

**Council Business Meeting
August 5 - 8:30 – 10:30
State Capitol – Room 152**

Welcome and Introductions (8:30 – 8:50)

- Larry Krause, Vice Chair
 - Introductions
 - Approval of June Minutes
 - Future meetings/FY2016 ITMC Nominations

- Ron Baldwin, State CIO Update (15 minutes)

Business (9:00 -10:25)

- FIM Project – Jerry Marks (5 minutes)
 - Observations/Concerns/Feedback – Roundtable discussion (5 minutes)

- Service Catalog/vRealize – Matt Van Sickle (10 minutes)
 - Observations/Concerns/Feedback – Roundtable discussion (5 minutes)

- Mobile Device Management – Jerry Marks (5 minutes)
 - Observations/Concerns/Feedback – Roundtable discussion (5 minutes)

- IT Conference Update – Dan Chelini/Maura Fleetwood (5 minutes)
 - Observations/Concerns/Feedback – Roundtable discussion (5 minutes)

- MT-ISAC Meeting Update – Joe Frohlich (5 minutes)
 - Observations/Concerns/Feedback – Roundtable discussion (5 minutes)

- Data Classification Policy – Joe Frohlich (5 minutes)
 - Observations/Concerns/Feedback – Roundtable discussion (5 minutes)

- eGov Managers Group – Ron Baldwin/Mike Bousliman (5 minutes)
 - Observations/Concerns/Feedback – Roundtable discussion (5 minutes)

- ITPR/TRB Update – Pete Wiseman (5 minutes)
 - Observations/Concerns/Feedback – Roundtable discussion (5 minutes)

Work Group Reports

- PMO Tool – Stuart Fuller (5 minutes)
 - Observations/Concerns/Feedback – Roundtable discussion (5 minutes)

Adjournment (10:27-10:30)

- **Next Meeting September 2**
- **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's 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 Samantha Cooley at (406)444-4616, or email scooley@mt.gov

Information Technology Manager's Council Meeting

June 3, 2015 Meeting Minutes

8:30 am – 10:30 am

State Capitol, room 152

Attendee's	
<i>Meeting Chairperson: Larry Krause</i>	
Name	Agency
Kreh Germaine	DNRC
☪ Joe Chapman	DOJ
☪ Dale Gow	LEG
☪ Jerry Kozak	DOJ
☪ Lisa Mader	MT Supreme Court
☪ Dave Swenson	MPERA
☪ Mark Van Alstyne	SOS
Tim Bottenfield	DOR
Mike Bousliman	MDT
Rick Bush	TRS
Dan Chelini	DEQ
Sky Foster	AGR
Stuart Fuller	DPHHS
Jim Gietzen	OPI
Evan Hammer	MSL
Judy Kelly	DLI
Lynne Pizzini	SITSD
Stacy Ripple	STF
<i>Meeting Minutes completed by: Samantha Cooley</i>	

☪ **Real-time Communication:**

Jenifer Alger, Peter Cannon, Dale Stout, Greg Snortland, James Newhall, Michail Jares, Anne Kane, Chris Kuntz, John Levick, Kenny Kyler, Jack Marks, Dan Mossman, Dave Nagel, Pete Wiseman, Tammy Peterson, Jessica Plunkett, Kent Nice, Angie Riley, Jerry Steinmetz, Tammy Stuart, Sue Leferink, Michael Sweeney, Eric Tarr, Dawn Temple, Lisa Vasa, Irv Vavruska, Erika Billiet, Kyle Belcher, Kristin Burgoyne, Kim Warren, Wes Old Coyote, Cindy Person and James Thomas

Meeting Guests:

Maura Fleetwood, SITSD; Jerry Marks, SITSD; Tom Murphy, SITSD; Matt Hosking, SITSD; Brad Runnion, SITSD; Chris Hope, SITSD; Jody Troupe, SITSD; Christie McDowell, DOR; Joe Frohlich, SITSD; Sean Rivera, SITSD; Veronica Lamka, Northrup Grumman; Audrey Hinman, SITSD; Penne Cross, SITSD; Jeremy Stoshick, SITSD; Donny Reichert, ITC; Justin Porter, ITC; Cheryl Pesta, SITSD; Carter Williamson, IBM; Bryan Shaw, Dell; Kris Wilkinson, LFD; Manuel Soto, OPI; Matt Van Syckle, SITSD; Bret Collurd, ASG; Karen Furley, Dell; Cheryl Grey, SABHRS; Matt Pugh, SABHRS; Carol Schopfer, SITSD and Barney Benkelman, Ikuw Solutions

I. Welcome and Introductions

Approval of May Minutes

The May, 2105 ITMC Meeting Minutes were approved.

Future Meetings/FY2016 ITMC Nominations

The ITMC Chairperson, Larry Krause, announced that the nomination process for FY2016 ITMC members is coming up. The primary role of Official Members is to set the meeting agenda. However, anyone can submit topics. The group discussed the following two options:

1. Re-elect all committee members through a Survey Monkey election process.
2. Keep the current committee in place and swap the role of Chairperson from Larry Krause to Tim Bottenfield. Larry would serve as Vice Chair and Tim would serve as the Chair. In FY2017, new members will be elected through a Survey Monkey election process.

Outcome: The group agreed on keeping the ITMC Official Members roster, as-is, for FY2016, with Tim Bottenfield serving as Chair.

Action: Maura Fleetwood will contact the Governor's Office to see what action is required to put the groups decision into effect.

II. CIO Update, Lynne Pizzini on behalf of Ron Baldwin

Click on the link to access the [SITSD May 2015 Re-Org PowerPoint Presentation](#) by Lynne Pizzini.

Background

During the 2015 Legislative Session SITSD's operating budget was cut \$3.7M. SITSD's main objective was to maintain services customers by re-running the rates and providing the same services. SITSD responded by:

- ◆Business consolidation, combining five bureaus into two
- ◆Moving the procurement bureau over to State Procurement
- ◆Cutting operational expenses by reducing travel/training, re-negotiating contracts and decreasing network expenses
- ◆Reduction in force, primarily, c-level and management staff

The new organizational structure can be viewed on slide three of the PowerPoint presentation. The Financial Management Services Bureau has taken on Contract and Vendor Management, Internal Auditing and Accounting and Asset Management. The Information Technology Services Bureau is responsible for Customer Relations, the Project Management Office, Policy and Planning and Service Maintenance.

The end result of these changes was a \$3.7M savings over the next biennium. Opportunities from the re-org have been identified as:

- ◆Improved internal communication
- ◆Improved services to customers
- ◆Increased efficiency within the division

For additional information on the re-org, please contact Lynne Pizzini.

III. **Business**

O365, Jerry Marks

SITSD processed a decision brief on O365 that was a high level overview of the recommendations for O365. The recommendations, as stated in the decision brief, are as follows:

1. There will be no changes to the existing rates related to Microsoft Office 365 (O365).
2. There will be no additional charge to utilize One Drive for Business (OD4B)
3. The State of Montana will utilize Active Directory Federation Services (ADFS) with the Enterprise Forest to provide single sign on to O365 for agencies in the enterprise AD and same sign on for agencies in their own forest.
4. SITSD will manage the user activation within the State of Montana G-Tenant Space.
5. The State of Montana will implement OD4B in the secure State of Montana G-Tenant Space.
6. Agencies will be responsible for managing groups in the Enterprise Active Directory that will be used for user license activation and access to OD4B.
7. Agencies will be responsible for upgrading clients to use O365 licenses.
8. SITSD will be responsible for providing E-Discovery for both Exchange (as it is done today) and for OD4B for the Enterprise, billable on an hourly basis using the Enterprise Applications Expert Time rate.
9. SITSD will train agency technical staff through workshops. Agencies will train agency end users.
10. Agencies will be responsible for user account “clean up” activities such as assigning managers and changing SIP (Session Initiation Protocol) information within the enterprise AD forest for their assigned Organization Units (OUs).
11. DOA will pilot O365 in order for SITSD to refine and document processes for the enterprise wide roll out of O365. DOA would pilot the month of June 2015 and Agency Technical staff would start testing July 1, 2015.
12. Exchange, Lync (Skype for Business), and SharePoint will remain on premise.

Inquiry, Larry Krause:

“When do you expect this process will be complete, for all of the agencies?”

Response, Jerry Marks:

“We want to ensure this is a strategic rollout, we have a group also working on a data classification policy. We will be getting that out at the same time, there are ties between the two.”

O365 provides unlimited storage for users. Each agency will be contacted individually to explain the recommendations and the topic will be discussed at NMG.

Lynne Pizzini commented SITSD is encouraging all agencies to classify their data. More information on this will be available through the Data Classification Policy. O365 and the Data Classification Policy go hand in hand.

Internet Bandwidth, Chris Hope and Jody Troupe

Currently NTSB is conducting Flex VPN testing in-house. Jody Troupe provided an overview. Due to the fact that NTSB recognizes the need for more VPN technology and increased demand for agencies on the Statewide Network, NTSB has come up with a scalable solution called Flex VPN.

The in-house tests have been successful, NTSB stood up the proof of concept in the Data Center. The plan is that all VPN connections on the network will transition because we are reaching end of life with ASA 5505 firewalls, they need to be phased out. Flex VPN is scalable and has a 90-120 day estimated rollout period. NTSB expects that in September this product will be stood-up and available for all agencies. Pricing is not yet available.

Benefits of Flex VPN

- ◆ More dynamic
- ◆ Better security
- ◆ Runs Internet Key Exchange Protocol (IKE) version 2
- ◆ New MPLS
- ◆ Two hub deployments, western and eastern

Flex VPN is a CISCO technology. Remote sites are spokes, allowing dynamic multipoint VPN and spoke to spoke communication. NTSB is taking steps to build in robust features of VPN to securely access State resources. Due to budget constraints, there is no longer an option to go to multi-gig Ethernet. However, with VPN, NTSB is looking into spinning off multiple internet portals and getting additional bandwidth using other partners. CISCO 8011 routers will replace ASA-5505 routers over the next one to two years. It also supports layer 3.

Inquiry, Mike Bousliman:

“How will the funding work with the rates if we secure circuits that cost less?”

Response, Lynne Pizzini:

“We are waiting to hear the response on the HB10 funding plan. Replacement of the equipment was included in HB10, falling under ‘replacement of end of life equipment’ within the bill.”

Comment, Mike Bousliman:

“SITSD asked us to submit what we plan on spending, but if we start investing in less expensive circuits, it leaves us in a position to have to explain why we over stated the costs on our budget requests. It would be helpful if when SITSD sends out requests to

agencies for estimated revenues to differentiate items that are pass-through/subject to change.”

Response, Lynne Pizzini:

“We will do our best to make sure costs that are pass through /subject to change are identified when we call for estimated revenues from agencies going forward.”

Inquiry, Stuart Fuller:

“With this technology, for three to five person office’s, considering the cost of T1’s and partial DSL, is this really the way to go?”

Response, Chris Hope:

“Yes, that is one of the reasons we pursued this technology. Regarding smaller offices, if it makes sense to go to a local broadband ISP connection, that is certainly an option that can be utilized. Keep in mind, we cannot guarantee connectivity on these local connections.”

Inquiry, Stuart Fuller:

“What is the procurement vehicle to get to commodity broadband?”

Response, Lynne Pizzini:

“We are working on an RFP and developing an acquisition process for this.”

NTSB has been on a campaign the last few months to get better pricing for internet.

Action: Anyone interested in getting a price check for high cost lines, contact NTSB for a price check to see what other options may be available.

Jody Troupe commented NTSB has been able to obtain significant cost savings and improved bandwidth in Thompson Falls and Libby. They will continue pressuring Telco and Charter to partner with local telephone companies, this process takes time, but is beneficial in the long run.

Lynne Pizzini commented this is one way NTSB staff is trying to eliminate some of the traffic and move to separate internet services, moving only the VPN’s to that service. We are working hard to reduce costs and increase bandwidth. When we reach one gig we have to swap out equipment and add it to a secured area. That is one reason we are adding VPN because it doesn’t fall under those security restrictions.

Inquiry:

“Have you looked into other opportunities for multiple one gigs, besides VPN?”

Response, Lynne Pizzini:

“Yes. We are exploring all of our options.”

Inquiry, Stuart Fuller:

“Has there been further discussion with Charter or Century Link on honoring more than four QOS tags to split off internet and use QOS how it’s meant to be used? What about doing QOS tagging on some of our internet traffic to route to different pipes? This would prioritize certain internet traffic, particularly those sites that are outward facing.”

Response, Chris Hope:

“We just had a conference call with CISCO about this, one option to prioritize traffic is a product they have called iwan. This product gives you options to prioritize traffic through an expensive, NPLS circuit and a cheap broadband circuit, running the two parallel. This is a new technology and is an option in the future.”

Comment, Kyle Beltcher:

“The MOE circuits through Century Link are substantially cheaper than Charter.”

Response, Chris Hope:

“We know this is true, however, Charter has full failover capabilities. MOE is a latent dependent service with no failover capabilities. The hope with HB10 was to build MOE in Missoula as an extra failover. That request was not approved. Going between Charter and Century Link, we had to consider cost vs. risk.”

Inquiry, Mike Bousliman:

“What is the RFP strategy? My concern is that it will lock us into less flexibility in the future. If we haven’t talked about long term network needs, how can we construct an RFP? I anticipate the network going through some major changes over the next five years.”

Response, Lynne Pizzini:

“There are several agencies with different network connections, what we want to do is consolidate these to get a better pricing structure and move towards more efficient and better network services. This is included in the five year plan that will be available in July. Our strategy is to consolidate and negotiate for better prices down the road.”

Comment, Stuart Fuller:

“I want to be able to go to Triangle, Blackfoot or Mid-Rivers and use their full commodity pricing and have that procurement vehicle to get to the local telco’s.”

Response, Lynne Pizzini:

“That is what we are trying to achieve.”

In the long run, consolidation gives us more flexibility. We are trying to get all the telco’s to participate with competitive pricing. Today, for example, under the Transport Services contract, we can only reach the telco’s through Century Link or Charter. Down the road, we will save time by being able to go direct to the telco’s and ourselves and still abide by State Procurement law.

It’s expected that the decision on HB10 funds will be in by the end of the month.

Kuddos to NTSB

Kuddos to NTSB from the DNRC. They have increased connectivity speed anywhere from three to five times as fast, reduced costs for the department and have been very responsive to their needs.

BMC Control-M, Jerry Marks

Several years ago SITSD signed a four year contract with Control-M, which is the job scheduling software. The contract includes 1,900 scheduled tasks in the distributed environment and 318 mips in the mainframe environment. During the contract renewal, SITSD discovered that the test environment must be included with the licensing for BMC. More tasks are needed to achieve compliance with the licensing agreement and compliance is based on peak, daily usage. Currently, SITSD is billing based on monthly usage. SITSD is covering the costs and not receiving for revenue for this licensing.

In order for SITSD to achieve compliance with the licensing requirements, a new BMC contract was created that added 6,000 tasks between the mainframe and the distributed environment. SITSD is making some changes to recover the costs. SITSD will have to charge for tasks scheduled in the distributed test and mainframe environments. Agencies will be charged with an allotted limit, using a formula based on the last 13 months of BMC usage. SITSD will contact each customer to explain the upcoming changes going into effect as of July 1.

Project Portfolio Tool Update, Stuart Fuller

There have been several meetings to view demos of project portfolio tools, although the group has yet to make a final decision. Ability to meet requirements and the cost of software are two key challenges with making a decision. DPHHS is keeping enterprise pricing in mind while making a decision.

Action: Add Stuart to the agenda for the August ITMC Meeting to report on the project portfolio tool decision that is made.

Server/Storage, Jerry Marks

There are some budget neutral changes being made for storage and virtual server catalog items. Billing will change from an annual to a monthly virtual server rate. We are implementing minimum, one gig requirements of free space on system OS which will help with patching. Over time, patches build and servers run out of space. Changes being made will help alleviate that issue. All changes align SITSD to be a private cloud.

Server 2003, Jerry Marks

The extended maintenance for Server 2003 ends on July 14. Microsoft will not support 2003 servers without extended maintenance agreements in place. There are two extended maintenance agreement options:

1. Standard Option: enrollment is \$300K and covers up to 100 servers. Anything over 100 is \$3K per server. This option includes all patches for the one year enrollment period, can be paid quarterly and allows the number of servers to be reduced with 30 day notice. The price increases on year two to \$450K, year three to \$675K and there is no year four option.
2. Essential Option: enrollment is \$100K per year plus \$1K per patch, per server. This option can be paid quarterly and allows the number of servers to be reduced with 30 day notice.

In November of 2014, there were 188 of the 2003 servers on the State domain. Currently, there are 75. The cost for continued use of these servers falls on the agencies. SITSD would like to make the requests listed in "action" for agencies continuing to use 2003 servers.

Action: 1. Submit an exception request to SITSD for continued use of 2003 servers. 2. Have agency technical staff update the comment attribute in the enterprise active directory with information on when the server will be commissioned.

Esri Proof of Concept, Audrey Hinman

Audrey expected to have more to report on at this meeting, but she has yet to receive the contract she was expecting on Monday from Esri.

The proof of concept is complete and the results were sent to the GIS forum. To view the results, [click here](#). The testing went well; the main focus was to test if the response speed was sufficient for interacting with cloud services. Audrey will be meeting with MSL tomorrow to get suggestions on how it will be structures. She will report in at the August ITMC Meeting.

File Transfer Service, Audrey Hinman

The launch took place on May 12 and was a success. To date, over 8,000 files have been transferred using this service. You can access this service at transfer.mt.gov. All state employees will receive 20 gigs of free space. This product is fully encrypted and meets the requirements to store confidential information. The advantage to using the File Transfer Service, opposed to One Drive, is to share with external entities through ePass. Users can grant access through ePass email addresses. In the instance of staff turnover, File Transfer accounts are handled the same way email accounts are handled, with supervisors having access for a period of time.

Users can now address file transfers to active directory groups, as requested by DOJ. This attribute can be enabled by contacting the Service Desk.

eGov Advisory Group, Mike Bousliman

Mike would like to propose rethinking whether or not this group is needed.

Challenges:

- ◆ There is limited interest, usually only two or three agencies show up to meetings
- ◆ eGov is so mainstream and integrated into every day that there is no longer a need for this group
- ◆ Unclear scope/unclear goals/lack of direction
- ◆ eGov Advisory Group ended through legislation

Opportunities:

- ◆ This group was in the process of assessing the State's contract with MI. This is important work and needs to be done
- ◆ This group was in the process of developing an eGov Strategy for the State, this may have been beneficial for agencies to provide some direction for their future planning.

Outcomes:

1. eGov Managers Group will be on hiatus until September.
2. This topic will be added as an agenda item for the next ITMC meeting.
3. Ron Baldwin can bring this up at ITB and they can provide input on whether or not the group should continue and if they continue, what the role and scope should be.
4. In the meantime, the MI contract evaluation will be added as a standing agenda item to ITB.

eContracts, Matt Pugh

eMax is the new procurement system being implemented by SABHRS. Currently the project is in Phase I and vendors will be able to self-register in two weeks. The target date to cut off One Stop and move to eMax is July 10. Phases II and III will be combined, rolling out contract management and payment simultaneously. The timeline for this to be complete is uncertain, Matt expects by the end of this year/early next year it will be in place.

IV. Member Forum/ Announcements

GIS End-User Training Opportunity

Yesterday, there was a GIS Managers Forum in which the need for training was expressed. This training will be for end-users of GIS, not technical staff and will teach users how to use the GIS apps with Office products (such as excel imports etc.) The training will be held sometime in September.

Action: If agency GIS end users are interested in attending, please email Meghan Burns, GIS Analyst at MBurns2@mt.gov to express an interest.

Information Security Advisory Council (ISAC) Meeting in July

Joe Frohlich announced the first ISAC Meeting. The first meeting will be a review of the Goals and Objectives and the Rules of Operation. This council was put in place by Executive Order of Governor Bullock . Council members will consist of CIOs or agency security reps and members from the private sector and local government offices. The ISAC is asking that agency representatives serving as an official member have the authority to approve policy and direction within their agency. This meeting is an open meeting, anyone is welcome to attend and sit in the audience.

ISAC Meeting Information

Title: ISAC

Date: July 15, 2015

Time: 8:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Location: State Capitol, room 152

Web-link: <http://sitsd.mt.gov/Governance/ISAC>

Contact: Joe Frohlich

Spam and Whitelisting

SITSD is receiving a lot of questions on spam and how that is dealt with. One of the frequent questions asked is if people can whitelist certain emails and the response is always no, due to security reasons. Users do have some ability to move items of spam or quarantine. For more information on dealing with spam please visit MINE or [click here](#).

V. Adjourn

Next Meeting Information

Date: August 5, 2015

Time: 8:30-10:30 am

Location: State Capitol, room 152

Web-link: <http://sitsd.mt.gov/Governance/Boards-and-Councils/ITMC>

VI. Attachments

Web-links:

[SITSD Re-Org May 2015 PowerPoint Presentation](#)

[File Transfer Service](#)

[Esri Proof of Concept Results](#)

[SPAM Information](#)

[ISAC Meeting Information](#)

[ITMC Meeting Information](#)

VII. Summary of Action Items

Action: Maura Fleetwood will contact the Governor's Office to see what action is required to put that decision into effect.

Action: Anyone interested in getting a price check for high cost lines, contact NTSB for a price check to see what other options may be available.

Action: Add Stuart to the agenda for the August ITMC Meeting to report back on the decision made.

Action: 1. Submit an exception request to SITSD for continued use of 2003 servers. 2. Have agency technical staff update the comment attribute in the enterprise active directory with information on when the server will be commissioned.

Action: If agency GIS end users are interested in attending, please email Meghan Burns, GIS Analyst at MBurns2@mt.gov to express an interest.

Meeting Minutes Draft Submitted by: Samantha Cooley on July 29, 2015

Montana Operations Manual Guideline	Category	Information Technology, Infrastructure
	Effective Date	
	Last Revised	

Issuing Authority	Department of Administration State Information Technology Services Division
-------------------	--

GDE-Data Classification Guideline

I. Purpose

This document provides a guideline for state government employees regarding Data Classification.

II. Scope

This document is a guideline to the Data Classification Policy and it is noted in that document. If there is any conflict between the Data Classification Policy and this document, the Data Classification Policy shall prevail. This document will be updated from time to time with additional declarations of data classification or examples of context sensitive guidelines

III. Guideline

How to use this document:

First, all data classifications must adhere to all the rules and regulations of the appropriate governing bodies such as federal, state and local governments.

Second, consider the characteristics of the data elements individually. If the data elements are part of a dataset, then the dataset must be classified no lower than the highest classification of any data element.

Third, consider the characteristics of the data elements in context. The combination of multiple data elements may, in some situations, result in the combined rating being higher than the highest individual rating.

Data that should be classified as: State of Montana Public

Context Sensitive Types of Information	Examples
Agency Name	Dept. of Transportation
Hours of Operation	8 AM to 4:30 PM Monday thru Friday
Office Address	123 Main St Anywhere MT
Office Phone Number	406 555 1234
Types of Reports or Collections of Data	
Audit Reports	Excluding Data that provides knowledge that could be used to injure the State, its Citizens or Business Partners.
Agency Policies	Excluding Data that provides knowledge that could be used to injure the State, its Citizens or Business Partners.
Computer Usage History	Excluding Data that provides knowledge that could be used to injure the State, its Citizens or Business Partners.
Expenditure Data	Excluding Data that is covered by Agreement or Contract, for example Non- Disclosure Agreements
Revenue Data	Excluding Data that is not Public because of law.

1 - Data that is classified as State of Montana Public would reside in *information systems* that are categorized as Low.

Data that should be classified as: State of Montana Confidential

PII Personally Identifiable Information	PFI Personal Financial Information	PHI Personal Health Information	Other
ELECTIONS Record ¹	PAYROLL Record	PAYROLL Record	Facts on Disaster Recovery Plans
PAYROLL Record	PERSONNEL Record	PERSONNEL Record	Information covered by Non- Disclosure
PERSONNEL Record	Personal Income Tax Record		Information about an Investigation
Personal Income Tax Record	Financial Institution Information on one person or business		Passwords giving access to data. (For example, a Citizen's password granting access only to their Confidential record)
			Technical documentation, i.e., detailed network port/ip diagrams and system architectures for systems containing public, confidential or secret data
Defendant, or Witness PII Record			

1 – Note the one difference between State of Montana Public and State of Montana Confidential is the protection (confidentiality) of data.

2 - Data that is classified as State of Montana Confidential would reside in *information systems* that are categorized as medium.

Data that should be classified as: State of Montana Secret

PII Personally Identifiable Information	PFI Personal Financial Information	PHI Personal Health Information	Other
ELECTIONS Files	Federal Tax Information	PAYROLL Files	Passwords giving access to Secret data
PAYROLL Files	PAYROLL Files	PERSONNEL Files	Data that is specifically protected by law: for example: HIPAA or GLB
PERSONNEL Files	PERSONNEL Files	Information regarding people's health	Facts on Disaster Recovery Plans Data such as: Location of Recovery Sites, etc
Personal Income Tax Files	Personal Income Tax Files	Information regarding a person with AIDS	Information about Investigations, Audits, etc.
Files that contain Defendant, or Witness PII	Financial Institution Information on more than one person or business		Files containing information covered by Non-Disclosure Agreements or Federal Law
			Technical documentation, i.e., detailed network port/ip diagrams and system architectures for systems containing top secret data
			Expunged Court Cases
			Sealed Court Cases, or Child Support information

1 - Data that is classified as State of Montana Secret would reside in *information systems* that are categorized as medium.

Data that should be classified as: State of Montana Top Secret

PII Personally Identifiable Information	PFI Personal Financial Information	PHI Personal Health Information	Other
			Facts on Disaster Recovery Plans such as: Disaster Recovery Activation Codes, PII on particular people's role in a Disaster, etc.
			Information about Investigations, Undercover Officers, Police Raids, etc.
			Information about State or National Homeland Security
			Passwords giving access to Top Secret data

1 - Data that is classified as State of Montana Top Secret would reside in *information systems* that are categorized as high.

Montana Operations Manual POLICY		Category	Information Technology, Data Management
		Effective Date	
		Last Revised	
Issuing Authority	Department of Administration State Information Technology Services Division		
POL–Data Classification			

I. Purpose

The Montana Information Technology Act (MITA) assigns the responsibility of establishing and enforcing statewide IT policies and standards to the Department of Administration (DOA). The purpose of this Policy is to implement the Data Classification for defining actions to fulfill the responsibility.

II. Scope

This Policy applies to the CIO as required under [2-17-521\(4\), MCA](#), and to executive branch agencies, excluding the university system, as required under Section [2-17-524\(3\), MCA](#).

III. Policy Statement

This policy has been developed for the state’s enterprise information systems maintained by DOA based on the Montana Information Technology Act (MITA). This policy is in cooperation with the federal and local governments with the objective of providing seamless access to information and services to the greatest degree possible [2-17-505 \(3\)](#).

IV. Roles and Responsibilities

Roles and responsibilities are required by this policy and in accordance with [Appendix B - Security Roles and Responsibilities](#).

V. Requirements

This policy provides instruction on how State agencies are to better handle, secure, access, and use data. Sound business judgment and practices must be applied, and the State must comply with applicable Federal, State and Local laws and regulations, as well as any agency-specific guidelines that have been adopted for data management.

The agency head is required to classify all of the data acquired, created, or maintained by their state agency into one of the following classes:

State of Montana Public – Information available to the general public and eligible for public access. Data that is classified as State of Montana Public would reside in *information systems* that are categorized as Low.

State of Montana Confidential – Information that is covered by laws that determine and protect confidentiality. The disclosure of this information could endanger citizens, corporations, business partners and others. The types of information might be covered under non-disclosure agreements, MOU's and state contracts; or safeguarded by a general reference in law or best practices. Data that is classified as State of Montana Confidential would reside in *information systems* that are categorized as medium.

State of Montana Secret – Information that, if divulged, could compromise or endanger the people, or assets of the State; such as Public Safety Information. This is data that is specifically protected by law (e.g., HIPAA, CJI, FTI). Data that is classified as State of Montana Secret would reside in *information systems* that are categorized as medium.

State of Montana Top Secret – Information that could, if divulged, expose the State's citizens and assets to great risk. Data that is classified as State of Montana Top Secret would reside in *information systems* that are categorized as high.

The classifications stated herein are to be considered as **minimum classification levels** for data. The agency head may not specify a lower classification.

Minimum Classifications

The following data elements are examples of data that must be classified no lower than as shown regardless of the context in which they are represented.

Data Element	Classification
Social Security Number	State of Montana Confidential
Employee ID	State of Montana Confidential
Bank Account Number	State of Montana Confidential
Credit Card Number	State of Montana Confidential
Mother's Name	State of Montana Confidential
Father's Name	State of Montana Confidential
Place of Birth	State of Montana Confidential

A Data Classification Guideline has been published to assist agencies in classifying data. If there is any conflict between the Data Classification Guideline and this policy, the policy shall prevail.

VI. Definitions

Refer to the [GDE-Statewide Glossary: Information Systems Policies and Standards](#) for a list of local definitions.

Refer to the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) [Glossary of Key Information Security Terms](#) for a list of NIST definitions.

VII. Compliance

Compliance shall be evidenced by implementing the Policy as described above.

Policy changes or exceptions are governed by the Procedure for Establishing and Implementing Statewide Information Technology Policies and Standards. Requests for a review or change to this instrument are made by submitting an [Action Request form](#). Requests for exceptions are made by submitting an [Exception Request form](#). Changes to policies and standards will be prioritized and acted upon based on impact and need.

VIII. Enforcement

Policies and standards not developed in accordance with this policy will not be approved as statewide IT policies or standards.

Enforcement for statewide policies and standards developed in accordance with this policy will be defined in each policy, standard or procedure.

If warranted, management shall take appropriate disciplinary action to enforce this Policy, up to and including termination of employment, consistent with current State Policy. The discipline policy can be found in the [MOM Policy System](#) (search for: 261). When considering formal disciplinary action, management will consult with their assigned Human Resource Specialist before taking action.

IX. References

A. Legislation

- [2-15-112 MCA](#) Powers and duties of department
- [2-17-505 MCA](#) Policy
- [2-17-512 MCA](#) Duties and Powers of Department Heads
- [2-6-102 MCA](#) Citizens entitled to inspect and copy public writings
- [Montana Information Technology Act \(MITA\)](#)

B. Policies, Directives, Regulations, Rules, Procedures, Memoranda

- [SITSD Procedure: IT Policies, Standards, Procedures and White Papers](#)
- [Statewide Policy: Establishing and Implementing Statewide Information Technology Policies and Standards](#)
- *****May add additions here*****

C. Standards, Guidelines

See **Data Classification Guideline**.