1.025 billion. This is over the life of each contract reported. Below are a series of tables that display the top 10 vendors when the data is sorted by key fields. The data included in the following summary tables exclude the agencies listed above, which have not yet turned in completed reports.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Top 10 Vendors with the Most Spend for All Fiscal Years and Number of Agency Users** | | | |
| **Vendor** | **All FY Spend** | **# of Contracts** | **# of Agencies** |
| CNSI | $ 709,765,862 | 3 | 1 |
| FYI Properties | $ 531,727,229 | 2 | 1 |
| IBM | $ 461,504,598 | 29 | 13 |
| Microsoft | $ 401,064,549 | 76 | 42 |
| Fast Enterprises LLC | $ 220,458,572 | 6 | 4 |
| SHI | $ 185,122,124 | 380 | 72 |
| Workday Inc | $ 175,933,626 | 2 | 2 |
| Dell | $ 172,139,316 | 91 | 58 |
| CDW Government, Inc. | $ 151,439,988 | 109 | 51 |
| Insight Public Sector | $ 149,130,479 | 25 | 11 |

Note: FYI Properties is the owner of 1500 Jefferson which houses the state data center.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Top 10 vendors with the Most Contracts for All Fiscal Years** | | |
| **Vendor** | **All FY Spend** | **# of Contracts** |
| SHI | $ 185,122,124 | 380 |
| Synchronous Technologies | $ 13,177,208 | 269 |
| CTS - Cabling & Technology Services | $ 2,971,343 | 157 |
| CDW Government, Inc. | $ 151,439,988 | 109 |
| Zones Inc | $ 7,486,106 | 103 |
| Hewlett-Packard Enterprise Company | $ 61,483,518 | 96 |
| Dell | $ 172,139,316 | 91 |
| Right Systems | $ 20,809,266 | 85 |
| Microsoft | $ 401,064,549 | 76 |
| Verizon Wireless Services LLC. | $ 49,626,012 | 75 |

Agencies reported $1.025 billion in IT contract spend in FY21, $698 million in FY20, $550 million for FY19 and $484 million projected for FY22. The following tables display the top 10 IT Vendors spend reported for FY21.

**Top 10 IT Vendors by FY21 Combined Spend for Master Contracts and Non Master Contracts**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Vendor** | **FY 21 IT Contract Report Spend** |
| Insight Public Sector | $ 148,706,532 |
| Submittable Inc | $ 62,650,000 |
| SHI | $ 43,834,329 |
| CNSI | $ 43,037,671 |
| IBM | $ 41,722,947 |
| Deloitte Consulting Llp | $ 36,047,160 |
| CDW Government, Inc. | $ 30,262,298 |
| Dell | $ 28,408,030 |
| Washington State Child Care Resources | $ 27,982,102 |
| FYI Properties | $ 21,924,037 |

**Top 10 IT Vendors by FY21 Spend for Master Contracts Only**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Vendor** | **FY 21 IT Contract Report Spend** |
| Insight Public Sector | $ 148,702,157 |
| SHI | $ 39,593,210 |
| Dell | $ 21,555,901 |
| Verizon Wireless Services LLC. | $ 13,859,963 |
| Carahsoft Technology Corporation | $ 9,723,892 |
| CDW Government, Inc. | $ 8,147,864 |
| Hewlett-Packard Enterprise Company | $ 6,739,686 |
| Cisco Systems, Inc. | $ 6,698,424 |
| Right Systems | $ 5,942,585 |
| Ivoxy Consulting | $ 5,802,454 |

**Top 10 IT Vendors by FY21 Spend for Non Master Contracts**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Vendor** | **FY 21 IT Contract Report Spend** |
| Submittable Inc | $ 62,650,000 |
| CNSI | $ 43,037,671 |
| IBM | $ 41,648,919 |
| Deloitte Consulting LLP | $ 36,047,160 |
| Washington State Child Care Resources | $ 27,982,102 |
| CDW Government, Inc. | $ 22,114,435 |
| FYI Properties | $ 21,924,037 |
| Epic Systems Corp | $ 21,346,562 |
| Microsoft | $ 17,176,029 |
| Workday Inc | $ 16,749,783 |

When comparing the previous tables to the FY20 dataset, there are a few vendors this year that were not included in the top vendors reported last year. These vendors are either newly awarded vendors on master contracts or agency contracts.

**FY21 Analysis Challenges**

This is the first year in which IT contracts that were active at any point during the fiscal year were required to be reported. A comparison to FY20 is still not very accurate since the reporting period has changed. Many contracts active in FY20 could have been excluded in the FY20 report.

The due date of Oct. 31 continues to be a challenge for DES to complete an analysis. A due date of Sept. 1 for agencies to submit their reports is necessary for DES to complete the analysis and allow time for an internal review and a 30-day external review of the report by Oct. 31. With the final phase 2 fiscal year close in early September and the vendor reported master contract sales due on July 31, agencies scramble to meet the Sept.1 deadline. When agencies do not meet the due date, DES cannot complete a full analysis for the Oct. 31 submission and is required to complete a second report and analysis each year.

**Long Term and No End Date Contracts**

A handful of contracts end on 02/01/2099. After analysis, most of these contracts fall under the DES Master Contract 08215 “Information Technology Professional Services.” This contract functions more as a “program” than a typical master contract with the first tier creating a vendor pool. Agencies and institutions of higher education must then perform a second-tier solicitation and execute their contracts with vendors accepted as a part of this program. End dates for those contracts are most likely shorter-term agreements but agencies were instructed to report their agreements under the master contract, using the Contract Start and Contract Max Term dates as start and end dates.

No End Date contracts are represented by showing 99/99/9999 in the Contract End Date column. There are 29 agencies that have contracts with no end dates and 296 contract records were reported as having no end date. The majority of the contracts with no end date fall in the “Applications” IT Tower. Included in the report is a “Contract Date Explanation” column where agencies were asked to explain why a contract does not have an end date.

**IT Tower Analysis and Tables**

The following tables, graphs and charts examine the contract information reported by IT Tower. The types of services are defined by Technology Business Management IT Towers and include:

* Application
* Compute
* Data Center
* Delivery
* End User
* IT Management
* Network
* Output
* Platform
* Security
* Storage
* An option for Non-IT/Other for agencies to utilize.

Like the previous tables, these charts and tables are missing data for those agencies that have not yet reported for 2021.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IT Tower** | **Total Spend All FY's** | **% of Spend All FY's** | **Total Contracts** | **% of Contracts** |
| Application | $ 2,602,447,618 | 38% | 3,295 | 22% |
| Compute | $ 321,528,425 | 5% | 1,340 | 9% |
| Data Center | $ 657,053,890 | 10% | 879 | 6% |
| Delivery | $ 624,175,675 | 9% | 1,435 | 9% |
| End User | $ 959,945,322 | 14% | 2,717 | 18% |
| IT Management | $ 514,779,521 | 8% | 597 | 4% |
| Network | $ 514,779,521 | 8% | 1,791 | 12% |
| Output | $ 31,837,898 | 0% | 327 | 2% |
| Platform | $ 105,061,860 | 2% | 835 | 6% |
| Security | $ 127,687,919 | 2% | 875 | 6% |
| Storage | $ 178,825,355 | 3% | 785 | 5% |
| Other/Non-IT | $ 152,547,089 | 2% | 278 | 2% |
| **Total** | **$ 6,790,670,095** | **100%** | **15,154** | **100%** |

More tables regarding spend can be found on separate worksheets in the excel workbook accompanying this report. Tables included:

* Fiscal Year Totals by Tower
* Fiscal Year Totals by Tower and Agency
* Number of Contracts by IT Tower
* Number of Contracts by IT Tower and Agency
* Vendors by Tower by Contracts
* Vendors by Tower by Spend

The report template has a field for agencies and institutions of higher education to indicate if a contract is a master contract or not. The tables below compare the vendor spend reported in the IT Contract Report by agencies and institutions of higher education to what was reported by master contract vendors.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Report** | **FY21 Spend** |
| IT Master Contract's Spend | $ 270,145,296 |
| IT Contract Master Contract's Total Spend | $ 359,921,472 |
| **Total** | **$ (89,776,176)** |

# DES IT Master Contracts Portfolio Summary

DES has a portfolio of master contracts with 800 IT vendors that covers about 25 different IT commodities. The total Fiscal Year (FY) 2021 IT master contracts spend by all state agencies, institutions of higher education, political subdivisions, and qualified non-profit organizations was approximately $602 million, an increase of approximately $28 million from the prior fiscal year. State agencies and institutions of higher education are responsible for approximately 45% of this annual fiscal contract spend. The tables below have been included to give a total picture of all DES customer spend as well as tables breaking down the information into the categories of “State Agencies and Higher Education” and “Political Subdivisions and Qualified Non-Profits.”

**FY21 Top IT Master Contracts by Spend**

**All Customer Summary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Contract Title** | **Number of Vendors** | **FY21 Master**  **Contract Spend** |
| Computer Equipment | 12 | $ 201,801,616 |
| NASPO ValuePoint Software Resellers | 4 | $ 102,018,723 |
| NASPO ValuePoint Wireless Data, Voice, and Accessories | 5 | $ 73,838,988 |
| Information Technology Professional Services | 99 | $ 44,890,895 |
| Cloud Solutions | 12 | $ 40,586,304 |
| NASPO Data Communications | 10 | $ 31,925,074 |
| Copiers and Managed Print Services | 7 | $ 18,596,587 |
| Illumination, Traffic Signal & Intelligent Transportation Systems Equipment | 22 | $ 11,754,107 |
| Data Communications (NASPO) | 5 | $ 11,455,095 |
| NVP Public Safety Communications Equipment | 10 | $ 10,645,312 |

**State Agency and Higher Education Summary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Contract Title** | **Number of Vendors** | **FY21 Master Contract Spend** |
| NASPO ValuePoint Software Resellers | 4 | $ 56,949,583 |
| Computer Equipment | 12 | $ 53,421,188 |
| Information Technology Professional Services | 90 | $ 39,645,431 |
| Cloud Solutions | 9 | $ 17,417,382 |
| NASPO ValuePoint Wireless Data, Voice, and Accessories | 5 | $ 13,083,048 |
| Copiers and Managed Print Services | 6 | $ 7,727,696 |
| Data Communications (NASPO) | 3 | $ 6,394,192 |
| Security Technology Services | 5 | $ 4,426,776 |
| NASPO Data Communications | 6 | $ 4,342,013 |
| Organizational Development | 10 | $ 3,517,939 |

**Political Subdivisions and Qualified Non-Profits Summary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Contract Title** | **Number of Vendors** | **FY21 Master Contract Spend** |
| Computer Equipment | 12 | $ 148,380,428 |
| NASPO ValuePoint Wireless Data, Voice, and Accessories | 5 | $ 60,755,940 |
| NASPO ValuePoint Software Resellers | 4 | $ 45,069,140 |
| NASPO Data Communications | 10 | $ 27,583,061 |
| Cloud Solutions | 11 | $ 23,168,922 |
| Copiers and Managed Print Services | 7 | $ 10,868,891 |
| Illumination, Traffic Signal & Intelligent Transportation Systems Equipment | 21 | $ 8,852,290 |
| NVP Public Safety Communications Equipment | 10 | $ 8,111,244 |
| Security Technology Services | 7 | $ 5,547,273 |
| Information Technology Professional Services | 20 | $ 5,245,464 |

Notes:

* The above tables were compiled using the Fiscal Year 2021 vendor reported sales for DES IT Master Contracts.
* [NASPO Value Point](https://www.naspovaluepoint.org/portfolios/) contracts are nationwide contracts that Washington State participates in through a statutorily authorized cooperative agreement.

**FY21 Top 10 Customers by IT Master Contracts Spend**

**All Customer Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Customer Name** | **FY21 Master Contract Spend** |
| Department of Social and Health Services | $ 28,086,973 |
| Consolidated Technology Services | $ 25,834,132 |
| Department of Transportation | $ 25,720,669 |
| City of Seattle | $ 21,448,284 |
| Department of Employment Security | $ 19,126,379 |
| King County | $ 17,974,508 |
| Department of Enterprise Services | $ 16,291,374 |
| Department of Corrections | $ 13,965,744 |
| Seattle School District 1 | $ 11,121,071 |
| Bellevue School District 405 | $ 10,950,754 |

**State Agency and Higher Education Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Customer Name** | **FY21 Master Contract Spend** |
| Department of Social and Health Services | $ 28,086,973 |
| Consolidated Technology Services | $ 25,834,132 |
| Department of Transportation | $ 25,720,669 |
| Department of Employment Security | $ 19,126,379 |
| Department of Enterprise Services | $ 16,291,374 |
| Department of Corrections | $ 13,965,744 |
| University of Washington | $ 10,482,232 |
| Department of Health | $ 9,943,506 |
| Washington State Patrol | $ 9,315,910 |
| Office of the Attorney General | $ 9,121,204 |

**Political Subdivisions and Qualified Non-Profits Summary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Customer Name** | **FY21 Master Contract Spend** | |
| City of Seattle | | $ 21,448,284 |
| King County | | $ 17,974,508 |
| Seattle School District 1 | | $ 11,121,071 |
| Bellevue School District 405 | | $ 10,950,754 |
| Seattle Sound Transit | | $ 9,062,377 |
| Snohomish County PUD | | $ 5,254,634 |
| City of Tacoma | | $ 5,144,912 |
| Lake Washington School District 414 | | $ 4,950,982 |
| Central Valley School District 356 | | $ 4,318,309 |
| Highline School District 401 | | $ 4,255,784 |

**FY21 Top 10 IT Vendors by Master Contract Spend**

**All Customer Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Vendor Name** | **FY21 Master Contract Spend** |
| Dell | $ 108,245,066 |
| SHI International Corp | $ 61,646,899 |
| HP Inc. | $ 52,887,916 |
| Verizon Wireless | $ 47,334,904 |
| Cisco Systems, Inc. | $ 32,732,150 |
| Insight Public Sector, Inc. | $ 31,556,669 |
| CDW Government LLC | $ 29,234,346 |
| Lenovo Corporation | $ 16,635,593 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc | $ 16,116,114 |
| Carahsoft Technology Corporation | $ 13,507,838 |

**State Agency and Higher Education Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Vendor Name** | **FY21 Master Contract Spend** |
| SHI International Corp | $ 46,221,626 |
| Dell | $ 34,056,131 |
| Insight Public Sector, Inc. | $ 22,943,094 |
| Verizon Wireless | $ 19,678,611 |
| Cisco Systems, Inc. | $ 14,842,421 |
| Carahsoft Technology Corporation | $ 9,404,296 |
| HP Inc. | $ 7,638,686 |
| Ricoh USA, Inc. | $ 5,279,694 |
| ADT Commercial LLC | $ 4,981,745 |
| CDW Government LLC | $ 4,513,416 |

**Political Subdivisions and Qualified Non-Profits Summary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Vendor Name** | **FY21 Master Contract Spend** |
| Dell | $ 74,188,935 |
| HP Inc. | $ 45,249,230 |
| Verizon Wireless | $ 27,656,293 |
| CDW Government LLC | $ 24,720,930 |
| Cisco Systems, Inc. | $ 17,889,729 |
| Lenovo Corporation | $ 16,124,211 |
| SHI International Corp | $ 15,425,273 |
| T-Mobile USA, Inc | $ 14,917,095 |
| Insight Public Sector, Inc. | $ 8,613,575 |
| AT&T Mobility | $ 7,000,612 |

**IT Master Contract/Non-IT Master Contract Comparison**

The following tables compare IT master contract sales to the Non-IT master contract sales for fiscal years 18 through 21. Of the total sales in FY21, IT master contract sales average about 42% for all customers, 45% for state agencies and higher education, and 55% for political subdivisions and qualified non-profits.

**All Customer Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contract Type** | **FY18** | **FY19** | **FY20** | **FY21** |
| IT Master Contract | 416,566,971 | 540,760,518 | 574,197,408 | 602,231,588 |
| Non IT Master Contract | 936,323,849 | 867,148,685 | 674,205,225 | 845,538,785 |
| **Total** | **1,352,890,820** | **1,407,909,203** | **1,248,402,633** | **1,447,770,374** |

**State Agency and Higher Education Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contract Type** | **FY18** | **FY19** | **FY20** | **FY21** |
| IT Master Contract | 190,758,252 | 257,510,284 | 255,773,619 | 270,145,296 |
| Non IT Master Contract | 313,155,952 | 332,029,970 | 271,142,622 | 284,769,205 |
| **Total** | **503,914,204** | **589,540,254** | **526,916,241** | **554,914,501** |

**Political Subdivisions and Qualified Non-Profits Summary**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contract Type** | **FY18** | **FY19** | **FY20** | **FY21** |
| IT Master Contract | 225,808,719 | 283,250,234 | 318,423,789 | 370,343,645 |
| Non IT Master Contract | 623,167,897 | 535,118,714 | 403,062,603 | 560,769,581 |
| **Total** | **848,976,616** | **818,368,948** | **721,486,392** | **931,113,225** |

# Information Technology Investments Captured in Apptio

**Technology Business Management (TBM) terms and data in Apptio**

Industry terms from the Technology Business Management (TBM) Council taxonomy are used for reporting on statewide technology investments. These standard reporting terms known as ‘Cost Pools’ and ‘IT Technology Towers with Sub-Towers’ are displayed in the charts below.



A weekly data feed from the state enterprise Agency Financial Reporting System (AFRS) into the TBM Program software from Apptio provides information on state agencies’ IT expenditures.

Using the AFRS data in Apptio, the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) can report FY21 IT expenditures by cost pools for 104 agencies and the IT Technology Tower expenditures for the 49 agencies in the TBM Program.

**IT Expenditures by Cost Pool**

Cost Pool categories are aligned with the state general ledger accounts using the sub-object field in AFRS. (See the Cost Pool Mapping tab in the attached workbook for more detail.)

There were 104 agencies with reported technology investments in FY21. The chart below includes a breakdown by Cost Pool. Except for internal labor, the remaining cost pools are associated with payments to vendors, contractors and service providers.

Note: Internal Services are expenditures to central service agencies.

**IT Expenditures by IT Technology Towers**

The 49 agencies in the state TBM Program are required to map their IT expenditures from Cost Pools to the IT Technology Towers. The chart below shows the investment breakdown of 49 agencies by IT Technology Towers, including internal labor.

**IT Expenditures by IT Technology Tower minus Internal Labor**

With the internal labor removed, what remains is the direct expenditures the agencies made for hardware, software, outside services, external labor, facilities and power. These percentages should align with the contract information the agency reported in their annual report to DES.

A comparison of the towers reported in the IT Contracts Report to the Apptio data received from CTS was completed for FY20 and FY21. The final comparison showed a total of $411 million difference in what was reported in Apptio verses the IT Contracts Report. The chart below shows the comparison of the towers for both fiscal years combined.

Of the $411 million, about $212 million was in FY20 and $199 million in FY21. Agencies reported more in Apptio under every tower except the Delivery tower. Almost 50% in spend was reported in the IT Contracts Report under delivery than in Apptio.

Notes:

* The IT Contract Report includes an Other/Non-IT tower that is not included in Apptio data. For the purposes of this comparison, the contract amounts reported under this tower were removed from the data.
* The Apptio data used in this analysis excluded Internal Labor.