

CONTENT MANAGEMENT SERVICE

Department of Information Services - September 2002

History

Almost two years ago the State of Washington Department of Information Services (DIS) started to talk about the issues of content management and formed the Content Management Infrastructure Committee to explore the feasibility of Content Management tools. DIS included the Department of Labor and Industries (L&I) and the Department of Ecology on this Committee. There was a lot of work on defining just what is content management.

In the Spring of 2001 DIS held three focus group sessions to do some “blue sky” thinking about what agencies would want in a tool. There were 50 attendees from all forms of state and local government at these meetings. Requirements gathered at the meetings were folded in to a very detailed Request for Information (RFI) that generated over 20 vendor responses.

On June 30, 2001 DIS issued a white paper. This paper recommended the development of an RFP to establish a Master Contract and to establish a service offering in DIS.

On Sept 30, 2001 the RFP was issued. In December, Interwoven was selected as the apparent successful vendor. Seven responses to the RFP were submitted and a few were disqualified. Interwoven was selected on both technical and financial merit.

Winter/Spring 2002 - The RFP required that the vendor work on a pilot project for Access Washington to verify the RFP responses before being named the successful vendor. After completion of contract negotiations and a difficult start in a difficult budget environment, a successful pilot was conducted and completed in June 2002.

Summer 2002 – The master contract was signed and is now available at the DIS email (<http://emall.dis.wa.gov>) in the master contract section. This contract may be used by any state or local governmental entity in the State of Washington. Work has begun on establishing a production infrastructure so that DIS can offer a pilot service offering based on Interwoven products for those customers on the State Government network. This infrastructure will be completed by year end.

Pilot

Pilot Status – Pilot was completed June 2002-Interwoven spent six weeks on site.

Application - Created application for Access Washington (AW) News Release that could be extended to allow direct submittal of AW news from agencies. Agencies have the ability to submit whether their agency has their corporate web site on the tool or not.

Old Process: DIS Communications office receives a press release from another agency, DIS Communications reformats the release to DIS format in a Word document. Word Document is passed to the DIS Webmaster team and reformatted again in html. Stories were then approved and sent out. An html page with the top stories was updated every day.

Efficiencies Gained - New Process: Agency itself or DIS Communications will paste body of the press release in a box on a template. Additional contact information is entered into several fields on the template. Template is submitted to the workflow. News item can be reviewed as it will appear on the AW web site complete with all links and formatting. If the item came from outside, it will be approved by the DIS Communications team. No approval is necessary if the DIS Communications team entered the item. Then the item is published immediately and the index will be updated. At the end of the day a template is used to generate the top story list.

Main findings from Pilot Process:

A. The software will work within DIS security infrastructure for multi-agency deployment on one version of the software. DIS can provide a service offering to multiple agencies.

B. There will be change - processes for content need to be discussed and in place before implementation:

- Creating processes around content creation

- Users creating their own content instead of relying on others to create pages

- Less need for central IT staff involvement after process creation

- Developers need to understand the tools in the suite (training)

- Implementation of change management

C. While tools are moving to provide more and more functionality “out of the box” the tools do not cover all situations and custom coding will be required.

Explanation: The workflow process can be mostly created with a GUI but the GUI cannot do custom features such as changing the name of a file to a standard for a particular web server. Any tool will require custom coding.

D. For non-templated data, Interwoven lives up to the claim of working with almost any content creation tool and deploying content to almost any platform (Unix, Windows, Linux and any software - IIS, Iplanet, Apache, websphere).

E. There will be a need for more in-depth partnerships between agencies, DIS and customers of the service offering.

- Technical issues surrounding virtualization

- Working out common approaches that can be extended or re-used

- Metatagging vocabularies

- Virtualization (an Interwoven exclusive) works but is also complex.

Next Steps:

DIS is targeted to go live with the tool by December 2002.

Lessons learned will be gathered and made known.

Service offering to be available in December for government entities on the SGN.

Availability of the service in the IGN will come as demand is demonstrated

Proposed PILOT Early Adopter Pricing:

0 to 25 users \$625

26 to 50 users \$1,150

51 to 100 users \$2,200

101 to 200 users \$3,400

201 to 500 users \$5,100

501 to 900 users \$6,800

901+ negotiate

Hidden Costs Associated with Web Site Maintenance:

1. Once there is agreement on strategy, design, message, and navigation, it takes 1.5 to 2 hours to develop a static web page.
2. There is a duplication of services as each program area may employ their own webmasters to re-interpret the corporate look and feel of the web site
3. Each webmaster/"formatter" must be trained.
4. Desktop tool purchase, installation, maintenance
5. Repetitive interaction with the central webmaster
6. The central webmaster must review each webmaster's work for consistency to the corporate look and feel.
7. Webmasters get drawn into disputes and quality issues when there is no clear defined procedure
8. Content owner/author unaware of standards
9. Content owner wants to retain sole ownership
10. Shifting control in organizations
11. May take months to simply update a look and feel or to add an element to every web page.
12. Central webmaster is constantly training webmasters.
13. Reusing content for different audiences/delivery mechanisms is difficult (departmental, statewide, partners, general public)
14. Standards/abilities vary in different program areas
15. Consistent metatags
16. Managing the life cycle of content
17. Approval processes are cumbersome
18. Difficult to maintain consistency of a message
19. Different program areas have different viewpoints - need to collaborate.
20. Overlapping topics
21. Different ad-hoc approval workflows
22. Difficult to maintain a high quality and consistency resulting in miscommunication that can damage relationships.