DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Wes Moore | Governor
Aruna Miller | Lt. Governor
Katie Savage | Secretary

MAJOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT FUND

aka INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT FUND

2025 JCR Page 84-85

Department of Information Technology

October 31, 2025

Wes Moore | Governor
Aruna Miller | Lt. Governor
Katie Savage | Secretary

Table of Contents

ITIF Financial Summaries

Note that the reports below contain the same information provided in the annual MITDP end-of-year report. Use of carryforward funds is subject to executive privilege.

FY25 IT INVESTMENT FUND (ITIF) SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS

Assets	
Cash Balance	
Funding:	
FY24 ITIF Cash Ending Balance	315,856,594
FY24 ITIF Revenue Transfers in Process	(52,141,683)
FY25 ITIF Beginning Balance	263,714,911
FY25 ITIF Funding	64,345,434
Total FY25 ITIF Funding Beginning Balance	**328,060,345**
Revenue:	
Resource Sharing Agreement	790,534
Investment Interest	0
Total Revenue	790,534
Cash Transfers:	
Reallocation from Prior Years (in beginning balance)	52,141,683
FY25 & Prior Year Expenses Reimbursed in FY25	(119,001,999)
Total Cash Transfers	(66,860,316)
FY25 Ending ITIF Cash Balance	**261,990,563**
Liabilities	
Prior Year Liabilities	
FY25 Expenses Reimbursement in Process	(40,180,876)
Potential & Eligible ITIF Expense through FY25 & Other Liabilities	(12,265,152)
Total Prior Year Liabilities	**(52,446,028)**
Obligations Against Prior Year Funds (FY24 & Earlier)	
Obligations against prior year funds - IV&V	(3,237,207)
Obligations against prior year funds - Oversight	(2,563,570)
Obligations against prior year funds - Project	(147,375,648)
Obligations against prior year funds - Restricted Funds	(13,823,384)
Total Prior Year Obligations	**(166,999,809)**
Obligations Against Current Year Funds (FY25)	
Obligations against current year funds - IV&V	(4,262,152)

Obligations against current year funds - Oversight	(3,847,163)
Obligations against current year funds - Project	(33,644,877)
Obligations against current year funds - Restricted Funds	(790,534)
Total Current Year Obligations	**(42,544,726)**
Total Liabilities & Obligations	**(261,990,563)**
Unobligated Fund Balance	
Total Unobligated Fund Balance	**0**

Maryland
DEPARTMENT OF
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Wes Moore | Governor
Aruna Miller | Lt. Governor
Katie Savage | Secretary

FY25 IT INVESTMENT FUND (ITIF) PROJECT EXPENDITURES AND OBLIGATIONS

Agency	MITDP Project Name	Balance through FY25				Obligations		Balance
		Funding through FY25	Actual Spend through FY25 - Reimbursed	Actual Spend through FY25 - Pending	Balance through FY25	Obligations against prior year funds	Obligations against current year funds	
COMP	Integrated Tax System	91,832,627	(90,420,956)	(69,643)	1,342,028	(64,463)	(1,277,565)	0
COMP	Financial Management Information Systems (FMIS) Transformation	17,850,000	(11,403,956)	(256,701)	6,189,343	(2,596,044)	(3,593,299)	0
COMP	CPB Payroll System Modernization (PSM)	20,432,971	(16,996,908)	0	3,436,063	(2,886,063)	(550,000)	0
DBM	Capital Budgeting Information System (CBIS) Replacement	4,964,313	(2,289,312)	0	2,675,001	(2,675,001)	0	0
DBM	Fleet Management System Replacement	200,000	0	0	200,000	0	(200,000)	0
DGS	eMaryland Marketplace eProcurement Solution	43,277,323	(39,389,031)	0	3,888,292	(3,888,291)	0	0
DGS	AS400 Replacement	1,523,810	(422,064)	0	1,101,746	(1,101,746)	0	0
DHCD	Energy Efficiency Program Management System	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DHS	Shared Human Services - Maryland Total Human Integrated Network	84,336,117	(78,111,378)	0	6,224,739	(6,224,739)	0	0
DHS	Child, Juvenile, and Adult Management System (CJAMS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DHS	Child Support Management System (CSMS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DHS	Eligibility & Enrollment (E&E)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DJS	DJS - ASSIST	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Wes Moore | Governor
Aruna Miller | Lt. Governor
Katie Savage | Secretary

Agency	MITDP Project Name	Balance through FY25				Obligations		Balance
		Funding through FY25	Actual Spend through FY25 - Reimbursed	Actual Spend through FY25 - Pending	Balance through FY25	Obligations against prior year funds	Obligations against current year funds	
DNR	DNR Modernization and OneStop Integration Project	15,323,719	(9,680,750)	0	5,642,969	(5,642,969)	0	0
DNR	Modernizing Maryland Park Reservation and Revenue Management System	3,727,533	0	0	3,727,533	(1,732,143)	(1,995,390)	0
DOIT	Enterprise Solutions Planning Initiative	11,320,468	(4,610,875)	(56,850)	6,652,742	(6,652,742)	0	0
DOIT	Maryland OneStop Portal	27,892,776	(14,134,588)	(3,816,651)	9,941,537	(9,941,537)	0	0
DOIT	Voice and Data Modernization	18,763,641	(18,248,245)	(100,000)	415,396	(415,396)	0	0
DOIT	MD FIRST Radio Tower and Backhaul Improvement Project	7,050,000	(1,794,178)	0	5,255,822	(5,255,822)	0	0
DOIT	Enterprise Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Modernization	4,072,443	(1,761,730)	(141,360)	2,169,354	(2,169,354)	0	0
DOIT	nwMD Modernization	9,421,334	(4,827,066)	0	4,594,268	(4,594,268)	0	0
DOIT	Maryland Enterprise Web Strategy	1,450,000	0	0	1,450,000	0	(1,450,000)	0
DPSCS	Computerized Criminal History Replacement (Phase II)	12,765,385	(2,084,383)	0	10,681,002	(10,043,198)	(637,804)	0
DPSCS	Electronic Patient Health Record Replacement	16,519,785	(6,944,357)	0	9,575,428	(9,575,428)	0	0
IAC	IAC Business Management System	1,464,143	(1,464,143)		0	0	0	0
MDA	Maryland Department of Agriculture Modernization Program	11,529,682	(7,066,592)	0	4,463,089	(2,398,881)	(2,064,208)	0

Agency	MITDP Project Name	Balance through FY25				Obligations		Balance
		Funding through FY25	Actual Spend through FY25 - Reimbursed	Actual Spend through FY25 - Pending	Balance through FY25	Obligations against prior year funds	Obligations against current year funds	
MDA	MDA Digitization and Modernization Project	1,000,000	(161,106)	0	838,895	0	(838,895)	0
MDE	MDE Portal Project	1,000,000	(275,078)	0	724,922	0	(724,922)	0
MDE	MDE - MITDP Determination For Wells and Septic Portal	858,964	0	0	858,964	0	(858,964)	0
MDE	Environment (MDE) ETS and LRCA System Consolidation and Modernization Project	0	0		0	0	0	0
MDH	Medicaid Long Term Services and Support Tracking System	37,803,734	(37,748,265)	0	55,469	0	(55,469)	0
MDH	Statewide Electronic Health Records System	24,277,554	(11,705,883)	(827,742)	11,743,929	(11,743,929)	0	0
MDH	Medicaid Enterprise Systems Modular Transformation	25,730,820	(22,657,845)	(681,193)	2,391,782	(2,391,783)	0	0
MDH	MDH Enterprise Licensing and Regulatory Management System Project	5,452,738	(167,401)	(158,590)	5,126,747	(5,126,747)	0	0
MDH	Integrated Electronic Vital Records Registration System	16,836,586	(14,591,189)	(664,388)	1,581,009	(517,098)	(1,063,910)	0
MDH	Migrate MDH HQ Data Center to the Cloud	17,685,070	(10,616,580)	(63,676)	7,004,814	(7,004,814)	0	0
MDH	VoIP Conversion	6,549,986	(1,086,312)	(158,490)	5,305,184	(5,305,184)	0	0
MDH	Bed Registry and Referral System	5,856,895	(499,538)	(14,549)	5,342,808	(4,719,113)	(623,695)	0

Agency	MITDP Project Name	Balance through FY25				Obligations		Balance
		Funding through FY25	Actual Spend through FY25 - Reimbursed	Actual Spend through FY25 - Pending	Balance through FY25	Obligations against prior year funds	Obligations against current year funds	
MDH	Maryland AIDS Drug Assistance Program (MADAP) Program Case Management System	110,771	0	(32,484)	78,287	(78,287)	0	0
MDH	OPER - Systems Integration and Modernization	4,605,254	(127,793)	0	4,477,461	(3,552,484)	(924,977)	0
MDH	MDH Non-Medicaid Case Management (CMM) Modernization	1,000,000	0	0	1,000,000	(1,000,000)	0	0
MDH	PHS Enterprise System Data Modernization	1,000,000	0	0	1,000,000	(1,000,000)	0	0
MDH	MMT - Behavioral Health ASO (BHASO)	4,951,640	(3,804,148)	(2,502)	1,144,990	(1,144,990)	0	0
MDH	MMT - Business Process Reengineering & Consolidated CRM	1,714,740	(891,830)	(101,666)	721,245	(721,245)	0	0
MDH	MMT - Consolidated Call Center and IVR	111,218	(3,729)	0	107,489	(107,489)	0	0
MDH	MMT - CMS Interoperability Rule	642,657	(399,338)	(3,410)	239,909	(239,909)	0	0
MDH	MMT - EDI Gateway	313,074	(161,463)	(6,833)	144,777	(144,777)	0	0
MDH	MMT - Decision Support & Enterprise Data Warehouse	323,493	(75,797)	(5,493)	242,203	(242,203)	0	0
MDH	MMT - Dental Administrative Services (DASO)	241,030	(132,203)	(2,711)	106,115	(106,115)	0	0
MDH	MMT - Enterprise Document Management System	118,709	(1,902)	0	116,807	(116,807)	0	0

Agency	MITDP Project Name	Balance through FY25				Obligations		
		Funding through FY25	Actual Spend through FY25 - Reimbursed	Actual Spend through FY25 - Pending	Balance through FY25	Obligations against prior year funds	Obligations against current year funds	Balance
MDH	MMT - Hospice And Maryland Daycare Enrollment	1,403,495	(396,717)	(6,829)	999,950	0	(999,949)	0
MDH	MMT - MES Claims Module	2,964,718	(885,443)	(6,216)	2,073,059	(2,073,059)	0	0
MDH	MMT - Non Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT)	227,618	(190,585)	(4,669)	32,365	(32,365)	0	0
MDH	MMT - Provider Management Module	3,198,618	(2,158,945)	(60,714)	978,958	(978,958)	0	0
MDH	MMT - Surveillance Utilization Review Subsystem	313,924	(160,133)	(2,531)	151,260	(151,260)	0	0
MDH	MMT - Utilization Control Agent (UCA)	2,978,563	(1,391,353)	(14,144)	1,573,065	(1,573,065)	0	0
MDL	Electronic Licensing Modernization (ELMo)	3,200,000	(1,170,000)	0	2,030,000	(2,030,000)	0	0
MDL	LABOR Omni-channel Contact Center System (LOCCS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MDOT	Occupational Health Monitoring System (OHMS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MHEC	Financial Aid Management System (FAMS)	2,744,014	(218,251)	0	2,525,763	0	(2,525,763)	0
MIA	MIA's Insurance Tracking System (ITS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MSDE	CCATS Replacement Project	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MSDE	Replacement Educator Information System	445,513	0	(257,376)	188,137	(188,137)	0	0
MSDE	The Educator Application and Certification Hub (TEACH)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Agency	MITDP Project Name	Balance through FY25				Obligations		Balance
		Funding through FY25	Actual Spend through FY25 - Reimbursed	Actual Spend through FY25 - Pending	Balance through FY25	Obligations against prior year funds	Obligations against current year funds	
MSDE	MSDE Website	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MSP	Automated Licensing and Registration Tracking System	8,596,667	(8,193,805)	0	402,862	0	(402,863)	0
MTA	Future Fare System (NGFS)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SBE	2022 Pollbook Project	7,576,564	(4,870,629)	(626,673)	2,079,262	(2,079,262)	0	0
SBE	2026 New Campaign Reporting Information System	2,110,000	(291,783)	(741,309)	1,076,907	0	(1,076,908)	0
SBE	2026 New Voting System Project	10,399,359	(422,743)	(124,643)	9,851,974	0	(9,851,974)	0
SBE	Statewide Poll Modernization	195,687	(145,125)	0	50,562	0	(50,562)	0
SBE	Voter Registration Election Administration Management System	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SDAT	Cloud Revenue Integrated System (CRIS) Modernization	1,482,302	0	0	1,482,302	(1,482,302)	0	0
SDAT	Maryland Assessment Administration and Valuation System (MAAVS) Modernization	500,000	0	0	500,000	0	(500,000)	0
STO	Financial Systems Modernization	16,510,713	(15,132,167)	0	1,378,546	(786)	(1,377,761)	0
WCC	Enterprise Modernization	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
n/a	Re-Appropriated Funds*	13,665,393	0	0	13,665,393	(13,665,393)	0	0

* Funds previously appropriated to the IT Investment Fund for projects that have since closed that were re-appropriated to other MITDPs in the FY26 budget as passed by the legislature.

Wes Moore | Governor
Aruna Miller | Lt. Governor
Katie Savage | Secretary

FY25 IT INVESTMENT FUND (ITIF) NON-PROJECT EXPENDITURES AND OBLIGATIONS

Category	Balance through FY25						Obligations		Balance
	FY25 Beginning Balance	FY25 Revenue	FY25 Realignment	Actual Spend in FY25 - Reimbursed	Actual Spend in FY25 - Pending	Balance through FY25	Obligations against prior year funds	Obligations against current year funds	
Discovery	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0	0	0
Interventions	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	0	0	0
IV&V	11,215,637	0	538,665	(3,808,376)	(446,568)	**7,499,359**	(3,237,207)	(4,262,152)	0
Oversight	15,744,261	0	(1,327,621)	(5,506,247)	(2,808,550)	**6,101,843**	(2,254,680)	(3,847,163)	0
ITIF Interest	12,356,419	0	(1,121)	0	0	**12,355,298**	(12,355,298)	0	0
Resource Sharing Agreement	3,769,087	790,534	(2,300,000)	(1,000)	0	**2,258,621**	(1,468,086)	(790,534)	0
Re-Appropriated Funds*	308,890	0	0	0	0	**308,890**	(308,890)	0	0

* Funds previously appropriated to the IT Investment Fund for projects that have since closed that were re-appropriated to other MITDPs in the FY26 budget as passed by the legislature.

Maryland
DEPARTMENT OF
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Wes Moore | Governor
Aruna Miller | Lt. Governor
Katie Savage | Secretary

FY26 ITIF Projected Balance Changes

The Governor's Fiscal 2026 Budget Book, Volume 1, page 336 includes the following table showing the financial position of the IT Investment Fund in FY25:

FISCAL YEAR 2025		
Sources:		
Cash Balance in R*STARS as of June 30, 2024:	374,762,192.50	
Project Obligations		
Total Cash Balance in R*STARS as of June 30, 2024		374,762,193
FY 2025 General Fund Appropriation		62,834,987
FY 2025 Estimated Special Fund Revenues (see details)		-
Subtotal Sources		437,597,180
Uses:		
Estimated Revenue Transfers for Approved Project Obligations:		
Approved/Pending	111,047,281	
Prior Year Obligations/Pending	263,698,000	
Current Year Obligations/Pending	62,834,987	
Subtotal Transfers		437,580,268
Subtotal Project Uses		437,580,268
FY 2025 Estimated Ending Balance		16,912

This table shows the starting cash balance of the ITIF in FY25 ($375M) plus the new FY25 appropriation ($63M), minus revenue transfers to MITDPs for approved expenditures ($111M), obligations against prior year appropriations ($264M), and obligations against current year appropriations ($63M). This calculation results in a projected balance at the end of FY25 of about $17,000.

However, this projected balance is not labeled well, leading to misunderstanding and the question from the Legislature. This balance is not the estimated *ITIF* balance at the end of FY25; it is the estimated *unobligated funds* balance at the end of FY25. This table is not showing how much money we anticipate spending in FY25, but rather how much of the money in the ITIF is expected to be obligated by the end of FY25. Thus when compared to the actual spend in FY25, the numbers will not match because the $264M and $63M "uses" in this table are not expenditures, they are obligations.

When understood in this way, this estimated unobligated funds balance is in line with those reported in past years: at the ends of FY21, FY22, and FY23, this amount was $0. At the end of FY24, the balance was a similar $17,000.

ITIF Fund Allocation Process

Managing the ITIF, including vetting agency funding requests and spending, is a significant portion of the work of DoIT's MITDP Oversight Division (MOD). Our goals throughout the processes described below are:

1. Ensure that ITIF funding is spent responsibly, meaning it is spent on legitimate project expenses that deliver value to Maryland at a reasonable cost
2. Ensure that high-priority MITDPs are receiving the appropriate amount of funding to continue their work at the appropriate pace
3. Ensure that ITIF funding is appropriated to the projects most likely to be able to spend that money responsibly, when possible

To achieve these goals, we exercise control over ITIF spending as described below.

Budget Recommendations

The first step in the ITIF funding lifecycle is the budget recommendations process, where DoIT collects ITIF funding requests for the next fiscal year from agencies, reviews them, and produces recommendations for the Department of Budget and Management. This process happens each summer from July through September.

The process begins with agencies submitting formal funding requests to DoIT for each of their existing MITDPs, previously part of the annual "IT Project Request (ITPR)". As of the budget cycle for FY27, this funding request takes the form of a spend plan for the upcoming year: agencies provide a list of the expenditures they expect in the year, how much they estimate each will cost, and details about the contract those expenditures are under, if any. For projects that are deep into their lifecycle, most or all of these expenditures will be fairly predictable because they are based on existing contracts or other expenses (such as payroll or non-contract expenses). For projects that are earlier in their lifecycle or are planning new expenditures, these amounts will be lower-confidence estimates.

Agencies also indicate in their spend plans how these expenditures should be split across funding sources, including ITIF funds, agency funds (of several different kinds), and federal funds.

DoIT receives those spend plans and reviews the data to ensure the expenditures are reasonable in both content and amount based on what we know of the projects and that we have copies of the contracts for items the agencies report are under contract. If we have concerns, we may go back to the agency to discuss them and / or reduce our ultimate funding recommendation. We then stack rank the projects by priority based on the criticality of the work, the impact it will have on Marylanders and State employees, and the performance of the project so far. Using that ranking, and the ITIF budget target set by DBM, we determine our funding recommendation for each project across all funding types, including ITIF. Our goal is to fund the highest-priority and highest-performing projects with the appropriate amount of funding, which may not be the amount they asked for, and to reduce risk by reducing funding to lower-performing projects until they make corrections.

Once our initial recommendations are complete, DoIT meets with each agency's finance and technology teams to discuss our recommendations and the underlying rationale and to give the agency a chance to give feedback and let us know the impact of our recommendations on their projects. In some cases, we make changes to the recommendations based on this feedback.

We then deliver our final recommendations to DBM, where the recommendations enter the statewide budget assembly process, during which they may be changed by several different parties. We also share a summary of the agencies' original funding request with DBM and DLS, along with other narrative information about the project.

Forecasts

Once the final budget has been passed by the legislature and prepared by DBM, the next phase of the ITIF funding lifecycle begins: updated forecasts. Each June, agencies update their spend plans from the previous summer's funding request to produce their forecasts for the upcoming fiscal year.

Updates to the spend plans are generally driven by changes to the project's available funding (new appropriation and unspent ITIF funds that carry forward into the new year), which is often different than what they had projected, and changes to the project over the intervening 11 months. Once DoIT receives these forecasts, we perform a similar evaluation as we did the prior summer: we ensure the planned expenditures are reasonable project items at a reasonable cost, based on what we know of the projects, and that we have contracts for any items that are already under contract. In this review cycle, we also ensure the project has adequate funding to cover the planned spend, through any combination of newly appropriated ITIF, agency, and federal funds and ITIF carryforward funds. If we have concerns with any aspect of the agencies' forecasts, we meet with them to discuss the issues and ask them to make changes to their forecasts.

When we have completed our evaluation and confirmed that the agency has the requisite funding, we accept the forecast. Once the forecast is accepted, the agency may not spend more than the forecast total in the fiscal year without a formal rebaseline request, which includes a detailed explanation of the changes and the reason(s) behind them. However, the agency may change the specific items they are using the funding for and the amount for each item based on the changing conditions within their project, as long as they stay under the total. These changes are then reviewed through the monthly review process, described below.

The last step in the forecast process is for agencies to submit a Budget Amendment for the ITIF portion of their forecast, which DoIT must approve. This gives the agencies the ability to spend against the appropriated amount.

Monthly Reviews

As agencies spend money throughout the year, they are required to provide DoIT with copies of their invoices (and any new contracts). DoIT reviews these invoices and compares them to transactions that appear in the project account in the State's Financial Management Information System (FMIS) to ensure that:

1. All invoices are for legitimate project expenses
2. All invoices are for legitimate project contracts
3. All project costs are charged to the correct account in FMIS
4. All transactions in the project account in FMIS are for expenses for which we have invoices and contracts (or other documentation)

When we discover issues, we raise them to the agency and work to get them corrected.

Agencies are also required to keep their forecasts updated throughout the year by replacing projections with actuals, once we have them, and updating future projections based on project changes. DoIT reviews changes to the forecasts as they are made and raises any concerns to the agencies.

Revenue Transfers

The final step in the ITIF lifecycle is the annual ITIF revenue transfer, which takes place after the end of each fiscal year (although we can and sometimes do process revenue transfers at other times of year; the steps remain the same). While agencies have been spending against their ITIF balance throughout the year, they are not reimbursed for the expenditures until the revenue transfer is complete.

DoIT kicks off the revenue transfer process at the end of each fiscal year by pulling together a list of all the approved project costs charged to ITIF from the project account in FMIS based on the ongoing monthly reviews and submitting a revenue transfer request for this amount for each project. Simultaneously, we share that list with each agency. The agencies then have a limited period of time to process any remaining expenses from the fiscal year and provide any missing documentation to DoIT. At the end of that time period, DoIT submits a second revenue transfer for each project with new approved expenses. Any remaining expenses—either that have not yet made it into FMIS or for which the agency has not provided sufficient documentation—will wait until the next revenue transfer cycle for reimbursement or will be removed from the project.

Realignments

DoIT has the authority to submit realignments of ITIF funding throughout the fiscal year if we deem it appropriate. This isn't a standard part of the ITIF lifecycle, but we use it to move funding from lower-performing or lower-priority projects to higher-performing or higher-priority projects as conditions and project needs change throughout the year. Any realignment requires a plan from the receiving agency on how it will spend the additional funding.

Future Changes

DoIT would like to explore the possibility of "just-in-time" funding for ITIF appropriations, meaning the Budget Amendments giving agencies authority to spend their ITIF appropriations would be issued incrementally throughout the year as the agency is ready to spend the funding. This would allow the state to be more nimble and efficient, if we could make it work.

MITDP Change Management

DoIT manages change in the scope, schedule, and cost of MITDPs by setting "baselines" for each project and then requiring written "rebaseline" requests for changes to those baselines. These baselines serve as the expectations against which a project's performance in terms of scope, schedule, and cost is measured. DoIT must approve rebaseline requests in order for them to take effect.

The nature of each baseline changes throughout the lifecycle of an MITDP. Projects that are early in their lifecycle will have significantly more uncertainty, so their baselines will be estimates and are expected to change. Projects that are later in their lifecycle are expected to have more granular and more accurate baselines, although they still will and should change as the project continues to learn. To capture this uncertainty, both the overall cost and schedule baselines are shown as ranges.

Baselines are set for the first time when the project is designated as an MITDP. These baselines are systematically reviewed and updated when the project enters the delivery phase. In addition, the project sets a cost baseline for each fiscal year when DoIT accepts their forecast. Other than those specific times, the baselines may only be updated through the rebaseline process described below.

	BASELINE(S)	REBASELINE TRIGGERS
SCOPE	1. Definition of done	1. The project would like to make any change to the definition of done
SCHEDULE	1. Estimated number of years to complete the project	1. The project would like to change the estimated years to complete the project based on new information
COST	1. Estimated total cost to complete the project 2. Accepted forecast total for current fiscal year 3. Submitted budget recommendation for next fiscal year (October-June)	1. The project would like to make an increase to the total approved in the baseline forecast for the current FY 2. The project would like to make an increase to the total in the budget recommendation for the next FY (October - June) 3. The project would like to change the estimated total cost to complete

Rebaseline Process

Rebaselines are executed through a rebaseline form that includes the project's existing baseline, space for the agency to indicate the new baseline, and space for the agency to explain the change and the reason for it. Agencies must provide documentation to show the basis for any change in the project's costs baselines.

When we receive the rebaseline request form, DoIT reviews the requested changes to determine whether they are reasonable, supported by evidence, and whether there are alternatives to the proposed changes that would result in a better outcome. If we have concerns or propose another path, we discuss them directly with the agency and project team. Once we reach an agreement on the path forward, DoIT approves the request, with or without modifications, or rejects it. If we approve the request, the new baseline(s) takes effect.

MITDP Delegation

DoIT does not delegate any major IT project responsibilities to agencies, as those responsibilities do not lie with DoIT to begin with. Agencies are accountable for their own technology projects, just as they are accountable for the programs and services whose delivery their technology systems support. DoIT has the responsibility and authority to perform oversight of the implementation of MITDPs, which is defined in State Finance and Procurement §3.5-101 as:

> (d)(1) "Oversight of implementation" means management of the process to implement a new technology, system, or product into practice and use by a unit.
> (2) "oversight of implementation" includes:
> (i) planning and preparation to implement the product or practice; and
> (ii) ongoing monitoring and support of the implementation team to ensure successful execution and that the project goals are met.
> (3) "oversight of implementation" does not include:
> (i) responsibility for day-to-day management of any individual projects or products; or
> (ii) responsibility for implementing individual-level process requirements for a project or product.

DoIT executes this oversight responsibility and does not delegate it to any agency.

Expedited Projects Criteria

The Expedited Projects (EP) program was created in statute during the 2024 legislative session with a requirement that 20% of the ITIF appropriation each year, beginning in FY26, be set aside for EPs. Given the State's financial constraints heading into FY26, this requirement was struck and no funding was set aside for EPs. Because of our expectation that this would happen, DoIT did not prioritize formalizing and kicking off the EP program, so the information provided below is still in draft form and may change if and when the EP program starts.

Draft Expedited Project Criteria

To become an EP, a proposed project must meet all the following criteria:

1. It is expected to cost less than $5M, unless the Secretary determines the project should be exempted from the MITDP program.
2. It implements a new software or information technology application or enhances an existing one.

3. It requires using software code developed or customized to achieve the business needs of the project.
4. It is high-impact for either the residents or employees of the State, addresses a legacy system, and / or is high urgency, as determined by the Secretary.
5. It allows for modernization projects consistent with the State Modernization Plan to move forward in a nimble and expedited manner.

The EP program is optional, which means, unlike MITDPs, projects are not required to be EPs just because they meet the criteria. Instead, projects that meet the criteria may apply for the program and be approved, or can be added to the program at the Secretary's discretion.

When selecting projects to add to the EP program, DoIT may consider:

- Impact on the residents of Maryland, particularly their needs for public health, education, safety, or financial well-being.
- Impact on Maryland State employees as they execute the work of the State.
- Alignment with the State Modernization Plan and State Information Technology Master Plan.
- Impact on a legacy system or systems.
- Urgency of the proposed project.

EPs cannot also be MITDPs, per statute.

Closing

Please reach out to Sara Elalamy and Patrick Mulford if you have any questions on this information.

Sincerely,

Katie Savage
Secretary
Department of Information Technology