

3-2010

Developments in Practice XXXIV: Application Portfolio Management

James D. McKeen

Queen's School of Business, Queen's University, jmckeem@business.queensu.ca

Heather A. Smith

Queen's School of Business, Queen's University at Kingston

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aisel.aisnet.org/cais>

Recommended Citation

McKeen, J., & Smith, H. A. (2010). Developments in Practice XXXIV: Application Portfolio Management. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 26, pp-pp. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1CAIS.02609>

This material is brought to you by the AIS Journals at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in *Communications of the Association for Information Systems* by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact elibrary@aisnet.org.

Communications of the Association for Information Systems



Developments in Practice XXXIV: Application Portfolio Management

James D. McKeen

Queen's School of Business, Queen's University at Kingston

jmckeek@business.queensu.ca

Heather A. Smith

Queen's School of Business, Queen's University at Kingston

Abstract:

APM is the ongoing management process of categorization, assessment and rationalization of the IT application portfolio which allows organizations to identify which applications to maintain, invest in, replace, or retire. To understand current APM strategies and practices, the authors convened a focus group of senior IT managers from a number of organizations. Results of the focus group discussion pointed to the need to develop three inter-related APM capabilities: (1) strategy and governance, (2) inventory management, and (3) reporting and rationalization. To deliver value with APM, organizations must establish all three capabilities. Experience suggests that organizations tend to start by inventorying applications and work from the "middle out" to refine their APM strategy (and how it is governed) as well as to establish efforts to rationalize their applications portfolio. As such, APM represents a process of continual refinement. Fortunately, experience also suggests that there are real benefits to be reaped from the successful development of each capability. The paper concludes with some lessons learned based on the collective experience of the members of the focus group.

Keywords: IT planning; project portfolio; portfolio management; application rationalization; application assessment

Volume 26. Article 9. pp. 157-170. March 2010

I. APPLICATION PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT

According to many industry assessments, the typical IT organization spends as much as 80 percent of its human and capital resources maintaining an ever-growing inventory of applications and supporting infrastructure [Serena, 2008]. While no one argues with the importance of maintaining applications (after all, they do run the business), everyone is concerned with rebalancing the IT budget allocation to increase the discretionary spend by decreasing the maintenance spend, ensuring that the set of applications is well-aligned with business needs, and finally, positioning the organization technologically to respond to future initiatives. Collectively, this activity has come to be known as *application portfolio management* or APM.

Formally, APM is the **ongoing management process of categorization, assessment, and rationalization of the IT application portfolio**. It allows organizations to identify which applications to maintain, invest in, replace, or retire and can have significant impact on the selection of new business applications and the projects required to deliver them. The overall goal of APM is to enable organizations to determine the best approach for IT to meet business demands from both a tactical and strategic perspective through the use of capital and operating funds allocated to building and maintaining applications. APM typically includes an analysis of operating and capital expenses by application; demand analysis (i.e., assessing business demand at the application level to determine its strategic and tactical business drivers); and application portfolio analysis (i.e., the current versus the desired state of the application portfolio in terms of both technology and business value).

Although, APM is not a new idea, it may be one “whose time has come.” There are many espoused benefits of APM including the following: reduction of the cost and complexity of the applications portfolio; reduction, or elimination of redundant functionality; optimization of IT assets across different applications and functions; greater alignment with the business; better business decisions regarding technology; and an effective means of communicating the contribution of IT to the overall organization.

To explore how organizations are approaching this topic and to what extent the benefits of APM are actually being realized, we convened a focus group of senior IT managers from a variety of different companies representing several industries including manufacturing, insurance, consulting services, banking and finance, food processing, pharmaceutical, government, retail, automotive, and telecommunications. In preparation for (and during) the meeting, focus group members were asked to share their experiences by describing their APM processes in detail, the benefits they have realized, the difficulties they have encountered, and governance issues, as well as any best practices that have emerged. The group was sequestered for an entire day and the discussion was moderated by one of the authors while the other author recorded the discussion. The remainder of this article represents a summary of the focus group discussion.

II. THE APPLICATIONS QUAGMIRE

According to a recent industry report, the ...

typical IT organization expends as much as 80% of its human and capital resources maintaining an ever growing inventory of applications and supporting infrastructure. Born of autonomous business-unit-level decision making and mergers and acquisitions, many IT organizations manage multiple ERP applications, knowledge management systems, and BI and reporting tools. All are maintained and periodically upgraded, leading to costly duplication and unnecessary complexity in IT operations. Left unchecked, the demands on the IT organization to simply maintain its existing inventory of applications threatens to consume the capacity to deliver new projects [Serena, 2008].

The proliferation of application systems within organizations is legendary. Built over time to serve an ever-changing set of business requirements, they span generations of technologies (e.g., hardware, software, systems, and methodologies) many of which are now obsolete and unsupported by any vendor community; are host to countless “workarounds,” remain poorly documented; depend on the knowledge of a rapidly retiring workforce; yet continue to support the key operations of the organization. Some (if not many) of these application systems have never been revisited in order to ascertain their ongoing contribution to the business. Based on decisions made by separate business units, many applications duplicate the functionality of others and are clearly redundant, while others have become unnecessary but have managed to escape detection. Accounts of organizations continuing to pay licensing

fees for decommissioned software and supporting twenty-seven different payroll systems, all attest to the level of disarray that typically exists in a large organization. The full impact of such a quagmire becomes apparent either when virtually the entire IT budget is consumed by maintenance, and/or when an organization attempts to integrate its suite of applications with those of an acquiring firm—whichever comes first.

Cause and effect are straightforward. The number of applications grows due to the practice of continually adding new applications without eliminating old ones. As it grows, the number of interfaces increases exponentially, as does the number of complex and often proprietary EAI solutions to “bridge” these disparate systems. The combined effect is to increase the frequency of (and costs of supporting) redundant systems, data, and capabilities across the organization. As their number and complexity grow, so does the workload and, without expanding IT budgets and headcounts commensurably, so does the portion of the IT budget devoted to maintenance and operations. From a management perspective, organizations are left with shrinking discretionary funds for new IT development and find themselves unable to: assess the capability or measure the adequacy and value of current application support structures; track dependencies of business processes on applications; determine where money is being spent, and map IT investments to business objectives. Thus, in many organizations, the suite of IT applications has become close to unmanageable.

But, while the cause and effect are identifiable, remedies are not easily obtained. The first obstacle is resources:

After years of acquiring software systems and not getting rid of anything, companies have severe application clutter. As a result, given their limited financial resources, they can't meet the current demand for IT unless they “turn off” some applications The practice of continually adding to the IT burden while holding IT budgets and head counts relatively flat is obviously problematic. Yet that's exactly what many companies have done since the early 2000s. And this practice is one of the reasons why many CIOs feel that they simply don't have enough resources to meet internal demand for IT [Gomolski, 2004].

A second barrier is that few line-of-business managers want to give up any application once it's installed. In their minds, the agony of change is clearly not worth the rewards. “Some applications are so old that nobody remembers who ordered them” [Gomolski, 2004]. The third impediment, and perhaps the most severe, is the fact that IT often lacks the political clout to make business managers engage in an exercise to rationalize applications across the enterprise in order to decommission some applications.

III. THE BENEFITS OF A PORTFOLIO PERSPECTIVE

A part of the application dilemma is the lack of a portfolio perspective. Historically, organizations have opted to evaluate applications exclusively on their own merits—a practice which can easily promulgate unique systems across any business unit that can justify the expense. One focus group member claimed that this practice results in “a stream of one-off decisions . . . where each decision is innocent enough but, sooner or later, you are in a mess . . . sort of like walking off a cliff using baby steps.” In contrast, adopting a “portfolio” perspective means . . . **evaluating new and existing applications collectively on an ongoing basis to determine which applications provide value to the business in order to support decisions to replace, retire, or further invest in applications across the enterprise.**

The portfolio approach is universal in finance and provides a point of comparison. Boivie (2003) presents the following analogy:

Just imagine you bought stock a decade ago for a lot of money, a good investment at the time, but then you did not review its value over the intervening years. Merely sitting on the stock may have been the right thing to do. Then again, you may have missed opportunities to invest more profitably elsewhere if the company was not doing well, or to invest more in the stock if it was profitable. Obviously this is not a wise way to handle your investment, but it's exactly what many companies are doing when it comes to investments in their IT applications!

Kramer (2006) concurs that application portfolio management is similar to the approach used by portfolio managers at money management firms where “investment officers continually seek to optimize their portfolios by assessing holdings and selling off assets that no longer are performing.” It is suggested that “the same approach can be used by technology executives, especially when evaluating the applications in their portfolios and deciding which ones to continue funding, which to pull back on, and which to sunset or kill.” One focus group member mapped *investment* portfolio management against *applications* portfolio management (see Table 1) in order to highlight the similarities and advocate for adopting this approach for IT applications.

Table 1: Managing IT Applications as a Financial Portfolio

Investment Portfolio Management	Application Portfolio Management
Professional management but the client owns the portfolio.	Professional management but the business owns the portfolio.
Personal financial portfolio is balanced across investments in: • equities • fixed income • cash	Application portfolio is balanced across investments in: • new applications • currency (maintenance, enhancements, upgrades) • retiring/decommissioning
Client directs investment where it is needed (e.g., 50% equities, 40% fixed, 10% cash)	Business directs investments where it is needed (e.g., 40% new applications, 30% currency, 30% decommissioning)
Client provides direction on diversity across investments (e.g., investment in one fund would exclude/augment investment in other funds)	Business provides direction on diversity of investment (e.g., investment in one business capability might exclude/augment investment in another)
Client receives quarterly updates on their portfolio health and an annual report	Business receives quarterly updates on application portfolio health and an annual report
New investments are evaluated on their impact on the overall portfolio as well as on their own merits	New applications are evaluated on their impact on the overall portfolio as well as on their own merits

The ensuing discussion of the focus group suggested that the requirement for all new investments (i.e., IT applications) to be evaluated relative to all existing (i.e., past) investments within the portfolio is arguably the critical benefit provided by adopting a portfolio perspective. The group also urged caution, however, due to the differences between a portfolio of financial assets (e.g., stocks and bonds) and one of applications. With the former, we assume a degree of independence among assets which rarely exists with applications. According to one writer [Anonymous, 2008], “while financial planners can sell an underperforming stock, CIOs will likely find it far more difficult to dispose of an unwieldy application.” Applications are rarely standalone; business functionality is often delivered by an integrated web of applications that cannot be separated piecemeal. As a result, diversification strategies can be difficult where IT assets are highly interdependent and deliver returns only collectively [Kasargod and Bondugula, 2005].

A portfolio perspective forces the linkage between the set of existing applications (i.e., the applications portfolio) and the set of potential applications (i.e., the project portfolio). The linkage is bi-directional; that is, potential applications must be evaluated against existing applications and vice versa. Caruso (2007) differentiates these as follows:

- **Application Portfolio**—This focuses on the spending of established applications, trying to balance expense against value. These applications may be assessed for their contribution to corporate profitability, and also on nonfinancial criteria such as stability, usability, and technical obsolescence.
- **Project Portfolio**—Management of this portfolio focuses on future spending, attempting to balance investments to develop new capabilities with technology and application upgrades, and IT cost-reduction efforts.

The focus group suggested that organizations have focused most of their attention on new projects which has, in part, resulted in the applications quagmire previously described. While the focus of this article is on application portfolio management, it can be argued that the effectiveness of the project portfolio can be enhanced substantially by managing the application portfolio much more effectively. This linkage is made explicit later in the article.

The benefits to be realized by adopting an applications portfolio perspective are significant. The focus group was polled to solicit the benefits that their organizations had identified. These benefits were then grouped into the three categories, as established by Caruso [2007], and are presented in Table 2.



Table 2: A List of APM Benefits

1. Visibility into where money is being spent, which ultimately provides the baseline to measure value creation.
 - a. Increases the ease of determining which legacy applications are to be retired
 - b. Simplifies the technical environment and lowers operating costs
 - c. Reduces the number of applications and optimizes spending on application maintenance
 - d. Increases the predictability of measuring service delivery for project selection
 - e. Provides an enterprise view of all applications allowing for ease of reporting (e.g., how many applications use Sybase? How many systems support sales reporting?)
 - f. Enables a common view of enterprise technology assets improving reuse and sharing across the enterprise
 - g. Provides clarity over maintenance and support spending
 - h. Allows us to manage and track business controls and regulatory compliance of all applications.
2. Prioritization of applications across multiple dimensions, including value to the business, urgency, and financial return.
 - a. Funds the right application effort by providing quick access to validated information in support of business cases for investment
 - b. Provides better project solutions by identifying available capabilities for reuse
 - c. Provides criteria to drive application rationalization and monitor impacts
 - d. Provides an "end state" view for all applications which helps direct roadmaps and enables progress reporting
 - e. Expedites prioritization discussions and executive decision making
 - f. Drives IT refurbishment initiatives
3. A mechanism to ensure that applications map directly to business objectives.
 - a. Aligns business and IT efforts with business processes by providing (a) clarity of the application landscape leading to synergies across different business units and the pursuit of a global systems architecture; and (b) insight into gaps or redundancies in the current portfolio thereby enhancing the ability to manage risk effectively and efficiently
 - b. Enables productive discussions with senior management regarding IT's contribution to business value
 - c. Identifies the strategic and high business value applications allowing the redirection of some of the funding previously used for nonstrategic applications
 - d. Enables easy and effectively analysis of impacts to applications from changing business conditions
 - e. Improves the focus and direction of investments
 - f. Provides a vehicle to drive the technical portfolio to the "right" mix, based on strategy, architecture, TCO, and internal skill sets
 - g. Prioritizes efforts and provides focus for IT delivery—ensuring the right skills are in place to support business requirements

The list of benefits is impressive. To put them into perspective, a number of comments are in order. First, if the benefits to be realized are this substantial, why haven't organizations moved more aggressively to enact APM practices? The short answer is that APM has been difficult to fund and, once funded, represents an enormous management challenge. Second, the majority of these are "anticipated" benefits as they have yet to be reaped by focus group firms. Third, APM requires the development of a number of related activities which are described in the latter sections of this article. While benefits are realized during individual activities, the most significant benefits are not realized until most, if not all, of these capabilities have been completed. Finally, APM involves a different way of approaching IT investments—a collective view of all IT applications across the enterprise—which has cultural and political ramifications for organizations. The good news is that organizations who are well advanced in APM have realized significant benefits. We highlight one such firm in Table 3.

Table 3: An APM Case Study

Vision
• Reverse the rising tide of application maintenance costs • Fund strategic development efforts from reduced support and maintenance costs • Align IT with business goals
Challenge
• Assess current portfolio of applications • Establish targets, savings strategies, and supporting plans • Establish data currency and accuracy
Solution
• Identify redundant or obsolete applications and set end-of-year targets for retiring a committed percentage of the total • Classify applications by their strategic value and shift maintenance support focus to highly strategic applications • Rank applications with a quality score; applications failing to meet a baseline are selected for preventive maintenance, code simplification, maintainability • Migrate an increasing share of maintenance work to lower-case geographies
Value
• Cut applications by 70% • Establish rigorous priorities—SLAs now vary based on objective business criteria • Re-engineer applications—defects down 58% and maintenance costs down 20% relocated work—significant maintenance is now performed in countries with costs 60–70% lower than previous


IV. MAKING APM HAPPEN

As the focus group discussion evolved, it became apparent that application portfolio management presents a significant management challenge and success requires the commitment of considerable organizational resources. Furthermore, APM involves the development of three interrelated capabilities. The first capability is the articulation of a strategy including goals, deliverables, and a set of governance procedures to guide the management of the application portfolio. Next is the creation of an applications inventory in order to monitor key attributes of existing applications. The third capability involves building an analysis and reporting capability in order to rationalize the applications portfolio according to the strategy established. These capabilities (depicted in Figure 1), while distinct, are also closely interrelated and build on each other.¹ To deliver value with APM, organizations must establish all three capabilities. Experience suggests that organizations tend to start by inventorying applications and work from the “middle out” to refine their APM strategy (and how it is governed) as well as to establish efforts to rationalize their applications portfolio. As such, APM represents a process of continual refinement. Fortunately, experience also suggests that there are real benefits to be reaped from the successful development of each capability. These capabilities are described in detail below.

Capability 1: Strategy and Governance

There are many different reasons to adopt application portfolio management. At one firm, the complexity of their IT application portfolio had increased to the point of becoming unmanageable. They viewed APM as the means to gain some measure of control over their burgeoning collection of disjointed IT applications. Another firm had set an architectural direction and established an IT roadmap and saw APM as a way to “put some teeth” into the enforcement of these policies. At a third firm, the manager of a strategic business unit was frustrated over escalating annual IT costs and the “pile of applications” which seemed to have “little connection to actual business services.” A simple poll of the focus group, however, suggested that APM tended to be an IT-led initiative as opposed to a business initiative—a fact that has implications for launching and funding APM.

¹ The focus group did not see APM as a “stage” model where organizations advance through a prescribed set of stages. Instead they identified three highly interrelated “capabilities” that organizations need to establish in order to advance their application portfolio management.



In order to get an APM initiative underway, it is necessary to build a business case. How this is done depends on your strategy. According to one focus-group manager, “if APM is positioned as inventory management, you’ll never get the business to pay for it.” In his organization, APM was promoted as a cost reduction initiative focused on the elimination of unused (or underused) applications, unnecessary software licenses, duplicated data, and redundant applications. Their business case included an aggressive schedule of declining IT costs to the business. In another organization, the APM initiative is supported internally by the IT organization and driven largely by the enterprise architecture group. In fact, the business is unaware of their APM program. In a third example, APM was couched within the overall strategy of transforming the business. The argument was that APM could “reduce ongoing support costs for existing applications in order to re-direct that IT spend into business transformation.” The business case included metrics and a quarterly reporting structure to ensure that savings targets were obtained. The conclusion reached by the focus group was that each organization is unique and, given the wide variety of potential APM benefits, the best strategy is to attach APM to a broader enterprise goal. The focus group felt that, if APM is attempted solely within the IT organization without business backing, it is less likely to produce the full range of benefits.


The strategy selected to launch APM has direct ramifications for the information collected about each application (i.e., the second capability—inventory management), as well as what information is reported and tracked by senior management (i.e., the third capability—reporting and rationalization). In the next section of the article, we present a comprehensive set of information that could be collected for IT applications within the portfolio. Organizations, depending on their APM strategy, may focus on a subset of this information and develop a reporting and rationalization capability built on this information.

APM strategy and governance are linked; if strategy is the destination, then governance is the map. According to one focus group manager, governance is “a set of policies, procedures and rules that guide decisions and define decision rights in an organization.” Application portfolio governance answers three questions:

1. **What decisions need to be made?** This addresses the types and/or categories of decisions often referred to as decision domains. It also links the decisions with the processes that are needed to manage the application portfolio.
2. **Who should make these decisions?** This addresses the roles and accountabilities for decision makers (e.g., who provides input, who approves and who has final authority). This links the decisions to be made (the “what”) with the decision makers (the “who”).
3. **How are these decisions made?** This addresses the structures and processes for decision making (e.g., the architecture review board). This links the decisions to be made (the “what”) with the people/roles (the “who”) involved in decision making with the timelines and mechanisms for making those decisions (the “how”).

On an ongoing basis, organizations introduce new applications and (less frequently) retire old applications. The key difference with APM is that these applications are managed holistically across the enterprise on a much more formalized and less piece-meal basis. The goal is to discover synergies as well as duplication, alternative (and less costly) methods for providing business services, and rebalancing (or rationalizing) the portfolio of applications with regard to age, capability, and/or technical health. This represents a significant organizational change which impacts governance procedures directly. According to one focus group member, "no longer can business units acquire an IT application that duplicates existing functionality without scrutiny by the APM police." With the adoption of APM governance procedures, such actions become visible at high levels within the organization.

How new governance procedures are actually implemented varies by organization. However, the focus group suggested that effective APM governance must be both free-standing (in order to have visibility and impact) and closely integrated within the framework of existing governance mechanisms (in order to affect the status quo). As an example, the IT project selection committee must consider the impact of prospective IT projects on the existing portfolio of enterprise applications if the organization is to achieve its APM rationalization goals regarding architecture, and/or functionality. That is, the APM governance processes must leverage existing organizational governance processes, including architectural reviews, exception process handling, IT delivery processes, strategic planning, and annual budgeting, as well as technology reinvestment and renewal. One focus member shared his enterprise IT governance framework to demonstrate where and how APM was situated within other established processes (see Figure 2).



Effective governance starts with ownership which entails responsibilities and accountabilities. At a tactical level, each IT application should have an owner. This individual is held responsible for the ultimate disposition of the application; that is, when it is enhanced, refurbished, or decommissioned. The sense of the focus group was that the application owner should be a business manager, except for internal IT applications. While each application should have a business owner, it is common to also appoint a custodian whose key duty is to keep the information up-to-date. Given the technical nature of the application information (see Appendix), the custodian is typically an IT employee perhaps an account manager or someone within the enterprise architecture group. With stewardship (i.e., owner and custodian) in place at the application level, the next level of governance is the portfolio level. A management committee comprised of application owners, senior enterprise architects, and IT planners/strategists should meet regularly, perhaps quarterly, to make decisions regarding the disposition of applications within the overall portfolio. This committee would report to the senior executive on portfolio activities, performance toward goal achievement, and establish linkages to fiscal planning and strategy. In very large organizations, an additional committee of portfolio owners might also be required.

Effective governance is critical for overcoming a number of problems common during the initial phases of APM. Some of the challenges experienced by the focus group included:

- Application owners are accountable to execute the process but no one has defined who (or what body) is accountable for the process itself or what governance practices should be applied to make it happen.
- Managing applications requires additional maturity for defining a roadmap for the portfolio. Without this, some applications are well-planned while the overall portfolio is not.
- The classification criteria for applications are in flux and lack an executive process for validating the ratings.
- Application assessments are not taken seriously by executive owners (“everything is important if not critical”) and this erodes the credibility of the process and the overall value of the exercise of managing applications as a portfolio.
- Awareness and acceptability is lacking by business managers.
- There is difficulty from the “supply” side; that is, there is reluctance to take ownership of the data to assure its integrity, quality, and timeliness.
- “Demand”-side aggression in terms of pushing for more and more application attributes.

The focus group felt that each of these problems requires effective governance procedures. But, like all organizational initiatives, changes to existing routines and methods take time to mature.

Capability 2: Inventory Management

Before building an inventory of applications, organizations first need to know what applications they are going to inventory. One focus group firm started by defining an application as ...

a computer program or set of computer instructions that allows end users to accomplish one of more specific business tasks and can operate independently of other applications. An application can also be a distinct data store used by multiple other applications. Examples include commercial off-the-shelf packages, applications written in Excel that perform specific business functions, custom developed computer software programs, a data warehouse and/or the reporting applications accessing it, and/or modules, services, or components, either purchased or custom built to perform a specific business function. This definition excludes system software or platform software (e.g., operating systems, device drivers, or diagnostic tools) programming software and user-written macros and scripts.

What is most important is that organizations identify which specific applications will be included in the portfolio to be actively managed. One firm in the focus group excluded all applications not explicitly managed by IT (e.g., Excel spreadsheets developed by managers for analytical purposes); another focused only on “major” applications according to size; and a third firm only included “business-critical” applications. This decision has direct implications for the size of the APM effort. The organization that limited its portfolio to business-critical applications reduced the portfolio to 180 applications from 1,200—a significant reduction in the amount of effort required. The organization’s decision to limit (and, therefore, focus) its application portfolio depends on the strategy outlined in Step 1 above.


With inclusion criteria established, organizations must then identify what specific information about applications will need to be captured. A list of possible information items gathered from the members of the focus group is presented in the Appendix. These items are categorized according to the following five headings:

- **General Application Information**—is the information used to explicitly and clearly identify an application, distinct from all other applications, and provide a basic understanding of its functionality.
- **Application Categorization**—is the information providing criteria used to group applications for comparison and portfolio management purposes (e.g., business capability provided, life cycle status).
- **Technical Condition**—provides the overall rating of the technical quality of the application, including various elements of risk (e.g., development language, operating system, architecture).
- **Business Value**—this provides an overall rating of the value of the application to the business (e.g., business criticality, user base, effectiveness).
- **Support Cost**—this captures the order of magnitude of the overall cost of an application after deployment. It includes maintenance and support costs (including upgrades), but not the initial purchase, development, or deployment costs.

The focus group could not overstate the importance and criticality of selecting the information to be maintained as part of the application inventory as this information dictates the types of analyses that can be performed after-the-fact (as outlined in the next section). Once selected, the task of capturing application information and keeping it current is a monumental effort. The focus group suggested that, without clear ownership of the information and assigned responsibilities for a custodial function, attempts at application portfolio management would falter. One of the key motivations for establishing a strict information regime is the delivery of demonstrable benefits from the exercise. These are discussed in the next section.

Capability 3: Reporting and Rationalization

With an application inventory established, most focus group firms suggest creating a set of standard parameter-driven reports. Most had a basic report which presents the status of all existing applications so that management can readily ascertain the health of any specific application or the overall health of the portfolio of applications. One firm has a collection of standard reports that analyze the number of applications and their costs; how business capabilities are supported and where duplication exists; breakdowns of annual application costs; application life-cycle patterns; and reuse options for future projects. One widely adopted report compares applications on the basis of business value, technical condition, and cost (see Figure 3). As depicted, this chart helps organizations rationalize their IT application portfolio by tracking applications over time as they become less important to the business and/or lose technical currency. One organization found that eliminating those applications in the bottom left of the quadrant—that provide limited business benefit often at a significant cost—can be a “combination of quick hits and longer term initiatives.” Even managers reluctant to retire a business application can be convinced with evidence of the full support costs.



Once the application inventory is assembled, the number of ways to “slice and dice” the information is unlimited and the value obtained is commensurate. One focus group member claimed that, for the first time her organization is able to answer questions such as “how many applications use Sybase?” and “how many systems support sales reporting”? The provision of ad hoc reporting capability is a quick way to discover the number of current licenses with a specific vendor and/or to assess the costs of providing specific business services. Ultimately, organizations need to know their true costs of doing business in order to explore options for providing different customer services. The information produced by analyzing the IT application portfolio takes them a huge step closer to this level of understanding and optimization.

The information needs supported by an application inventory vary by stakeholder. The IT organization wants to map business functionality against applications; the risk, audit, and security teams are most interested in regulatory compliance and a risk management perspective; while business teams are interested in understanding the costs and business value of the applications they use. Even within IT, different groups (e.g., solutions delivery, information

security, production support, executive management, regulatory compliance, infrastructure, architecture, and planning) have unique information needs from the application portfolio. For this reason, most firms mandate a single application portfolio capable of supporting many different views at different levels as well as a composite view of the entire portfolio. One member of the focus group explained this by claiming that, while different views of the portfolio satisfy individual groups within her organization, the “consolidated view ultimately demonstrates the effectiveness of monitoring and tracking business performance of the assets across the entire IT application portfolio.”

V. KEY LESSONS LEARNED

The following represent some of the lessons learned based on the collective experience of the members of the focus group.

- **Balance demand and supply**—Managers tend to push for the inclusion of more and different application attributes, as well as more reports of infinite variety (the “demand” side), while balking at assuming ownership of this data in order to ensure its integrity, quality, and timeliness (the “supply” side). When an APM initiative is launched, clear governance procedures should be established to govern regular enhancements and releases for APM reporting.
- **Look for quick wins**—Gaining awareness and acceptance of an APM initiative can be an up-hill struggle. This effort is aided greatly by capturing a number of “quick wins” early on. Organizations should look carefully at the possibility of decommissioning applications as a ready source of immediate and visible wins that impact the bottom line directly. Reuse provides mid-term wins and virtualization/rationalization provides longer-term wins.
- **Capture data at key life stages**—It is a mistake to wait to capture data when applications are already in production. Data should be captured at multiple stages—when the application is first approved, when in testing during development, when promoted to production, each time during significant modifications are made, and when it is retired. As soon as data is captured and made available, the organization can benefit. For example, knowing the attributes of applications under development can be valuable for planning/budgeting purposes and ultimately enables better project solutions.
- **Tie APM to TCO initiatives together**—If a total cost of ownership (TCO) initiative is underway, ensure that the APM is closely tied to the TCO initiative. Much of the information captured as part of the APM initiative will support the TCO initiative ... and vice versa. Knowing this relationship in advance will ensure that the data is captured to facilitate both purposes. The long-term savings can be significant.
- **Provide an application “end-state” view**—It is important to provide current information about applications but it is equally important to provide an end-state view indicating the application’s future trajectory. This facilitates a planned and orderly evolution toward retirement for applications as well as key information for business planning (e.g., roadmaps, gap reporting, and progress reporting).
- **Communicate APM Benefits**—Gaining awareness and acceptance of an APM initiative is a constant struggle. Organizations must seek opportunities to communicate why this initiative is underway, what results have been realized, and what the next stages to be accomplished are. Effective communication is even more important in situations where the APM initiative is being driven internally by the IT organization.

VI. CONCLUSION

This article, based on the collective experience and insights of senior IT managers from a number of leading organizations, provides guidance to those investigating APM and/or planning to launch an APM initiative. Application portfolio management promises significant benefits to adopting organizations. Obtaining those benefits, however, requires the development of three mutually reinforcing capabilities. The first capability is the development of an APM strategy buttressed with governance procedures. The second is the creation of an application inventory and the third is a reporting capability built to align the application portfolio with the established strategy. Each of these capabilities provides standalone benefits, but together they enable an organization to optimize its IT assets; to reduce the cost and complexity of its portfolio; reduce or eliminate redundant functionality; facilitate better business decisions regarding technology; and effectively communicate the contribution of IT to the overall organization.

REFERENCES

Editor’s Note: The following reference list contains hyperlinks to World Wide Web pages. Readers who have the ability to access the Web directly from their word processor or are reading the paper on the Web, can gain direct access to these linked references. Readers are warned, however, that:

1. These links existed as of the date of publication but are not guaranteed to be working thereafter.

2. The contents of Web pages may change over time. Where version information is provided in the References, different versions may not contain the information or the conclusions referenced.
3. The author(s) of the Web pages, not AIS, is (are) responsible for the accuracy of their content.
4. The author(s) of this article, not AIS, is (are) responsible for the accuracy of the URL and version information.

Anonymous (2008) "Maximizing IT Investment", *Wall Street & Technology Online*, <http://www.itbusinessedge.com> (current April 2008).

Boivie, C.A. (2003) "Taking Stock of Your Portfolio: Do You Have a Good Idea of the Value of Your IT Applications, Both Old and New?" *CIO Canada* (11)10 (October 2003).

Caruso, D. (2007) "Application Portfolio Management: A Necessity for Future IT", *Manufacturing Business Technology*, (25)10 (October 2007), p. 48.

Gomolski, B. (2004) "Cleaning House", *Computerworld* (38)51 (December 2004), p. 29.

Kasargod, D., and K. Bondugula (2005) "Application Portfolio Management", *Infosys* (April 2005), pp. 1–8 (originally published in www.gtnews.com).

Kramer, L. (2006) "CIO Challenge: Application Portfolio Management", *Wall Street & Technology*, New York (May 2006), pp. 43–44.

Serena (2008) "Mariner Application Portfolio Management", <http://www.serena.com/products/mariner/application-portfolio-management.html> (April 2008).

APPENDIX

APPLICATION INFORMATION

- A. General Application Information**—is the information used to explicitly and clearly identify an application, distinct from all other applications, and provide a basic understanding of its functionality.
- Name—the name that uniquely identifies the application
 - Short Name—an abbreviation or acronym that is likely a unique identifier of the application and is used for reporting when there is not room to use the application's full name
 - Description—a more extensive description of the application typically focusing on its functional scope
 - Portfolio Owner—the title of the portfolio owner of the application and the name of the person currently filling that role. The portfolio owner is typically filled by someone at VP level or higher.
 - Stakeholders—key people (by name and title) that could have been identified as a portfolio owner if multiple portfolio owners were allowed
 - Application owner—the title of the portfolio owner's delegate (if there is one) and the name of the person currently filling that role. The application owner is typically someone reporting to the portfolio owner and empowered to make decisions relating to the ongoing use and evolution of the application. The application owner role is typically filled by someone below the VP level.
 - Business consultant—the name of the IT-business liaison. This person is part of the IT organization but responsible for the relationship with the business unit.
 - Internally versus externally developed—states whether the application was developed internally (by any business or IT organization) or whether it was purchased from an external vendor
 - Vendor—the name of the vendor that owns the application. For internally developed applications, this should be the business unit or IT unit that is responsible for maintaining the application (i.e., provides the resources and funding).
 - Product name—the name of the product; only required when a product has an explicit name that is not the vendor name
 - Version number—the complete version number of the application that is in production
 - Current version—the most current version number in full release by the vendor
 - Implementation date—the year and month that the solution went into production
 - Last major upgrade—the year and month that the last major upgrade went into production. Major upgrades typically require a project approach, explicit funding, training, and planning to avoid downtime, etc. This field is blank if there has not been a major upgrade after the implementation date.
 - Last minor upgrade—the year and month that the last minor upgrade went into production. Minor upgrades are typically upgrades that can be performed during regularly scheduled maintenance windows and can be performed as part of routine application maintenance. This field is blank if there has not been a minor upgrade after the last major upgrade (e.g., point releases, security patches).
 - Next scheduled review—the year and month that the application profile should next be reviewed. By default, this should be one year from the current review, but will be updated once assessment schedules are developed.

B. Application Categorization—is the information providing a variety of criteria/data used to group applications for comparison and portfolio management purposes.

- Application scope—identifies the breadth of use of the application across the organization (e.g., enterprise, multi-divisional, divisional, multi-departmental, departmental, individual users)
- Life-cycle status—identifies the lifecycle stage that the application is in (e.g., emerging, standard, contained, retirement target, retired)
- SBUs used by—a choice of one or more business divisions that use the application
- SBUs used for—a choice of one or more business divisions that the application is used on behalf of
- Application capability—broad categories of capability that applications provide; for example, supply chain management (SCM) planning, SCM execution, SCM procurement
- Application sub-capabilities—sub-capabilities of functionality that applications provide. A single application will often provide functionality covering multiple sub-capabilities
- Support organization—identifies the organization support the application (e.g., IT organization, 3rd party, business unit)
- Recoverability—the requirement to be able to recover the application in the event of a disaster and the ability to perform that recovery
- Application type—a general categorization of the application's use of data (e.g., analytical/reporting, transactional, collaborative, hybrid)
- Application profile—a general categorization of the application's functional profile (e.g., suite, best-of-breed, in-house)

C. Technical Condition—provides the overall rating of the technical quality of the application, including various elements of risk

- Development language—the programming languages that the application is developed with. The language element should address programming code running on the server, client, database, middleware, etc.
- Operation system(s)—the operating systems required for all layers of the application where there are application-specific requirements. This can be applied to the server, database, middleware, client, etc. This evaluation categorization does not address the web browser in a web-based application.
- Hardware platforms—the hardware platforms required for all layers of the application where there are application-specific requirements. This can be applied to the server, database, middleware, client, etc.
- Database/data model—the database platform and database model (i.e., data architecture) that the application is tied to (or built on)
- Integration—the integration tools and model used to integrate the applications with other applications. The “model” aspect of this criterion is closely related to the overall architecture of the systems, but specifically looks at the framework/approach used for integration.
- Architecture—the application architecture, technology patterns, etc. that define “how” different elements of technology were put together to create the application (e.g., .NET, J2EE, J2SE, OO, Client/Server, Web-based, thin-client, etc). This criterion also addresses the extensibility of the application—the ability of the applications to be modified to meet future/changing functional requirements.
- Security—the capability of the application to (1) limit access to data and functionality to specific users and/or groups; and (2) provide audit information related to functions performed (or attempted to be performed) of the data viewed (or attempted to be viewed) by specific users. This metric addresses the applications native capabilities, the specific implementation/modification of those capabilities, and the security requirements of the organization.
- Vendor viability—the likelihood that the vendor will remain strong in the relevant application market and vertical industry
- Vendor support—the ability and commitment of the vendor to provide support for the applications. This includes the ability and commitment to provide new releases and patches to the application.
- Key Abilities—three key abilities are considered: (1) the availability of the application relative to user requirements identified in service level agreements (SLA); (2) scalability of the application to meet current and future user and transaction volumes; and (3) performance of the application in starting, retrieving information, and performing transactions.
- User interface—the overall usability/intuitiveness of the application's interface. This is often reflected by training requirements, support requirements, online documentation, etc.

D. Business Value—this provides an overall rating of the value of the application to the business.

- Competitive advantage—the extent to which the application enables a capability that (1) increases revenue; (2) lowers cost; or (3) differentiates the company in the marketplace

- Business criticality—the extent to which the application materially affects the company’s ability to conduct core business processes (i.e., sell, deliver, close financial books). This includes the ability to meet regulatory requirements.
- User base—the number and variety of users that use the application. This measure is adjusted to reflect the difference between casual/occasional users and power users, as well as internal versus external users. This measure also includes transaction volumes that the application performs to account for essential applications with few users but large transaction volumes that the business is dependent on.
- Current effectiveness—ability of the application to meet current business requirements within the scope of the functionality it was intended to provide
- Future effectiveness—ability of the application to meet future business requirements within the scope of the functionality it was intended to provide and logical/reasonable extensions of that functionality

E. Support Cost—this captures the order of magnitude of the overall cost of an application after deployment. It includes maintenance and support costs (including upgrades) but not the initial purchase, development, or deployment costs.

- Elements included—license maintenance, other licensing fees, vendor/external support, internal support, and hardware
- Elements not included—PCs, network, telephony, or other shared services; end-user costs (e.g., time lost to support calls, downtime, etc). Typically this data is not readily available at the level of granularity required.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

James D. McKeen is a professor of IT Strategy and Distinguished Research Fellow in MIS at the School of Business, Queen’s University at Kingston, Canada. Jim received his Ph.D. in Business Administration from the University of Minnesota. He has been working in the IT field for many years as a practitioner, researcher, and consultant and is a frequent speaker at business and academic conferences. Dr. McKeen co-facilitates the networking of senior executives in the IT sector through two well-known industry forums: the IT Management Forum and the CIO Brief. He also has extensive international experience, having taught at universities in the U.K., France, Germany, and the U.S. His research has been widely published in various journals including the *MIS Quarterly*, *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, the *Journal of Information Technology Management*, the *Communications of the Association of Information Systems*, *MIS Quarterly Executive*, the *Journal of Systems and Software*, the *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *Information and Management*, *Communications of the ACM*, *Computers and Education*, *OMEGA*, *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, *Journal of MIS*, *KM Review*, *Journal of Information Science and Technology* and *Database*. Jim is a co-author of three books on IT management with Heather Smith, the most recent being *IT Strategy in Action* (Pearson Prentice Hall, 2008). He currently serves on a number of editorial boards.

Heather A. Smith (hsmith@business.queensu.ca) has been named North America’s most published researcher on IT and knowledge management issues. A senior research associate with Queen’s University School of Business at Kingston, Canada, she is the co-author of four books: *IT Strategy in Action*; *Management Challenges in IS: Successful Strategies and Appropriate Action*; *Making IT Happen: Critical Issues in IT Management*; and *Information Technology and Organizational Transformation: Solving the Management Puzzle*. A former senior IT manager, she is currently co-director of the IT Management Forum and the CIO Brief, which facilitate inter-organizational learning among senior IT executives. She is also a senior research associate with the Society for Information Management’s Advanced Practices Council. In addition, she consults, presents, and collaborates with organizations worldwide, including British Petroleum, TD Bank, Canada Post, Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales, the OPP, and Boston University. Her research is published in a variety of journals and books including *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *Communications of the Association of Information Systems*, *Knowledge Management Research and Practice*, *Journal of Information Systems and Technology*, *Journal of Information Technology Management*, *Information and Management*, *Database*, *CIO Canada*, and the *CIO Governments Review*. She is also a member of the editorial board of MISQ-E.

Copyright © 2010 by the Association for Information Systems. Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and full citation on the first page. Copyright for components of this work owned by others than the Association for Information Systems must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, or to redistribute to lists requires prior specific permission and/or fee. Request permission to publish from: AIS Administrative Office, P.O. Box 2712 Atlanta, GA, 30301-2712, Attn: Reprints; or via e-mail from ais@aisnet.org.



Communications of the Association for Information Systems

ISSN: 1529-3181

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF
Ilze Zigurs
University of Nebraska at Omaha

CAIS SENIOR EDITORIAL BOARD

Guy Fitzgerald Vice President Publications Brunel University	Ilze Zigurs Editor, CAIS University of Nebraska at Omaha	Kalle Lyytinen Editor, JAIS Case Western Reserve University
Edward A. Stohr Editor-at-Large Stevens Institute of Technology	Blake Ives Editor, Electronic Publications University of Houston	Paul Gray Founding Editor, CAIS Claremont Graduate University

CAIS ADVISORY BOARD

Gordon Davis University of Minnesota	Ken Kraemer University of California at Irvine	M. Lynne Markus Bentley College	Richard Mason Southern Methodist University
Jay Nunamaker University of Arizona	Henk Sol University of Groningen	Ralph Sprague University of Hawaii	Hugh J. Watson University of Georgia

CAIS SENIOR EDITORS

Steve Alter University of San Francisco	Jane Fedorowicz Bentley College	Jerry Luftman Stevens Institute of Technology
--	------------------------------------	--

CAIS EDITORIAL BOARD

Michel Avital University of Amsterdam	Dinesh Batra Florida International University	Indranil Bose University of Hong Kong	Ashley Bush Florida State University
Evan Duggan University of the West Indies	Ali Farhoomand University of Hong Kong	Sy Goodman Georgia Institute of Technology	Mary Granger George Washington University
Ake Gronlund University of Umea	Douglas Havelka Miami University	K.D. Joshi Washington State University	Michel Kalika University of Paris Dauphine
Julie Kendall Rutgers University	Nancy Lankton Michigan State University	Claudia Loebbecke University of Cologne	Paul Benjamin Lowry Brigham Young University
Sal March Vanderbilt University	Don McCubbrey University of Denver	Fred Niederman St. Louis University	Shan Ling Pan National University of Singapore
Jackie Rees Purdue University	Thompson Teo National University of Singapore	Craig Tyran Western Washington University	Chelley Vician Michigan Technological University
Rolf Wigand University of Arkansas, Little Rock	Vance Wilson University of Toledo	Peter Wolcott University of Nebraska at Omaha	Yajiong Xue East Carolina University

DEPARTMENTS

Global Diffusion of the Internet Editors: Peter Wolcott and Sy Goodman	Information Technology and Systems Editors: Sal March and Dinesh Batra
Papers in French Editor: Michel Kalika	Information Systems and Healthcare Editor: Vance Wilson

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

James P. Tinsley AIS Executive Director	Vipin Arora CAIS Managing Editor University of Nebraska at Omaha	Copyediting by Carlisle Publishing Services
--	--	---

