

FINAL BILL REPORT

SHB 2814

C 20 L 92
Synopsis As Enacted

Brief Description: Revising statutes regarding state information resources.

By House Committee on Appropriations (originally sponsored by Representatives H. Sommers, Silver, Anderson, Locke and Winsley; by request of Department of Information Services and Office of Financial Management).

House Committee on Appropriations
Senate Committee on Ways & Means

Background: The Information Services Board and Department of Information Services: The Information Services Board and the Department of Information Services were created in 1987 to provide coordinated planning, management, and delivery of state information services. The board provides direction to state agencies on strategic planning and technical policies for information services, develops acquisition standards, and assists agencies in acquiring and implementing information services.

Service and Planning Components: The department consists of two principal functional components: service and planning. The service component provides telephone, data transmission, mainframe computing, bulk purchasing, and consulting services. The department holds roughly 30 percent of the state agency market for these services. Services are provided on a full cost-recovery basis, and the department must compete with other vendors to provide services to state agencies. The planning component provides staff support to the board and its duties include conducting reviews and assessments of agency information technology projects, as directed by the board.

The department is scheduled for sunset review in 1994.

Report to the Legislature: In response to troubled large computer system development, the 1991-93 Omnibus Appropriations Act provided funding only for fiscal year 1992 for the planning component. The act also directed the department to report to the Legislature by January 15, 1992, on the state's information systems development, review, and approval process.

The report recognizes that information technology planning has been poorly executed and that project oversight has been ineffective. To remedy these problems, the report lays out a two-year planning cycle and a project oversight process that are intended to improve control over project resources, the quality of technical requirements assessments, and the accuracy of estimates of the time and funding necessary for implementation.

Summary: Legislative Intent: The legislative intent behind the establishment of the department is expanded to specify that information projects be implemented on an incremental basis, that the state move toward open system architecture, and that the state recognize price advantages available in midrange and personal computing architecture.

Planning and Funding of Major Information Technology Projects: The department is required to establish standards and policies, subject to approval of the board, governing planning, implementation, and evaluation of major information technology projects. These standards and policies are to define a process and procedures which agencies will follow in developing and implementing major projects. Agencies may propose their own process for department approval. Processes are to include distinct and identifiable "phases" upon which funding can be based and user validation of products through system demonstrations and testing of prototypes. Project plans and agreements are to be mutually agreed to by the director of the agency involved, the director of the department and the director of financial management. The director of the department may terminate a major project if it is not meeting anticipated performance standards. The department must evaluate projects at three developmental stages and provide copies of evaluations to the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and to selected members and staff of the appropriations committees. The department is to define what projects will be subject to this process.

OFM must establish policies and standards governing the funding of major projects. The director of information services, the director of the department, and the head of the agency proposing the project are to agree on terms and conditions for funding projects. The department may require that funds be released on a phase-by-phase basis. Products are to be tested and approved before final payment is made.

Review of Funding Requests for Information Technology: At the request of OFM, the department must review agency funding requests for major information technology projects. Department recommendations regarding such funding requests

are to be submitted to OFM and the Legislature along with the agency's budget request.

State and Agency Strategic Planning: The department is required to develop a state strategic information technology plan setting forth the statewide mission, goals, and objectives for the use of information technology. The plan and any updates are to be approved by the board.

Each agency is required to develop an agency strategic information technology plan setting forth the agency mission, goals and objectives relating to information technology. Plans must include an explanation of how the agency plan conforms to the state strategic plan and projects, resources, and estimated funding required to meet the objectives of the plan.

Biennial Performance Report: The department is required to develop a biennial performance report on information technology. This report must include an assessment of progress toward implementing the state strategic information technology plan; an analysis of the success or failure, feasibility, progress, costs, and timeliness of major information technology projects; identification of benefits, cost avoidance, and cost savings generated by major projects; and an inventory of state information technology.

Agencies are required to develop agency performance reports similar to the statewide performance report outlined above.

Information Services Board (ISB): Board composition requirements are changed, deleting the requirement that three members represent cabinet agencies and specifying that one member represent a statewide elected official other than the governor.

Other: Research applications at institutions of higher education are exempted from the provisions of the bill. The director of the department is required to appoint, after consulting with the board, the assistant director of the planning component.

Sunset: The current sunset review of the Department of Information Services (DIS) and the ISB scheduled for June 30, 1994 is extended to June 30, 1996.

Emergency Clause: The proposed substitute contains an emergency clause.

Votes on Final Passage:

House 94 0

Senate 44 0 (Senate amended)
House 96 0 (House concurred)

Effective: March 20, 1992