

Minutes for the Legislative Branch Computer System Planning Council Meeting held on March 2, 2000.

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Bob Person, Executive Director, Legislative Services Division, ex officio chairman
Scott Seacat, Legislative Auditor
Clayton Schenck, Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Rosana Skelton, Secretary of the Senate
Representative Mark E. Noennig (By Speaker Phone)

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT

Marilyn Miller, Chief Clerk of the House
Chuckie Cramer, Senate Sargent At Arms

TECHNICAL SUPPORT STAFF PRESENT

Legislative Services Division

Hank Trenk
Jeanette Nordahl
Steve Eller

Legislative Fiscal Division

Terry Johnson
Greg DeWitt
Pam Joehler

Legislative Audit Division

Tori Hunthausen

Bob Person called the meeting to order at 1:40 P.M.

After introductions were made, Bob referred the Council to Appendix A of the current Computer System Plan to discuss the role of the Computer System Planning Council. Appendix A contains the sections of the MCA (Title 5, chapter 11, part 4) which govern the Computer System Planning Council. Bob went on to explain that the purpose of the law was to "establish a mechanism for computer system planning encompassing broad policy needs, long-term direction for computer use, and the effective implementation of a detailed plan for the legislative branch"...

and "to assure coordination of information system decisions so that the overall effectiveness of the senate, the house of representatives, and legislative agencies may be improved.". Bob also pointed out that the duties of the Computer System Planning Council were to prepare a biennial computer system plan.

The Council then moved on to item 3 on the agenda: Report on IT Management Committee, ITAC and ITMC. Pam Joehler and Greg DeWitt from LFD gave a presentation on the activities of the IT Management Subcommittee (See Attached). Bob asked Pam if there was anything that the Computer System Planning Council needed to do to comply with decisions of the IT Management Subcommittee. Pam replied that the IT Management Subcommittee wasn't far enough along in it's decision process to answer that question. Bob then gave a report on the activities of ITAC. ITAC stands for Information Technology Advisory Council. ITAC deals mainly with policy level decision concerning IT. Bob said that ITAC had just finished their biennial strategic planning session. The main topic of discussion was E-Government. E-Government is the movement toward putting government services on the Internet. Hank updated the Council on the activities of ITMC. ITMC stands for Information Technology Managers Council and is a group of all of the IT managers in State Government. Hank said that ITMC had conducted it's biennial strategic planning session last fall. The main two topics of discussion there were E-Government and educating policy makers on IT issues facing IT managers. Hank also said that ITMC was working on Windows 2000 implementation, Year 2000, MS Office 2000 implementation, and other things. Rosana asked if the Branch was planning on converting to Windows 2000 in the short term. Hank said that because of the instability of new releases that the Branch was going to wait until after the 2001 session to convert to Windows 2000.

Bob then asked Hank to report on the implementation of the current Branch Plan. Hank referred the Council to Page 27 of the current Computer System Plan. Hank said that the branch continued to keep current with release of software where appropriate, and that the branch continued to replace older PCs on a 4 year replacement cycle. The Branch has just purchased 20 new laptops, 16 of which were to replace existing obsolete laptops and 4 new ones. The Branch was planning to purchase 100 new PCs and 20 new printers for the 2001 session. The Branch was also in the process of purchasing new file serve hardware. The Branch has spent a significant amount of time making systems Year 2000 compliant. So far there have not been any Year 2000 bugs reported. The Branch was spending quite a bit of time rewriting it's interfaces to the new state HR and accounting systems (SABHRS). Both LAD and LFD had ongoing projects in this area. The Branch had mostly completed its conversion to the MS Office Suite. LSD had chosen to convert it's WP 6.1 macros to WP 8 and continues to use WP 8. LAD and LFD chose to convert to the MS Office Suite. Conversion of the LFD Lotus Revenue Estimation System to Excel was nearly complete. LAD still had some WP 6.1 Reports macros that needed conversion to Word.

Bob then asked Hank to go over the list of proposed IT Projects/Initiatives for FY 2002 - 2003. Hank reviewed the 11 items on the list. Bob then asked if there was anything else to add to the list. Scott and Clayton said that they might need some help interfacing to the University System new Banners system. Terry said that ISD was talking about dropping support for the PC-SAS system and that this was a system that was still needed by the Branch. Representative Noennig

said that he would like to see computers for legislators on the list. Scott questioned whether the NT Server and Support initiative was something that should be done by the enterprise (ISD). Hank said that ISD was reluctant to support agencies running non state standard software on their NT Servers. Hank would check with them again.

The Council then moved on to item 6 of the agenda: Legislator access to State computers and communications. Rosana said that the generic e-mail box for legislators worked well last session. However, she said that they noticed a lot of e-mail last session from one person to many different legislators. It would be nice if there was some way to make the person originating the e-mail put in their address so that the receiving legislator could tell if the person was in their district. Rep. Noennig said that he would also like to see district number on the e-mail because he is not always sure if the address is in his district. With regard to computers for legislators, Rosana said that she felt that those legislators that were use to using a laptop for everything they do, would adjust real well to using computer during a legislative session, but for those who weren't use to using a laptop, they would be too busy during a legislative session to learn to use a computer and keep up with the other demand put on their time. Hank said that maybe the PDA's like the Palm Pilot would work better for legislators than a PC laptop. With a PDA, you could schedule meetings, take notes and have the contents of your PDA calendar synchronized with you PC calendar when you got back to your PC.

The Council then moved on to item 7 of the agenda: Remodeling the Capitol and its affect on IT. Bob said that there were plans to put 11 kiosks in the capitol building. The contractor was only responsible for the cabinet and the touch screen monitor. The state was responsible for the CPU and the software to run the kiosk. We have done some investigation into kiosk software and believe that using the Internet with kiosk software running on top of an Internet Browser is the best approach. Bob said that the state still has to work out how and who will administer the 11 kiosks and what will be displayed on them. Hank said that the Legislature typically had two Internet bill status terminals in the hallways of the Capitol for a legislative session. If the state did not get the kiosk situation figured out by the 2001 session, the Legislature could continue to hook up its own bill status terminals. Bob also said that as a result of capitol renovation every desk on both the house and senate floors was to be wired with a network connection. Also, the building is to be wired for future capability of using wireless technology to communicate with laptop PCs. Bob said that when capitol renovation was complete, the building would be wired for computer automation of legislators, but that the Legislature still needed to plan how and when this would occur.

The Council then move on to item 8 on the agenda: How should the legislature set policy to govern use of state owned IT equipment by Legislators. Scott said that any policy in this area should be set by legislators themselves. Bob and Representative Noennig said that they would take this issue to the Legislative Council. Clayton said that he felt there needed to be policy set on legislative requests for database type data. He said that his agency gets requests from legislators to provide them with a database and the software to access the data in the database. He was concerned with the amount of time his staff would spend responding to these requests. Hank said that they also get similar requests from legislators to provide them with systems to satisfy certain needs. Clayton said that maybe this was something the 3 directors (Bob, Clayton

and Scott) needed to address similar to the 16 hour rule that is currently in effect for providing research/information to Legislators.

The council established a work plan consisting of two more meetings. At the 2nd Council meeting, staff would present cost estimates for the Projects/Initiatives identified at this meeting. Also at the 2nd meeting, the Council would provide staff with any other input to the plan. Staff would then prepare a final draft plan for approval of the Council at their 3rd meeting. The 2nd meeting of the Council is tentatively scheduled for the afternoon of Tuesday May 9th and the 3rd meeting is scheduled for the afternoon of Thursday September 7th.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM..

c43 lbcspc.mi8

(Attachment)

MONTANA LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Legislative Fiscal Division

Room 494 Federal Building • P.O. Box 201711 • Helena, MT 59620-1711 • (406) 444-2986 • FAX (406) 444-3971

Legislative Fiscal Analyst
CLAYTON SCHENCK

March 1, 2000

To: Legislative Branch Computer System Planning Council

From: Pamela Joehler, Legislative Fiscal Division
Greg DeWitt, Legislative Fiscal Division

RE: IT Management Subcommittee Study and Scope

House Bill 2 (HB2), as passed by the 1999 legislature, requires an interim study of the management of information technology in the state. HB 2 authorizes the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) to review and assess Montana's governance, policy, planning, and budgeting structures and processes associated with the state's investment in IT and to recommend appropriate changes and processes that will enable the legislature to make policy decisions relevant to IT budget issues.

HB 2 requires four specific outcomes:

1. Recommendations to the Office of Budget and Program Planning (OBPP) for presentation of IT budget information that enables the legislature to make policy decisions relevant to IT budget requests;
2. Development (by OBPP) of a unified computer budget summary by November 15, 2000 showing fiscal year 2000 actual and adjusted IT expenditures and budgeted amounts for each year of the 2003 biennium;
3. Review of the unified computer budget summary and other IT-related budget information by the long-range planning joint appropriations subcommittee, or other legislative committee, as designated, composed of members of the House Appropriations and Senate Finance and Claims Committees formed specifically to address statewide computer issues; and
4. A report of committee findings and recommendations to the Governor and the 57th Legislature.

Accomplishments To-Date

The LFC formed a four-member subcommittee to conduct the interim study. Due primarily to timing issues with the biennial budgeting process, the first issue addressed by the IT Management Subcommittee was to develop the recommendations to OBPP for presentation of IT budget information to the 57th Legislature. The Subcommittee directed its staff to work with the executive branch staff when developing the proposed requirements. At its December 1999 meeting, the IT Subcommittee (and subsequently the LFC) approved the proposal. The proposal included requirements for:

1. The executive branch to develop a statewide information technology (IT) plan;
2. State agencies to submit agency IT plans and IT budget information during the executive planning process and be included in the documentation supporting the Executive Budget; and
3. The executive branch to prepare an "IT Report" to the legislature that combines planning and budget information.

The Executive Planning Process instructions sent to agencies in February 2000 by the OBPP address many of these requirements.

Other Major Issues to be Reviewed

Governance

At its March 8, 2000 meeting, the IT Management Subcommittee will address IT governance in Montana and contemplate changes to the legislative process to review the unified computer budget summary and other IT-related budget information. An information technology consulting firm under contract with the state will provide the subcommittee a national perspective and comparisons of Montana's IT governance issues to those of other states and relevant industry sectors.

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee Review Options

Section 12(3) of House Bill 2 requires the unified computer budget summary and other IT-related budget information be reviewed by the long-range planning joint appropriations subcommittee, or other legislative committee, as designated, composed of members of the house appropriations and senate finance and claims committees formed specifically to address statewide computer issues. The Subcommittee will address various options for this review process at the March 8, 2000 meeting.

Timelines

June 2000

The IT Management Subcommittee workplan anticipates a final decision on governance and appropriation subcommittee review options no later than June 2000. Subcommittee directions to staff for drafting proposed statutory changes will occur at the June 2000 meeting.

September 2000

The draft final report to the legislature and the accompanying draft legislation will be reviewed and adopted at this final meeting of the IT Management Subcommittee. The full Legislative Finance Committee will also review the final report and proposed legislation at its September 2000 meeting.

House Bill 2 Language Directing It Management Study

56th Legislature

Section 12. Interim information technology management study.

1. To address legislative concerns regarding state agencies' investments in and expenditures for information technology hardware, software, and services, the legislative finance committee shall undertake a study of state information technology. The study may include a review and assessment of the following:
 - a) Management review and approval processes for information technology planning and budgeting;
 - b) Governance structures established to provide policy direction for information technology;
 - c) Adequacy and appropriateness of existing policy regarding asset replacement cycles;
 - d) Current level of interagency coordination of information technology deployment to minimize costs, reduce duplication, maximize efficiencies, and provide the greatest possible services to the citizens of Montana;
 - e) Past and current levels and trends with regard to information technology expenditures, with appropriate comparisons to other states and industry sectors;
 - f) Methods used to develop rates for proprietary-funded agencies providing information technology services; and
 - g) Current information technology statutes, rules, and policies.
8. The study should include recommendations to the office of budget and program planning for presentation of information technology budget information that enables the legislature to make policy decisions that result in establishment of and adjustment in computer-related expenditures by agency and program and within fund types. The office of budget and program planning shall present this information to the legislature in the form recommended by the legislative finance committee.
9. The information described in [section 9] and in subsection (2) of this section must be reviewed by the joint appropriations subcommittee on long-range planning, or other legislative committee as designated, composed of members of the house appropriations and senate finance and claims committees formed specifically to address statewide computer issues.

The committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the governor and to the 57th legislature.

Section 9. Unified computer budget summary.

The office of budget and program planning shall provide to the legislature no later than November 15, 2000, by agency and program, a report showing information technology-related actual and adjusted expenditures in fiscal year 2000 and budgeted amounts for each year of the 2003 biennium. The expenditure categories included must be by mutual agreement with the legislative fiscal analyst and the legislative finance committee through the state information technology study required under [section 12]. The office of budget and program planning shall present information that allows a reasonable determination of associated funding for each agency, program, and reporting level or equivalent report component.