

State of Montana Information Technology Managers Advisory Council

Council Business Meeting February 5, 2014 - 10:00 – 12:00 Room 152 – State Capitol

Welcome and Introductions (10:00 - 10:15)

- Michael Sweeney, Chair
 - ACTION ITEM: Approval of January minutes
- Ron Baldwin, State CIO Update

Business (10:15 – 11:50)

- Change Management Process (5 minutes)
 - Action Item – Michael Sweeney
- Legislative Finance Committee Reports – Kris Wilkinson (5 minutes)
- LGIT Update – Joe Frohlich (5 minutes)
- Multifactor Authentication Update – Lynne Pizzini (5 minutes)
- Potential New Services
 - Project Management Tool – Anita Bangert (5 minutes)
 - Security Audit Service (5 minutes)
- Software Asset Management
 - GIS/ESRI Renewal – Maris Cundith (5 minutes)
 - Microsoft EA Update – Maris Cundith (5 minutes)

BREAK

- Strategic Planning Update - Ron (10 minutes)
- Legislative/IT Planning Timeline – Tammy (2 minutes)
- ITMC Work Plan – Michael Sweeney (10 minutes)
 - Action Item
 - Next steps discussion
- ITMC Executive Membership (10 minutes)

Standing Agenda Items (11:50 – 11:55)

- Posted Reports:
 - *State Strategic Plan, SITSD IT Plan, posted pending*
 - *Legislative/IT Planning Timeline*
 - *ITMC Work Plan*
 - *YouTube Terms of Service*
 - *Data Protection Initiative*
 - *Enterprise Change Notice Process*
 - *MITA Review*

Adjournment (11:55-12:00)

- **Next Meeting – March 5**
- **Member Forum**
- **Public Comment**
- **Adjourn**

Notice: The Department of Administration will make reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities who wish to participate in the ITMC public meetings or need an alternative accessible format of this notice. If you require an accommodation, contact the Department of Administration no later than six business days prior to the meeting of interest, to advise us of the nature of the accommodation that you need. Please contact Carol Schopfer, 406-444-4510 or cschopfer@mt.gov.

2014 ITMC Work Plan

2014 WORK PLAN

The purpose of this work plan is to identify the high-level **priorities** of the ITMC and the **actions** needed to support those priorities. This work plan will:

1. Support the State CIO and the Statewide Strategic IT Plan.
2. Focus ITMC efforts on priorities that have been identified as important.
3. Identify tangible actions and outcomes for ITMC to work towards achieving.

For 2014, these priorities are focused on how we work together or are a major common concern and are not necessarily technology or operational priorities per se. The actions will help drive the ITMC working groups and efforts to be focused on the “right” work. Well defined actions are also measurable in that we can look back and say “Did we accomplish what we said we were going to do?”

PRIORITIES AND ACTIONS

1. **GOVERNANCE PRIORITY** – While respecting the federated structure of IT operations in state government, we also recognize the value and necessity of working together as an enterprise. We also understand that we also need to be able to measure our performance as an enterprise and tell the story of all IT in the State of MT.

GOVERNANCE ACTIONS:

- **Make the ITMC Work Plan a duty of the ITMC Executive Board with refreshing of the Work Plan yearly.** A plan that is revised annually to reflect the changing makeup and priorities of the ITMC Executive Board and the IT environment of the State ensures that ITMC doesn't fall back to irrelevancy or apathy.
- **Revamp the ITPR process so that it is driven to develop a clearinghouse of what agencies are doing, buying and when.** This also ties into the agency IT Strat Plans (what we're now calling our operational or tactical plans).
- **Develop an enterprise IT Project Inventory/Portfolio that includes all projects.** This would be internal and NOT an LFC reporting mechanism, although it could feed such. We need something operational and not constrained by political influence. Done correctly, the open exchange of information will help foster accountability and cooperation.
- **Inventory and charter all “enterprise working groups”** such as the ISMG, NMG, and any others so everyone knows what they are supposed to do (purpose), how they operate (membership, meetings, how decisions are made), reporting, etc.

2. **SHARED SERVICES PRIORITY** – There are areas where we can and should work together to develop shared services. Even though this may result in unequal cost allocations we resolve to work through them in a manner that benefits the enterprise.

SHARED SERVICES ACTIONS:

- **Develop an IT Services Governance Group** – This group will assist SITSD in vetting and developing all SITSD enterprise services and investments. They will also participate in the shutdown and decommissioning of enterprise services that are no longer needed or are forecast to decline.
 - **Identify Services that are candidates for shared services** – This effort will identify, inventory and prioritize services provided by both SITSD and agencies that are candidates to become shared or enterprise services.
3. **SECURITY PRIORITY** – We’ve heard over and over and over that a lack of resources (mainly people with the expertise needed) is hampering our ability to develop agency level security programs, policies, processes and tools at a pace in compliance with the State’s adoption of the NIST standards. We need to work together to find the resources or lobby our respective leaderships for the needed resources. 20 voices saying the same thing is much more effective than one.

SECURITY ACTIONS:

- **Create a Statewide Security Coalition or Task Force tasked with addressing the number one security concern: Lack of resources.** Include all branches (Leg, Judicial and Exec.) and locals and universities where possible. This group will be responsible for obtaining the funding/resources necessary to meet the requirements of MCA 2-155...security program statute and perhaps other statutory or operational requirements of non-exec branch participants. We’re only secure as our weakest link.

Reporting to ITMC

| |
|---|
| Information Owner |
| Name: Brett Boutin |
| Organization & Work Unit: SITSD/ Acquisition Management Services Bureau |
| Phone: 444-0515 |
| Email: bboutin@mt.gov |
| Website (if applicable): |

| | |
|---|--|
| Information | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Informational <input type="checkbox"/> Issue <input type="checkbox"/> Action Needed <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | |
| Name of Service, Program, Project or Issue: YouTube (Google) Terms of Service | |
| Description/Background: The State CIO was asked to look into the YouTube Terms of Service Agreement to determine the best course of action for state agencies to be able to use YouTube. NASCIO (National Association of State CIOs) Social Media Legal Workgroup identified important issues found in YouTube’s standard terms in the areas of indemnification, governing law, and jurisdiction. The Workgroup has negotiated an agreement with Google which has more favorable terms for governmental entities than its standard agreement. The result was a Content License Agreement (CLA) that is available exclusively to state governments. The CLA resolves the legal issues noted above. The Chief Legal Counsel for the Department of Administration and the Governor’s office legal counsel have reviewed the CLA and recommend its use for state government. | |
| <u>Impact:</u> State agencies are advised to use this Content License Agreement for use of YouTube rather than agreeing to the standard agreement. While not perfect, this CLA ensures compliance with Montana state law and provides some safeguards to agencies from the standard agreement. While the language in the CLA does state “other Google services and products,” this only applies to the YouTube brand and product at this point. The language in the CLA refers only to embedded YouTube videos within other Google products, such as an Android based phone or Google +, but does not extend beyond that. | |
| <u>Process:</u> There is a specific process by which the agencies can obtain these terms for their YouTube usage (See Attachment 2). Each individual agency will need to assess the new terms and determine a contact within the agency that has the authority to enter into an agreement with YouTube and submit that to NASCIO. For example, agency CIO, legal counsel, or procurement/contract officer. (See Attachment 3 –NASCIO Submission Template.) NASCIO will then submit requests to YouTube on a monthly basis, and YouTube will return the CLA to the agency contact for them to click to sign. Each agency must separately file for their YouTube channel to be switched over. Each agency must go through this process in order to be under the new terms, and will be at risk if they remain under the standard terms. | |

If an agency is currently subject to the standard terms, it is recommended that you cancel this agreement by giving a 30-day notice and sign up for the new agreement.

YouTube will be providing branded channels as the new terms are put into effect. Branded channels provide more flexibility to the content provider in terms of personalizing the design and template of the channel. They also do away with “unrelated third party videos” and have significantly less advertising than a standard YouTube channel. Each branded channel will have their own specific URL, which can be used to allow state channels past content filters. NASCIO also believes that each state should have the ability to set up their own branded channel, with each agency then having a sub channel, though this will have to be worked out directly with YouTube, once they return to the individual agencies with the terms.

Attachments:

Attachment 1: NACSIO YouTube CLA (note: this is for reference, it is what will be e-mailed to the agency contact to accept via click-through. Consider review with your agency legal counsel. This CLA is not subject to further negotiations, need to accept as-is.)

Attachment 2: Agency YouTube CLA Process Steps

Attachment 3: NASCIO Submission Template

CONTENT LICENSE AGREEMENT

This Content License Agreement ("Agreement") is entered into by and between Google Inc. ("Google") with an address at 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA, 94043 and the state government entity agreeing to the terms herein ("Provider"). This Agreement will be effective as of the date a person who has full legal authority to bind the Provider to these terms and conditions clicks the "Agree and Accepted" button below (the "Effective Date"). Only persons who have full legal authority to bind the Provider to these terms and conditions may click the "Agree and Accepted" button below.

1. DEFINITIONS

"Confidential Information" is information disclosed by one party to the other party under this Agreement that is marked as confidential information by the disclosing party.

"Google Services" means the YouTube Website and other Google websites, products and services.

"Playback Pages" are pages on the YouTube Website that stream at no cost to the user the selected Provider Content.

"Provider Content" means the audio and audiovisual content and related metadata and materials provided to Google by Provider via specified delivery means.

"YouTube Video Player" is a media player that streams at no cost to the user the selected Provider Content via the Google Services.

"YouTube Website" means the Google Service known as YouTube located at <http://www.youtube.com>, including replacements or successor versions and international versions.

2. LICENSES

2.1 Provider Content. Provider grants to Google a non-exclusive, limited right and license to host, cache, route, transmit, store, copy, distribute, perform, display, reformat, excerpt, analyze, and otherwise use Provider Content on the Google Services to (i) host the Provider Content on Google's servers; (ii) index Provider Content; (iii) display, perform, and distribute Provider Content on Google Services; and (iv) make continuing improvements to Google Services. The foregoing includes all necessary licenses to use the compositions and sound recordings of any music included in the Provider Content in order to host, index, display, perform, synchronize, and distribute Provider Content (except for the necessary rights and permissions for the public performance in the United States of the musical compositions embodied in Provider Content), and the right to modify Provider Content solely to the extent technically necessary to index and display Provider Content. Provider understands and agrees that Google Services incorporating Provider Content may be syndicated to Google's affiliates and syndication partners.

2.2 Brand Features License. Provider grants to Google a non-exclusive, limited, worldwide, royalty-free license to use any trademarks, trade names, domain names, designs, and logos ("Brand Features") provided by Provider in connection with Provider Content to fulfill Google's obligations under this Agreement. Google may also include the Brand Features in partner lists and presentations, solely for the purpose of promoting the availability of Provider Content in Google Services. Notwithstanding the foregoing, Brand Features shall not be used to imply a direct endorsement by the Provider of YouTube, Google, or Google Services

3. OBLIGATIONS

3.1 Delivery, Hosting, Serving, Storage, Territorial Limitations. Provider will deliver the Provider Content and associated metadata pursuant to specifications provided by Google. Subject to Google's hosting policies and terms, Google will host, store, and serve Provider Content on the YouTube Website, through the YouTube Video Player, and via other Google Services. Google shall create or enable Provider to create multiple Provider channels on the YouTube Website that prominently displays the Provider trademarks, contains a collection of Provider Content, and may be designed by Provider using Google templates. Google will also provide Provider the means to select a specific URL for each Provider channel so long as that URL is available and not already in use. Provider will specify in a metadata feed or other Google interface the territorial limitations for streaming Provider Content, and

may set other limitations on distribution and display via Google Services other than the YouTube Website. Google shall also provide Provider with the ability to specify territorial limitations for streaming Provider Content. Google retains the right to place advertisements on and in connection with the YouTube Video Player and Google Services, except that Google will not place graphic or in-video advertising for third party products or services or the Promoted Videos module on the Playback Pages for Provider Content designated by Provider as “Track Only” through functionality made available by Google. Provider shall not include any promotions, sponsorships, or other commercial advertisements as part of Provider Content. If any such ads are included as part of Provider Content, Google may elect to remove the Provider Content. Provider shall not deliver to Google any Provider Content comprised substantially of third party materials unless Provider is an licensee of online distribution rights for the underlying material or Provider otherwise has the rights to use the material (e.g. in accordance with “fair use” principles. If a third party provides Google with a claim of ownership of any material contained within Provider Content, then: (a) the Provider Content may be blocked from the YouTube Website and the YouTube Video Player, and (b) if Provider disputes the third party claim, Provider will participate in an informal procedure administered on or behalf of Google to resolve the dispute. Notwithstanding the foregoing, nothing herein shall limit Providers rights and remedies under applicable law against a user with respect to any content in dispute.

3.2 **Removal.** If Provider notifies Google or Google determines that its use of Provider Content may create liability for Google or harm the integrity of Google’s servers or the Google Services, Google may stop displaying Provider Content. In that circumstance, or for any other reason, Provider may remove Provider Content through methods made available by Google to remove the material from Google Services within 48 hours. If Provider Content continues appearing on Google Services more than 48 hours after Provider has successfully initiated removal, Provider shall notify Google of the URL by sending an email to partner-takedownrequest@youtube.com or other addresses Google may designate, and Google will use commercially reasonable efforts to remove the material from the Google Services promptly, but no more than 20 days of confirmed receipt of such notice.

4. **Cookies.** Google will provide Provider the means to embed the YouTube Video Player so that the YouTube Video Player will not set persistent cookies until the YouTube Video Player begins playback of the Provider Content, provided that Provider complies with Google’s applicable technical requirements and instructions (which may be updated from time to time). Provider acknowledges that, except as expressly set forth in this Agreement, Google uses persistent cookies in connection with the YouTube Video Player.

5. **Confidentiality.** The parties shall not disclose to any third parties Confidential Information disclosed by one party to the other under this Agreement. Each party shall protect Confidential Information by applying the same degree of care used by the parties to protect their own confidential information. If any Confidential Information is required to be produced by law, the noticed party will promptly notify the other party and, to the extent allowed by law, cooperate to obtain an appropriate protective order prior to disclosing any confidential information. Both parties agree that, notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, Provider may be bound by state laws and regulations that may require disclosure of information, including disclosure of the fact that an agreement is in place between the parties. Provider agrees that any disclosure of information pursuant any law, regulation or compulsory process requiring disclosure will not, to the extent lawfully permitted, include any Confidential Information. Any required disclosure by Provider of documents that may contain Google Confidential Information will be preceded by notice to Google in accordance with applicable law, regulation and policy, including applicable agency rules.

6. **REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES.** Each party represents and warrants that it has authority to enter into the Agreement. Provider represents and warrants that (a) it owns or has secured all necessary rights and licenses to grant the licenses set forth in Section 2; or (b) Provider Content is in the public domain and does not require a license for Google’s use in accordance with this Agreement. Provider represents and warrants that it is a state government entity.

7. **DISCLAIMERS, LIMITATIONS OF LIABILITY, NO-COST NATURE OF AGREEMENT.** EXCEPT FOR THE EXPRESS WARRANTIES MADE BY THE PARTIES IN

SECTION 6, THE PARTIES DISCLAIM ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING ANY IMPLIED WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE. EXCEPT FOR BREACHES OF REPRESENTATIONS AND WARRANTIES SET FORTH IN SECTION 6, (I) NEITHER PARTY WILL BE LIABLE TO THE OTHER FOR INDIRECT, CONSEQUENTIAL, SPECIAL, PUNITIVE OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES OR PENALTIES ARISING FROM OR RELATED TO THIS AGREEMENT; AND (II) NEITHER PARTY'S AGGREGATE LIABILITY FOR ANY CAUSE OF ACTION ARISING FROM OR RELATED TO THIS AGREEMENT WILL EXCEED \$50,000. The parties understand and agree that the Provider is not obligated to deliver Provider Content and reserves the right to remove any or all Provider Content at its sole discretion. Nothing in this Agreement, in and of itself, obligates the Provider to expend appropriations or incur financial obligations. The parties acknowledge and agree that none of the obligations arising from this Agreement are contingent upon the payment of fees by one party to the other.

8. **TERMINATION.** (a) Either party may end this Agreement on 30 days written notice. All licenses granted in this Agreement will expire upon termination. (b) Sections 1, 5, 7, 8(b), and 9 survive termination.

9. **MISCELLANEOUS.** The parties are independent contractors, and nothing in this Agreement creates an agency, partnership, or joint venture. Neither party may assign this Agreement to any third party, except to its parent company or any majority owned subsidiaries, without the prior written consent of the other. This Agreement sets forth the entire agreement between the parties and supersedes any prior or contemporaneous written or oral agreements regarding its subject matter, including any clickthrough agreement not expressly incorporated into this Agreement (For avoidance of doubt, the parties agree that the execution of this Agreement does not constitute a clickthrough agreement). This Agreement may be amended only in a writing signed by both parties. Failure to enforce any provision of this Agreement will not be deemed a waiver. Each party will send any notices hereunder in writing and to the attention of the Legal Department at the address listed on the first page of this Agreement. If any provision of this Agreement conflicts with applicable laws or is adjudicated, that provision will be deemed eliminated from the Agreement and the Agreement will remain in effect so long as the essential purpose can still be achieved. This Agreement may be executed in one or more counterparts, each of which will be deemed an original and all of which, when taken together, will constitute a single instrument.

NASCIO/YouTube TOS Negotiation – Content License Agreement Process Steps

Agency Steps:

1. Assess current use of YouTube. Understand there is risk with standard terms and use of the Content License Agreement (CLA) is recommended. Adoption of revised terms grandfathers in existing YouTube content.
2. Request a click-through link to the new CLA by submitting entity name, authorized staff contact name, and email addresses to NASCIO. (See Attachment 3 NASCIO Submission Template.)
 - a. Submit the template to Samantha Wenger at swenger@AMRms.com.
 - b. Her complete contact information:

Samantha Wenger
Research Coordinator
National Association of State Chief Information Officers (NASCIO)
201 East Main Street, Suite 1405, Lexington, KY 40507 USA
O 859.514.9212 | F 859.514.9166 | swenger@AMRms.com | www.nascio.org
3. NASCIO submits the submission form to YouTube at monthly intervals.
4. YouTube forwards click-through email operationalizing new terms to agency contacts (See Attachment 1 – NASCIO YouTube CLA, for a preview of what will be sent to agency contact).
5. Agency contact will click to accept the CLA.

YouTube - NASCIO - Content License Agreement (CLA) Requests

| Agency Name | Authorized Requestor | Title | Email | Phone Number | Address_Line1 | Address_Line1 | City | State | Zip |
|-------------|----------------------|-------|-------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------|-------|-----|
|-------------|----------------------|-------|-------|--------------|---------------|---------------|------|-------|-----|

Reporting to ITMC

| |
|--|
| Information Owner |
| Name: Lynne Pizzini |
| Organization & Work Unit: State Information Technology Services Division |
| Phone: 444-9127 |
| Email: lpizzini@mt.gov |
| Website (if applicable): |

| | |
|---|--|
| Information | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Informational <input type="checkbox"/> Issue <input type="checkbox"/> Action Needed <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | |
| Name of Service, Program, Project or Issue: Data Protection Initiative | |
| Description: The Data Protection Initiative has three parts: Access Control and Verification, Multi-factor Authentication, and Enterprise Risk Assessment. This is an update to the status of each of these areas of this initiative. Access Control and Verification A governance group has been formed and is meeting on a monthly basis. This group has adopted the Enterprise Human Resources system as the “gold source” for employee data. This group is working on a proposal for some updates to policies related to UserIDs and passwords. The technical team meets on a weekly basis. The Federated Identity Management system has been configured within a test environment and many test scenarios are being completed. Multi-factor Authentication A business case has been created and a recommendation for a system has been made. The Department of Revenue will be piloting the system because of their need for the system quickly to meet IRS requirements as well as to mitigate the risk of data exposure. The project team is meeting on a weekly basis to establish tasks. Enterprise Risk Assessment The project charter has been approved. The team is meeting on a weekly basis with representatives from Health and Human Services, Department of Revenue, Department of Labor, and Department of Justice. Requirements are in review and will be released shortly for a CEP. | |
| Impact: Impacts all state agencies. | |

Key Dates:

Other information and list any attachments:

Enterprise Change Notification Process

BACKGROUND

The Information Technology Managers Council (ITMC) has recognized a need for an enterprise change notification process. The need for this process stems from an increase in shared resources (facilities, systems, etc.).

The purpose of the change notification process is to promote awareness of agency IT changes to systems either hosted in shared facilities or systems shared by multiple agencies. Benefits are; minimize system down time by ensuring the right resources are available at the time of the change and ensuring changes are occurring at a time that will have the least amount of negative impact on enterprise and agency services.

CHANGE NOTIFICATION PROCESS

State agencies will submit a Change Notification for all IT changes that have a moderate risk of having a significant impact on multiple agencies.

1. Change notifications will be submitted the SITSD Service Desk at least seven days prior to the scheduled change. The notification will include: Agency Point of Contact (name, phone number), Change Type (hardware, software, etc.), Planned Start Time (date, time), Planned End Time (date, time), Change description (work being performed), and Expected Impact (what will happen).
2. The SITSD Service Desk will post notifications to the Forward Schedule of Changes located on the SITSD Service Desk website <https://mine.mt.gov/content/it/service-desk/fsc.xls>
3. Agency Change Notifications will be reviewed and discussed weekly at the Wednesday Change Advisory Board (CAB) meeting. Meeting information can be found at: <http://mine.mt.gov/it/changemanagement/default.mcp>
4. For Urgent Changes – (Immediate change is required to resolve or avoid a major incident) Agencies will notify the SITSD Service Desk ASAP so proper notification can be sent to all agencies impacted.

MITA Review

A REVIEW OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MONTANA INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACT

DECEMBER 2, 2009

Pertinent Statute with Comments

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 1. | 2-17-505. Policy. (1) It is the policy of the state that information technology be used to improve the quality of life of Montana citizens by providing educational opportunities, creating quality jobs and a favorable business climate... | Minor Issue: CIO has no constitutional responsibility over education at the OPI or University level Minor Issue: Creating quality jobs is beyond the scope of IT since there is no capital investment strategy – we are a rate recovery organization. | |
| 2. | 2-17-505. Policy. (1) It is the policy of the state that information technology be used to...protecting individual privacy and the privacy of the information contained within information technology systems. (2) It is the policy of the state that the development of information technology resources in the state must be conducted in an organized, deliberative, and cost-effective manner. | Working well. | |
| 3. | 2-17-505. Policy. (2)(a) There are statewide information technology policies, standards, procedures, and guidelines applicable to all state agencies and other entities using the state network. | Minor Issue: Not all entities are funded or have the resources to comply i.e. Counties or small agencies | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 4. | <p>2-17-505. Policy. (2)(b) Whenever feasible and cost-effective, common data is entered once and shared among agencies.</p> <p>(c) In order to minimize unwarranted duplication, similar information technology systems and data management applications are implemented and managed in a coordinated manner.</p> <p>(d) Planning and development of information technology resources are conducted in conjunction with budget development and approval.</p> | <p>Working well: The agencies are just starting to address this in the state strategic plan</p> | |
| 5. | <p>2-17-505. Policy. (2)(e) Information technology systems are deployed aggressively whenever it can be shown that it will provide improved services to Montana citizens</p> | <p>Minor Issue: Aggressive deployment is up to four years due to the legislative budgeting process and the existing purchasing process.</p> | |
| 6. | <p>2-17-505. Policy. (2)(f) Public-private partnerships are used to deploy information technology systems when practical and cost-effective.</p> | <p>Working well: Becoming more prevalent. Minor Issue: Companies have expressed an interest in partnering with ITSD in making capital investment in the state’s IT infrastructure but there are no provisions in the law to allow for such private investment.</p> | |
| 7. | <p>2-17-505. Policy. (2)(g) State information technology systems are developed in cooperation with the federal government and local governments with the objective of providing seamless access to information and services to the greatest degree possible</p> | <p>Minor Issue: To the best of our ability – many times there are conflicting objectives and lack of information or communication from the federal side.</p> | |
| 8. | <p>2-17-505. Policy. (2)(h) State information technology systems are able to accommodate electronic transmissions between the state and its citizens, businesses, and other government entities.</p> <p>(3) It is the policy of the state that the department must be accountable to the governor, the legislature, and the citizens of Montana.</p> | <p>Working well.</p> | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|---|---|---|
| 9. | 2-17-506. Definitions. (1) "Board" means the information technology board established in 2-15-1021 . | Working well. | |
| 10. | 2-17-506. Definitions. (2) "Central computer center" means any stand-alone or shared computer and associated equipment, software, facilities, and services administered by the department for use by state agencies. | Major Problem: The term "central computer center" needs to be better defined. | |
| 11. | 2-17-506. Definitions. (4) "Data" means any information stored on information technology resources. | Major Problem: The term "data" needs to be better defined. | |
| 12. | 2-17-506. Definitions. (6) "Electronic access system" means a system capable of making data accessible by means of an information technology facility in a voice, video or electronic data form, including but not limited to the internet. | Minor Issue: Need to expand to meet today's criteria | |
| 13. | 2-17-506. Definitions. (7) "Information technology" means hardware, software, and associated services and infrastructure used to store or transmit information in any form, including voice, video, and electronic data. | Minor Issue: Need to expand to meet today's criteria | |
| 14. | 2-17-506. Definitions. (8) "State agency" means any entity of the executive branch, including the university system | Major Problem: Need to clarify status of agencies with elected officials. i.e. AG – DOJ/OPI/etc. University system is outside the authority of the CIO | Revise section to clarify the status of agencies with elected officials. i.e. AG – DOJ/OPI/etc. Section needs to clarify relationship between 2-17-512, 2-17-506, 2-17-516, and 2-17-546 |
| 15. | 2-17-506. Definitions. (9) "Statewide telecommunications network" means any telecommunications facilities, circuits, equipment, software, and associated contracted services administered by the department for the transmission of voice, video, or electronic data from one device to another. | Minor Issue: Need to expand to meet today's criteria | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|--|---|--|
| 16. | 2-17-511. Chief information officer -- duties. The duties of the chief information officer include but are not limited to: (1) carrying out all powers and duties of the department as assigned by the director of the department; (2) serving as the chief policy advisor to the director of the department on statewide information technology issues; and (3) assisting and advising the director of the department on the enforcement responsibilities provided in 2-17-514 . | Minor Issue: Does not truly reflect the duties of the CIO as they are currently being executed. | |
| 17. | 2-17-512. Powers and duties of department. (1) The department is responsible for carrying out the planning and program responsibilities for information technology for state government, except the national guard. | Major Problem: The term state government is very broad and exceed the boundaries outlined in 2-17-506 i.e. agencies and 5-17-516 | Section needs to clarify relationship between 2-17-512, 2-17-506, 2-17-516, and 2-17-546 |
| 18. | 2-17-512. Powers and duties of department. (1)(a) shall encourage and foster the development of new and innovative information technology within state government; (1)(b) shall promote, coordinate, and approve the development and sharing of shared information technology application software, management systems, and information that provide similar functions for multiple state agencies; (1)(c) shall cooperate with the office of economic development to promote economic development initiatives based on information technology; | Working well. | |
| 19. | 2-17-512. Powers and duties of department. (1)(d) shall establish and enforce a state strategic information technology plan as provided for in 2-17-521; | Major Problem: Does not define and provide for enforcement activities | |
| 20. | 2-17-512. Powers and duties of department. (1)(e) shall establish and enforce standards statewide information technology policies... | Major Problem: Does not define and provide for enforcement activities | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| 21. | 2-17-512. Powers and duties of department. (1) (g) shall coordinate with the office of budget and program planning to evaluate budget requests that include information technology resources. The department shall make recommendations to the office of budget and program planning for the approval or disapproval of information technology budget requests, including an estimate of the useful life of the asset proposed for purchase and whether the amount should be expensed or capitalized, based on state accounting policy established by the department. An unfavorable recommendation must be based on a determination that the request is not provided for in the approved agency information technology plan provided for in 2-17-523 . | Working well. | |
| 22. | 2-17-512. Powers and duties of department. (1) (j) shall review the use of information technology resources for all state agencies; | Minor Issue: Law does not define review and provide authority for corrective action. The CIO can only advise. | |
| 23. | 2-17-512. Powers and duties of department. (1) (k) shall review and approve state agency specifications and procurement methods for the acquisition of information technology resources; | Working well. | |
| 24. | 2-17-512. Powers and duties of department. (1)(l) shall review, approve, and sign all state agency contracts and shall review and approve other formal agreements for information technology resources provided by the private sector and other government entities; | Minor Issue: CIO cannot comment on private sector and other entity agreements such as university etc. | |
| 25. | 2-17-512. Powers and duties of department. (1) (m) shall operate and maintain a central computer center for the use of state government, political subdivisions, and other participating entities under terms and conditions established by the department; | Minor Issue: Does not define central computer center. The term the definitions section needs to be better defined. | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 26. | <p>2-17-512. Powers and duties of department.(1) (n) shall operate and maintain a statewide telecommunications network for the use of state government, political subdivisions, and other participating entities under terms and conditions established by the department;</p> <p>(o) shall ensure that the statewide telecommunications network is properly maintained. The department may establish a centralized maintenance program for the statewide telecommunications network.</p> <p>(p) shall coordinate public safety communications on behalf of all state agencies as provided for in 2-17-541 through 2-17-543;</p> <p>(q) shall manage the state 9-1-1 program as provided for in Title 10, chapter 4, part 3;</p> | Working well. | |
| 27. | <p>2-17-512. Powers and duties of department.(1) (r) shall provide electronic access to information and services of the state as provided for in 2-17-532;</p> | Minor Issue: There is no defined electronic records management process in the state at this time. | |
| 28. | <p>2-17-512. Powers and duties of department.(1)(s) shall provide assistance to the legislature, the judiciary, the governor, and state agencies relative to state and interstate information technology matters;</p> <p>(1)(t) shall establish rates and other charges for services provided by the department;</p> <p>(1) (u) must accept federal funds granted by congress or by executive order and gifts, grants, and donations for any purpose of this section;</p> <p>(1) (v) shall dispose of personal property owned by it in a manner provided by law when, in the judgment of the department, the disposal best promotes the purposes for which the department is established</p> | Working well. There is no guarantee of budgetary authority to execute funds being granted. | |
| 29. | <p>2-17-512. Powers and duties of department.(1) (w) shall implement this part and all other laws for the use of information technology in state government;</p> | Minor Issue: The term state government need to be better defined. | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| 30. | <p>2-17-512. Powers and duties of department.(1) (x) shall report to the appropriate interim committee on a regular basis and to the legislature as provided in 5-11-210 on the information technology activities of the department; and (1)(y) shall represent the state with public and private entities on matters of information technology.</p> | <p>Working well. The term state needs to be defined</p> | |
| 31. | <p>2-17-512. Powers and duties of department. (2) If it is in the state's best interest, the department may contract with qualified private organizations, foundations, or individuals to carry out the purposes of this section</p> | <p>Working well.</p> | |
| 32. | <p>2-17-513. Duties of board. The board shall: (1) provide a forum to: (a) guide state agencies, the legislative branch, the judicial branch, and local governments in the development and deployment of intergovernmental information technology resources;</p> | <p>Minor Issue: How does the board guide entities outside of the executive branch.</p> | |
| 33. | <p>2-17-513. Duties of board. The board shall: (1) provide a forum to: (b) share information among state agencies, local governments, and federal agencies regarding the development of information technology resources;</p> | <p>Minor Issue: There is no provision for including or identifying those federal agencies.</p> | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|---|----------------|--------------------------|
| 34. | <p>2-17-513. Duties of board. (3) review and advise the department on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) statewide information technology standards and policies; (b) the state strategic information technology plan; (c) major information technology budget requests; (d) rates and other charges for services established by the department as provided in 2-17-512(1)(t); (e) requests for exceptions as provided for in 2-17-515; (f) notification of proposed exemptions by the university system and office of public instruction as provided for in 2-17-516; (g) action taken by the department as provided in 2-17-514(1) for any activity that is not in compliance with this part; (h) transfer of information technology funds, resources, and employees as provided for in 2-17-531; and (i) the implementation of major information technology projects and advise the respective governing authority of any issue of concern to the board relating to implementation of the project; <p>(4) study state government's present and future information technology needs and advise the department on the use of emerging technology in state government; and</p> <p>(5) request information and reports that it considers necessary from any entity using or having access to the statewide telecommunications network or central computer center.</p> | Working well. | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| 35. | <p>2-17-514. Department -- enforcement responsibilities. (1) If the department determines that an agency is not in compliance with the state strategic information technology plan provided for in 2-17-521, the agency information technology plan provided for in 2-17-523, or the statewide information technology policies and standards provided for in 2-17-512, the department may cancel or modify any contract, project, or activity that is not in compliance. (2) Prior to taking action provided for in subsection (1), the department shall review with the board any activities that are not in compliance. (3) Any contract entered into by an agency that includes information technology resources must include language developed by the department that references the department's enforcement responsibilities provided for in subsection (1). A contract that does not contain the required language is considered to be in violation of state law and is voidable pursuant to subsection (1). The language developed by the department may not be varied pursuant to 18-4-224.</p> | <p>Minor Issue: All enforcement capability is contract centered – other enforcement actions are not provided for in statute.</p> | |
| 36. | <p>2-17-515. Granting exceptions to state agencies. Subject to 2-17-516, the department may grant exceptions to any policy, standard, or other requirement of this part if it is in the best interests of the state of Montana. The department shall inform the board, the office of budget and program planning, and the legislative finance committee of all exceptions that are granted and of the rationale for granting the exceptions. The department shall maintain written documentation that identifies the terms and conditions of the exception and the rationale for the exception.</p> | <p>Working well.</p> | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|---|---|--|--|
| 37. | <p>2-17-516. Exemptions -- university system -- office of public instruction -- national guard. (1) Unless the proposed activities would detrimentally affect the operation of the central computer center or the statewide telecommunications network, the office of public instruction is exempt from 2-17-512(1)(k) and (1)(l). (2) Unless the proposed activities would detrimentally affect the operation of the central computer center or the statewide telecommunications network, the university system is exempt from:</p> <p>(a) the enforcement provisions of 2-17-512(1)(d) and (1)(e) and 2-17-514;</p> <p>(b) the approval provisions of 2-17-512(1)(f), 2-17-523, and 2-17-527;</p> <p>(c) the budget approval provisions of 2-17-512(1)(g);</p> <p>(d) the provisions of 2-17-512(1)(k) and (1)(l); and</p> <p>(e) the transfer provisions of 2-17-531.</p> <p>(3) The department, upon notification of proposed activities by the university system or the office of public instruction, shall determine if the central computer center or the statewide telecommunications network would be detrimentally affected by the proposed activity.</p> <p>(4) For purposes of this section, a proposed activity affects the operation of the central computer center or the statewide telecommunications network if it detrimentally affects the processing workload, reliability, cost of providing service, or support service requirements of the central computer center or the statewide telecommunications network.</p> <p>(5) When reviewing proposed activities of the university system, the department shall consider and make reasonable allowances for the unique educational needs and characteristics and the welfare of the university system as determined by the board of regents.</p> <p>(6) When reviewing proposed activities of the office of public instruction, the department shall consider and make reasonable allowances for the unique educational needs and characteristics of the office of public instruction to communicate and share data with school districts.</p> | <p>Minor Issue: This section in differs with the scope of MITA outline in sect 2-17-512 and differs from the blanket exception granted 2-17-546</p> | <p>Section needs to clarify relationship between 2-17-512, 2-17-506, 2-17-516, and 2-17-546.</p> |
| <p>(7) Section 2-17-512(1)(u) may not be construed to prohibit the university system from accepting federal funds or gifts, grants, or donations related to information technology or telecommunications.</p> | | <p>Page 10 of 20</p> | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|--|----------------|--------------------------|
| 38. | 2-17-517. Legislative and judicial branch information sharing. The legislative branch and the judicial branch shall provide their information technology plans to the department. | Working well. | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|--|----------------|--------------------------|
| 39. | <p>2-17-518. Rulemaking authority. (1) The department shall adopt rules to implement this part, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) rules to guide the review and approval process for state agency software and management systems that provide similar functions for multiple state agencies, which must include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) identifying the software and management systems that must be approved; (ii) establishing the information that state agencies are required to provide to the department; and (iii) establishing guidelines for the department's approval decision; (b) rules to guide the review and approval process for state agency acquisition of information technology resources, which must include but are not limited to processes and requirements for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) agency submissions to gain approval for acquiring information technology resources; (ii) approving specifications for information technology resources; and (iii) approving contracts for information technology resources; and (c) rules for granting exceptions from the requirements of this part, which must include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) a process for applying for an exception; and (ii) guidelines for determining the department's approval decision. <p>(2) The department may adopt rules to guide the development of state agency information technology plans. The rules may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) agency plan review procedures; (b) agency plan content requirements; (c) guidelines for the department's approval decision; and (d) dispute resolution processes and procedures. <p>(3) Adequate rules for the use of any information technology resources must be adopted by the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) supreme court for judicial branch agencies; and (b) legislative council as a part of the legislative branch computer system plan, as provided for in 5-11-405, for the consolidated legislative branch, as provided for in 5-2-504. | Working well. | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|--|--|--------------------------|
| 40. | <p>2-17-521. State strategic information technology plan -- biennial report. (4) The department shall prepare a biennial report on information technology based on agency information technology plans and performance reports required under 2-17-524 and other information considered appropriate by the department. The biennial report must include:</p> <p>(a) an analysis of the state's information technology infrastructure, including its value, condition, and capacity;</p> | <p>Minor Issue: The state does not have an established accounting practice for valuing these types of assets. i.e. Purchase Value, Replacement Value, Depreciation Value, Residual Value, or Other.</p> | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|---|---|---|
| 41. | <p>2-17-524. Agency information technology plans -- form and content -- performance reports. (1) Each agency's information technology plan must include but is not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) a statement of the agency's mission, goals, and objectives for information technology, including a discussion of how the agency uses or plans to use information technology to provide mission-critical services to Montana citizens and businesses; (b) an explanation of how the agency's mission, goals, and objectives for information technology support and conform to the state strategic information technology plan required in 2-17-521; (c) a baseline profile of the agency's current information technology resources and capabilities that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) includes sufficient information to fully support state-level review and approval activities; and (ii) will serve as the basis for subsequent planning and performance measures; (d) an evaluation of the baseline profile that identifies real or potential deficiencies or obsolescence of the agency's information technology resources and capabilities; (e) a list of new projects and resources required to meet the objectives of the agency's information technology plan. The investment required for the new projects and resources must be developed using life-cycle cost analysis, including the initial investment, maintenance, and replacement costs, and must fulfill or support an agency's business requirements. (f) when feasible, estimated schedules and funding required to implement identified projects; and (g) any other information required by law or requested by the department, the governor, or the legislature. <p>(2) Each agency's information technology plan must project activities and costs over a 6-year time period, consisting of the biennium during which the plan is written or updated and the 2 subsequent bienniums.</p> <p>(3) Each agency shall prepare and submit to the department a biennial performance report that evaluates progress toward the objectives articulated in its information technology plan. The report must include:</p> | <p>Minor Issue: Successful accomplishment of the plan is often driven by availability of resources.</p> <p>Agencies are unable to project meaningful fiscal data 6 years out</p> | <p>Section (2) needs to be revised to reduce the project cost to 2 years.</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) an evaluation of the agency's performance relating to information technology; (b) an assessment of progress made toward implementing the agency information technology plan; | <p>Page 14 of 20</p> | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 42. | <p>2-17-524. Agency information technology plans -- form and content -- performance reports. (3)(c) an inventory of agency information services, equipment, and proprietary software.</p> <p>(4) State agencies shall prepare agency information technology plans and biennial performance reports using standards, elements, forms, and formats specified by the department.</p> | <p>Minor Issue: Prescriptive in nature – business requirements should drive the agencies IT support plans and capital investment strategy.</p> | |
| 43. | <p>2-17-526. Information technology project budget summary. (1) (a) The office of budget and program planning, in cooperation with the department, shall prepare a statewide summary of:</p> <p>(i) proposed major new information technology projects contained in the state budget; and</p> <p>(ii) proposed major information technology projects impacting another state agency or branch of government to be funded within the current operating budgets, including replacement of or upgrade to existing systems.</p> <p>(b) The office of budget and program planning and the department shall jointly determine the criteria for classifying a project as a major information technology project.</p> <p>(2) The information technology project summary must include:</p> <p>(a) a listing by institution, agency, or branch of all proposed major information technology projects described in subsection (1). Each proposed project included on the list must include:</p> <p>(i) a description of what would be accomplished by completing the project;</p> | <p>Working well.</p> | |
| 44. | <p>2-17-526. Information technology project budget summary. (2)(a)(ii) a list of the existing information technology applications for all branches of government that may be impacted by the project;</p> | <p>Major Problem: Establishes a legal requirement that is impossible to meet. Does not define branches of government and requires a knowledge base that does not exist.</p> | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|--|----------------|--------------------------|
| 45. | <p>2-17-526. Information technology project budget summary. (2)(a)(iii) an estimate, prepared in consultation with the impacted agencies, of the costs and resource impacts on existing information technology applications;</p> <p>(iv) the estimated cost of the project;</p> <p>(v) the source for funding the project, including funds within an existing operating budget or a new budget request; and</p> <p>(vi) the estimated cost of operating information technology systems.</p> <p>(b) a listing of internal service rates proposed for providing information technology services. Each internal service rate included on the list must include:</p> <p>(i) a description of the services provided; and</p> <p>(ii) a breakdown, aggregated by fund type, of requests included in the state budget to support the rate.</p> <p>(c) any other information as determined by the budget director or the department or as requested by the governor or the legislature.</p> <p>(3) The information technology project summary must be presented to the legislative fiscal analyst in accordance with 17-7-111(4).</p> | Working well. | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|---|--|--------------------------|
| 46. | 2-17-531. Transfer of funds, equipment, facilities, and employees. (1) The department shall provide for the cost-effective use of information technology resources. In order to ensure that needless duplication of efforts in this field do not occur, the department may order the transfer of appropriated funds, custody, and control of equipment and facilities and employees to the department as may be necessary to implement this program. Upon transfer, as authorized in this section, a credit account must be established in the name of the agency from which transfer is made in the amount of funds appropriated and the market value of equipment and facilities. A credit account must be used to defray the costs of associated charges from the department as provided in 2-17-512 . (2) The provisions of this section may not affect the rights or privileges of any employee transferred to the department under the public employees' retirement system, the group insurance plan, or personnel system. | Minor Issue: The political will does not exist to implement this section. | |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|--|--|---|
| 47. | <p>2-17-534. Security responsibilities of department. The department is responsible for providing centralized management and coordination of state policies for security of data and information technology resources and shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) establish and maintain the minimum security standards and policies to implement 2-15-114, including the physical security of the central computer center, statewide telecommunications network, and backup facilities consistent with these standards; (2) establish guidelines to assist agencies in identifying information technology personnel occupying positions of special trust or responsibility or sensitive locations; (3) establish standards and policies for the exchange of data between any agency information technology resource and any other state agency, private entity, or public entity to ensure that exchanges do not jeopardize data security and confidentiality; (4) coordinate and provide for a training program regarding security of data and information technology resources to serve governmental technical and managerial needs; (5) include appropriate security requirements in the specifications for solicitation of state contracts for procuring data and information technology resources; and (6) upon request, provide technical and managerial assistance relating to information technology security. | <p>Major Problem: This is a significant responsibility for which adequate resources have not been provided – Program funding, personnel, and SCIO</p> | <p>MITA needs to provide for a Chief Security Officer and related staff. See item 55 below.</p> |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|---|---|--|
| 48. | 2-17-546. Exemption of law enforcement telecommunications system -- exception. The provisions of this part do not apply to the law enforcement telecommunications system or its successor except for the provisions dealing with the purchase, maintenance, and allocation of telecommunication facilities. However, the department of justice shall cooperate with the department to coordinate the telecommunications networks of the state. | Major Problem: There is no agreement on what constitutes the Law enforcement telecommunications system and its successor. Need to define the term “telecommunication facility” and the term “shall cooperate” is too vague to enforce. | This section needs to be revised to clarify if the state is authorizing multiple networks and who has responsibility for managing those networks, including security issues, and to eliminate the conflict with 2-17-512 as it applies to responsibility for the network, and section 2-17-506(9). Section needs to clarify relationship between 2-17-512, 2-17-506, 2-17-516, and 2-17-546 |
| 49. | Not in Statute. | No purpose statement to provide scope and interpretation. What problem are we solving? | |
| 50. | Not in Statute. | Project management is not addressed. | Provision needs to be added to MITA |
| 51. | Not in Statute. | Dispute resolution is not addressed. | |
| 52. | Not in Statute. | The lack of an information technology fund does not allow for an effective capital planning and investment strategy for economic development required by section 2-17-505 and 512. | |
| 53. | Not in Statute. | Duties of the CIO are vague. | Some of the duties of the department (2-17-512) need to be moved to the duties of the CIO (2-17-511) and the status of the CIO as a cabinet member needs to be addressed |
| 54. | Not in Statute. | Need to define the scope and function of ITSD as it relates to its organizational alignment. | Statute needs to delineate the authority of CIO/ITSD to issues and enforce policy for Information technology. |
| 55. | Not in Statute. | No provision for a Chief Security Officer and related staff (requires funding). | Provision needs to be added to MITA |

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Statute</u> | <u>Comment</u> | <u>Corrective Action</u> |
|-------------|-----------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 56. | Not in Statute. | Need to make provision for a Chief Technology Officer. | Provision needs to be added to MITA |
| 57. | Not in Statute. | No provisions for a Capital Planning and Investment Committee – separate for advisory. | |
| 58. | Not in Statute. | REF: agency IT plans do not maximize data sharing and collaboration as communities of interest. | |
| 59. | Not in Statute. | IT responsibilities for Disaster Recovery need to be addressed. | |
| 60. | Not in Statute. | No provision for GIO and GIS staff. | |



MONTANA LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Legislative Fiscal Division

Room 110 Capitol Building * P.O. Box 201711 * Helena, MT 59620-1711 * (406) 444-2986 * FAX (406) 444-3036

Director
AMY CARLSON

DATE: March 6, 2012

TO: Legislative Finance Committee Members

FROM: Kris Wilkinson, Fiscal Analyst II

RE: Criteria for Placement on the IT Project Portfolio Listing

The Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) asked the staff to work with the State Information Technology and Services Division (SITSD) to create criteria for the IT project portfolio to ensure that the report adequately captures IT development within state government. The previous criteria for placement on the IT project portfolio listing were that projects exceeded \$400,000 and were funded with capital appropriations or were of legislative interest. The following issues with the previous criteria were identified:

- o Criteria do not capture sizeable investments being made in IT within base budgets
- o Difficulties in defining "impact to the citizenry as criteria" in determining which systems to add to the list when the risk to the public is perceived as greater than the cost to the system. The example used in the report was that if a low-cost change to an eligibility system such as the SNAP (food stamps) program is not completed correctly, it could impact the ability of the state to issue or re-load electronic benefit cards making it difficult for low-income families to purchase food
- o Investment is defined in terms of the cost to design, develop and implement a system; it does not contain any post implementation operational costs. The cost to operate a system is funded within an agency's budget

To address the concerns the Legislative Fiscal Division (LFD) and the SITSD developed the following criteria for placement on the IT project portfolio listing. The recommendation to the LFC is that if a project meets any one of these criteria, it will be included on the LFC IT project portfolio report:

- o Project estimate is at least \$500,000 for development. Development costs include costs for internal staff, vendor contracts, equipment and software
- o Project is included in the bill that provides resources for long-range IT
- o Project is potentially of enterprise interest or need. For example, document imaging systems have been implemented by a number of agencies with a cost of less than \$500,000, however statewide the investment in the technology could be considered significant
- o Request from the LFC to include the project on the report. To address concerns with impact to the citizenry, LFD staff will review IT strategic plans for smaller projects that

pose potential risks to the public. Staff would bring forward those projects with potential risks to the Legislative Finance Committee for discussion and potential placement on the IT project portfolio listing

To address concerns with the definition of the investment in IT projects the LFD recommends that the LFD, SITSD, and the Office of Budget and Program Planning develop a format for funding requests for IT projects that include operating costs.

IT Project Portfolio Report
LFC Meeting Date: December 9, 2013

| General Project Information | | | | | | | | | | Schedule Dates | | Total Estimated Cost | | Project Amounts | | | | | Expended | | Project Health | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|----|------------------------|----------|----------|----------------|------|---------|---------------|--|
| Agency | Title | Current Phase | Sponsor | HB10 Funding Year(s) | Actual Start Date | Original Delivery Date | Revised Delivery Date | % of Work Completed | Original Estimate | Current Estimate | General Fund | State Special Revenue | Federal | Other: note source in comment area | Total | Total | % | Supplemental financing | Scope | Schedule | Budget | Risk | Overall | Indep. Verif. | |
| AGR | Agricultural Licensing System | DEV | Greg Ames | | 4/29/2012 | 11/1/2013 | 6/30/2014 | 60 | \$580,000 | \$580,000 | \$0 | \$580,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$580,000 | \$201,250 | 35 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: CPP awarded the IT Contract to Stoneriver on 10/4/13. CPP and Stoneriver staff have been working on requirement for the Registration piece of the service since. We received the first draft of Phase one campaign & Committee requirements on 11/20/13 and are review the first draft of the deliverable for this portion of the project. The end date has been pushed to 5/14/14 only for the reporting portion of the project. The end date for the registration portion is still 1/14/14 and is on track to go live by then. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CPP | Campaign Finance Electronic Filing System | PLN | Jonathan Motl | 2013 | 7/1/2013 | 1/14/2014 | 5/1/2014 | 10 | \$502,000 | \$438,800 | \$502,000 | | | | \$502,000 | \$4,800 | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: RFP13-2276P, to design, develop, support, and maintain the State of Montana's new Remediation Information Management System, was released on 4/09/2013 and closed 6/11/2013; the original estimate for contract execution was September, 2013. DEQ received two proposals. Due to some technical procurement issues, DOA Procurement canceled the RFP. DEQ and DOA are making changes to the RFP and anticipates re-releasing it in the third quarter of Fiscal Year 2014. The project is estimated to take 2 1/2 years after the agreement is executed. Because it does not have a mandatory completion date, the Project Health remains green. CEP 13-DEQ-QA-22 for Quality Assurance and Independent Verification & Validation (I/V&V) services, was released on 5/17/2012 and closed 6/07/2013; the original estimate for contract execution was August 2013. DEQ did not receive any proposals and will re-submit the CEP after the above RFP is awarded. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DEQ | Remediation Information Management System (RIMS) | PLN | Jenny Chambers | 2013 | 1/23/2012 | | | 5 | \$1,800,000 | \$1,800,000 | \$700,000 | \$1,060,000 | \$40,000 | | \$1,800,000 | 0 | | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: STAARS Design, Development and Implementation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLI | STAARS Design, Development and Implementation | DEV | Roy Mulvaney | 2009, 2011 | 2/11/2013 | 2/24/2014 | | 66 | \$12,500,000 | \$12,500,000 | | \$16,735,567 | \$3,000,000 | | \$19,735,567 | \$5,753,209 | 29 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: Expended thru 11/14/13. Includes three payments to vendor totaling \$4,895,000. Two more payments are scheduled, one when the system goes into production (2/14/14) and the second at the end of the subsequent 15 month warranty period (5/24/15). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DLI | Workers Compensation Application Network (WCAN) | DEV | Diana Ferriter | | 10/3/2011 | 3/2/2015 | | 79 | \$3,000,000 | \$3,027,955 | | \$3,027,955 | | | \$3,027,955 | \$1,994,416 | 66 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: 39-71-225 (MCA) Workers' compensation database system. (1) The department shall develop a workers' compensation database system to generate management information about Montana's workers' compensation system. The database system must be used to collect and compile information from insurers, employers, health care providers, claimants, claims examiners, rehabilitation providers, and the legal profession. % complete has remained the same from last period due to an increase in the number of issues encountered by testers. % complete is based on the total number of issues and those completed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DOA | Computerized Maintenance Management System - CMMS | INT | Sheila Hogan | | 3/1/2013 | 1/5/2015 | | 0 | \$350,000 | \$350,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$350,000 | \$350,000 | \$0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: SABHRS: MBARS Upgrade | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DOA | SABHRS: MBARS Upgrade | DEV | Cheryl Grey | | 7/1/2011 | 12/31/2015 | | 41 | \$1,174,300 | \$1,222,500 | | | | \$1,222,500 | \$1,222,500 | \$786,164 | 64 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: Funding provided through SABHRS Finance and Budget Bureau proprietary/internal service fund. Working with contractor on data conversion, gap analysis, development, configuration, and testing | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DOJ | Enterprise Content Management (ECM) MVD Imaging System | IMP | Brenda Nordlund | | 9/30/2012 | 6/30/2013 | 6/30/2014 | 40 | \$325,000 | \$325,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$325,000 | \$325,000 | \$219,973 | 68 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: The ECM MVD Imaging Solution is a five phase project focused on developing: 1) Driver Document Management System workflow-based replacement of the obsolete Intellivue system; 2) Court Actions document scanning and interface workflow with Montana Office of the Court Administrator via Sharepoint; 3) Commercial Driver's License and Medical Certification document imaging workflow; 4) disability placard workflow processing; and 5) provide for the extension of the ECM capability to support other MVD and DOJ Division imaging business needs as funding allows. Appropriated Budget Amounts: E-Commerce funds will be committed to the implementation of the MVD Imaging Solution project. Item 4 is in the planning phase. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DOJ | MHP In-Car Video System | IMP | Tom Butler | | 6/27/2012 | 7/1/2016 | 6/30/2015 | 30 | \$1,900,000 | \$1,868,209 | \$0 | \$1,868,209 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,868,209 | \$781,816 | 42 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: MERLIN Phase 3 Drivers | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DOJ | MERLIN Phase 3 Drivers | PLN | Brenda Nordlund | | 3/31/2012 | 6/30/2012 | 6/30/2016 | 16 | \$5,100,000 | \$5,500,000 | \$0 | \$5,100,000 | \$401,314 | \$0 | \$5,501,314 | \$429,408 | 8 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: MERLIN (Montana Enhanced Registration and Licensing Information Network) Phase 1 and Phase 2 are in production (Accounting, Motor Vehicle Services, Dealer Services). The third and final phase is to provide analysis and design for the driver services that are foundational to the eventual development and deployment of MERLIN integrated driver licensing and records management applications. Phase 3 is planned in four parts (1. Accounting and Unified Customer; 2. Electronic Payment Services; 3. Customer Service Portal; 4. Driver Services). Phase 3 Parts 1 & 2 are underway, the business process design and requirements are about complete. The next step is the development. Phase 3 Part 3 is in the planning stage. Phase 3 Part 4 is still in progress with 3M assistance. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DOJ | Montana Insurance Verification System (MTIVS) | IMP | Brenda Nordlund | | 6/30/2011 | 6/30/2016 | | 80 | \$270,000 | \$270,000 | | \$270,000 | | | \$270,000 | \$232,000 | 86 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: The MTIVS solution allows law enforcement, courts, MVD, and other authorized users to determine if a Montana motorist has (or has had) valid insurance for their vehicle(s). MTIVS operations and maintenance costs for ongoing support are not included in the project development budget. MTIVS development is complete and an internet portal is operational to perform insurance verification transactions. Law enforcement, Criminal Justice Information Network, and Courts have access to MTIVS. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DPHHS | MACWIS Planning | PLN | Robert Runkel | | 10/1/2013 | 12/31/2014 | | 0 | \$350,000 | \$653,568 | \$326,784 | \$326,784 | | | \$653,568 | \$0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| Agency Comments: Original project estimate was created during the 2013 legislative session. Current project estimate is revised based on conversation with federal partner, ACF, and requirements that this planning effort also include a revised feasibility study and alternative analysis and to show total cost of ownership including agency support. Per conversation with federal partner this project is eligible for enhanced SACWIS federal participation at 50%. Project staff are in progress of being assigned and a project manager is anticipated to be on staff by 12/01/2013. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

IT Project Portfolio Report
LFC Meeting Date: December 9, 2013

| General Project Information | | | | | | | | | | Schedule Dates | | | | Total Estimated Cost | | Project Amounts | | | | | Expended | | Project Health | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|----|------------------------|-------|----------|----------|------|----------------|--------|--|--|--|
| Agency | Title | Current Phase | Sponsor | HB10 Funding Year(s) | Actual Start Date | Original Delivery Date | Revised Delivery Date | % of Work Completed | Original Estimate | Current Estimate | General Fund | State Special Revenue | Federal | Other: note source in comment area | Total | Total | % | Supplemental Post-imp. | Scope | Schedule | Budget | Risk | Overall | Verif. | | | |
| DPHHS | Medicaid Modernization and MAGI Implementation | DEV | Mary Dalton | | 6/20/2013 | 10/1/2013 | | 95 | \$6,665,789 | \$6,665,789 | \$666,579 | | \$5,999,210 | | \$6,665,789 | \$1,892,243 | 28 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: Development under this project is federally required modernization of the Medicaid Eligibility for Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI) which must be implemented by October 1, 2013.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DPHHS | Medicaid Eligibility & Enhancement and CHIMES MA/HMK-EA Integration | DEV | Mary Dalton | | 6/20/2013 | 12/31/2015 | | 15 | \$26,497,917 | \$26,497,917 | \$2,649,792 | | \$23,848,125 | | \$26,497,917 | \$2,860,495 | 11 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: This project includes development and implementation of the agency Service First Initiative, including online application, phone cloud, and full integration of CHIMES MA/HMK into the enterprise architecture.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DPHHS | Human Resource Database and Tracking System | INT | Deborah Sloat | | 6/1/2013 | 6/30/2014 | | 30 | \$550,000 | \$550,000 | \$214,665 | \$44,550 | \$290,785 | \$0 | \$550,000 | \$0 | 0 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: This project is being developed as an enterprise wide solution involving State Human Resource Division. Project is estimated at 30% complete based on contractor work performed; however no invoice has been received for payment as of this reporting period.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DPHHS | Budget Report Management System | DEV | Marie Matthews | | 6/1/2012 | 12/31/2013 | | 50 | \$501,180 | \$501,180 | \$217,430 | \$22,769 | \$260,981 | \$0 | \$501,180 | \$301,180 | 60 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: This is a multi phase project. Phase I of the project is estimated to be \$301,180; Phase II of the project for additional functionality is estimated to be \$200,000.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DPHHS | Healthcare Facility Licensing Database | DEV | Roy Kemp | | 6/1/2012 | 12/31/2013 | | 80 | \$535,136 | \$535,136 | \$426,084 | \$4,545 | \$104,507 | \$0 | \$535,136 | \$307,400 | 57 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: This is a multi phase project. Phase I of the project is estimated to be \$300,000; Phase II of the project for additional functionality is estimated to be \$235,136.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DPHHS | Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS) | DEV | Jeff Buska | 2009 | 4/2/2012 | 3/2/2015 | | 27 | \$70,000,000 | \$78,426,777 | \$10,046,470 | \$0 | \$68,380,307 | \$0 | \$78,426,777 | \$9,244,664 | 12 | X | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: MMIS includes \$69.9m from Long Range IT, including transfers, and \$8.4m from HB2 appropriations. Projected costs for ICD-10 project appropriated in HB4 during the 2007 legislative session are included in the reporting of the MMIS project.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DPHHS | Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Case Management System | PLN | Robert Runkel | | 1/1/2013 | 12/31/2013 | | 85 | \$1,475,500 | \$1,475,500 | \$314,282 | \$0 | \$1,161,218 | \$0 | \$1,475,500 | \$694,254 | 47 | X | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: Implementation remains as December 31, 2013. The final functionality pieces are being completed and moved in for End to End UAT.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DPHHS | Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) Safety Assessments and Centralized Intake - SAMS | DEV | Robert Runkel | 2007 | 8/1/2012 | 2/28/2014 | | 64 | \$1,495,000 | \$1,973,466 | \$1,082,426 | \$0 | \$891,040 | \$0 | \$1,973,466 | \$1,200,751 | 61 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: HB2 cost estimate is for interfaces and integration of MSAMS into the existing CAPS. This work will be completed under existing LOE within the CAPS M&O contract using base budgeted authority. No additional request for appropriations will be necessary for this current identified interface effort. This amount is identified here to provide a full cost accounting of the project across the agency. The project scope and timeline have been updated resulting in a good development and UAT routine for the releases with an anticipation of an initial launch in Feb 2014 and with 2 more releases for offline functionality coming in June 2014. Many of the technical challenges have been resolved or processes have been identified to address them in more efficient ways.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| JUD | Montana Courts Electronic Filing System | DEV | Beth McLaughlin | | 3/7/2013 | 6/30/2017 | | | \$1,717,367 | \$1,822,206 | \$1,535,000 | \$0 | \$287,206 | \$0 | \$1,822,206 | \$577,913 | 32 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: On our first report we did not include dollars received from a Court Assessment Program Grant because we were not certain we would get the funding. Since then the funding was approved and has been expended. It is possible the federal dollars will increase by approximately \$100,000 each year for the next 5 if the CAP Grant funding continues to be approved for E-Filing.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MDT | Safety Information Management System | PLN | | | 10/1/2012 | 6/30/2014 | 9/30/2014 | 30 | \$1,500,000 | \$3,000,000 | | | \$2,250,000 | \$750,000 | \$3,000,000 | \$147,233 | 5 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: Project was not funded by Legislative Appropriation. Original costs estimates were focused on a COTS Decision Support Tool for safety management. The new estimate includes a purchased data store needed to support the tool and includes MDT staff time for the duration of the project. A Request for Proposal (RFP) was released to the public in September 2013. Responses are under review by the MDT Evaluation Committee. Vendor selection is scheduled for November 2013.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MDT | Maintenance Management System (MMS) | PLN | Jonathon Swartz | FY2014 | 3/4/2013 | 7/1/2015 | | 12 | \$2,000,000 | \$2,000,000 | | | | | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | X | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: The MMS project is currently in the early stages of requirements gathering. The overall plan is to utilize the RFP process to procure a COTS (commercial off-the-shelf) system to replace the current computer application. This project is funded via HB10. We have not requested HB10 funds distribution as of yet. The current estimated cost does not currently include soft costs; the overall budget, which will include all costs, has not been finalized.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MPERA | Line of Business - Hosting | DEV | Barbara Quinn | | 7/9/2012 | 9/5/2016 | | 3 | \$1,140,000 | \$1,140,000 | | | \$1,140,000 | \$1,140,000 | \$33,507 | 3 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments: Funding source is Pension Administration. Project was unanimously approved by the Public Employee's Retirement Board on 10/14/2010. MPERA has contracted with Department of Administration Information Technology Services Division (SITSD) to host the Line of Business development environment at the state data center. Third Party Software and Hardware has been purchased and ongoing costs incurred as part of the hosting with SITSD.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MPERA | MPERA: Oversight Project Management & IV & V | DEV | Roxanne Minnehan | | 3/14/2011 | 4/1/2015 | | 53 | \$435,228 | \$435,228 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$435,228 | \$435,228 | \$203,162 | 47 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments:</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MPERA | MPERA: Data Cleansing Implementation | DEV | Patty (MPERA) Davis | | 8/5/2012 | 9/5/2016 | | 38 | \$487,098 | \$487,098 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$485,000 | \$450,000 | \$151,976 | 34 | X | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| | | | | | <p>Agency Comments:</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MPERA | MPERA: Line of Business - Implementation | DEV | Barbara Quinn | | 7/9/2012 | 9/5/2016 | | 30 | \$7,850,000 | \$7,362,891 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$7,850,000 | \$7,850,000 | \$2,153,403 | 27 | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |

| General Project Information | | | | Schedule Dates | | | | Total Estimated Cost | | Project Amounts | | | | | Expended | | Project Health | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------|----------|--------|------|---------|---------------|--|
| Agency | Title | Current Phase | Sponsor | HB10 Funding Year(s) | Actual Start Date | Original Delivery Date | Revised Delivery Date | % of Work Completed | Original Estimate | Current Estimate | General Fund | State Special Revenue | Federal | Other: note source in comment area | Total | Total | % | Supplemental Post-Fmp | Scope | Schedule | Budget | Risk | Overall | Indep. Verif. | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | In the last quarter MPERA and Sagitech have continued work on the phase of Calculations, Service Purchase, Claims, Death which started June 10, 2013. This phase has had some delays do to various circumstances. At this time there is no change to the overall completion of phase 4.A.2, however it is possible that the end date for the phase may be impacted. There was an approximate two month delay in completing construction for phase 4.A.1, which has impacted construction for phase 4.A.2, and it is currently behind schedule. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPI | K-20 Data Project | PRE | James Gletzen | | 7/1/2012 | 6/30/2015 | | 20 | \$4,000,000 | \$3,977,860 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,977,860 | \$0 | \$3,977,860 | \$271,000 | 7 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | Project is on track and is currently in contract negotiations with IBM for our Data Transport/Transcript Management Solution. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPI | School Staffing | IMP | Madalyn Quinlan | | 7/1/2010 | 1/1/2013 | 12/31/2013 | 97 | \$400,000 | \$625,000 | \$625,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$625,000 | \$531,275 | 85 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | The change in the end date is due to some limited resources available with both the OPI and the contractor at this time. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPI | Statewide Longitudinal Data System | DEV | Madalyn Quinlan | | 7/1/2010 | 6/30/2013 | 6/30/2014 | 95 | \$5,798,457 | \$5,798,457 | \$0 | \$0 | \$5,798,457 | \$0 | \$5,798,457 | \$4,043,210 | 70 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | The original deliverables were met on time and under budget. The project end date was extended to accommodate additional scope. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OPI | Direct Certification Process Improvement Project | DEV | | | 2/6/2012 | 12/31/2013 | | 95 | \$959,537 | \$959,537 | \$0 | \$0 | \$959,537 | \$0 | \$959,537 | \$884,858 | 92 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | Project is scheduled to go live in September 2013. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SITSD | Data Protection Initiative | INT | Ron Baldwin | 2014-2015 | 10/15/2013 | 6/30/2015 | | 1 | \$2,000,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,000,000 | \$0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | This project has just begun. The project plan is still in development. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SITSD | Phase 1 (RFI) Electronic Records Management (ERM)/Electronic Content Management (ECM) Project | PLN | Ron Baldwin | | 7/16/2013 | 1/1/2014 | 2/1/2014 | 20 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | Sent out survey; received responses; preparing to issue RFI in December 2013 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SITSD | SITSD: Public Safety Communications System | DEV | | 2007; 2009; 2013 | 8/1/2004 | 7/1/2016 | 7/1/2016 | 70 | \$150,000,000 | \$121,000,000 | \$12,500,000 | \$0 | \$51,400,000 | \$5,500,000 | \$69,400,000 | \$62,622,170 | 90 | X | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | Since the last report the total project funding increased by \$3.0 million due to the approval of an appropriation by the 2013 Legislature for system operations and maintenance. All of the current remaining project funding of approx. \$6.778 is currently obligated to vendors/contractors for outstanding projects. We will continue to report the budget and risk in YELLOW due to the risk of not being able to secure funding to fully complete the system to provide coverage to the entire state. It should be realized that what has been completed is functional and is operating today, the system is just not built out to all locations across the state. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SOS | Information System Management (SIMS) - Phase 2 & 3 | PRE | Linda McCulloch | 2013 | | | | | \$4,078,385 | \$4,078,385 | \$4,078,385 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,078,385 | \$0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | Phase 2 and 3 include document back scanning and hosting costs. Document back scanning RFP awarded and work began 11/4/2013. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SOS | Information System Management (SIMS) - Phase 1 | IMP | Linda McCulloch | | 7/2/2009 | 2/27/2012 | 12/1/2013 | 95 | \$1,529,181 | \$1,529,181 | \$1,529,181 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1,529,181 | \$1,446,169 | 95 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | Phase 1 went live on 7/1/2013. Final acceptance on 11/13/2013. 12-month warranty period expires 11/12/2014. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| STF | Insurance Claim Processing System Upgrade | DEV | Al Parisian | | 7/1/2013 | 3/31/2015 | | | \$484,644 | \$484,644 | \$0 | \$0 | \$484,644 | \$0 | \$484,644 | \$0 | 0 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TRS | M-Trust Technical Upgrade | PLN | Shawn Graham | | 10/10/2013 | 4/22/2016 | | 0 | \$2,550,000 | \$2,550,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,550,000 | \$2,550,000 | \$40,740 | 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Agency Comments | At the time of reporting, TRS is in the process of developing CEPs to procure IV&V, technical writing, and testing services for this project. The estimated cost of these services is included in the Total Estimated Cost category of the LFC IT Project Portfolio Report. The M-Trust Technical Upgrade is being conducted module by module where percent complete is based on accepted invoice deliverables. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Current Phase: The project's current phase: INT=Initiation, PLN=Planning, DEV=Development, IMP=Implementation, CLS=Close, HLD=Hold

Project Health Criteria

Scope: Green = features and functionality being built as designed and still within green parameters of schedule, budget and/or risk.
 Yellow = scope changes have been introduced that either (1) the impact is unknown; or, (2) cause the schedule, budget and/or risk to become Yellow.
 Red = scope changes negatively impact the schedule, budget and/or risk into Red.

Schedule: Green = Critical Path milestones are on schedule.
 Yellow = Critical Path milestone has been missed but schedule contingency exists.
 Red = Critical Path milestone has been missed and no schedule contingency exists. Or more than one Critical Path milestone has been missed.