PROBLEM:

Proposed Executive Order 06-17 intends to dissolve the statutory 40 person, $40M Department of Information and Innovation and 'stand up' a new Agency of Digital Services absent any plan whatsoever, specifically including the required but missing plans and reports detailed in the attached statutory sections referencing DII.

The most significant problem of DII billing all state agencies as a funding mechanism, on a per seat basis, is not addressed and is unsustainable. Similarly, discretionary use of Internal Service Funds for large purchases, to be repaid by per-seat billback is also not resolved nor transparent.

Both of the detailed planning requirements, a consolidation of the four separate and overlapping statutory sections as well as the resolution of a fixed appropriation to support an information services department or agency should be completed prior to 'standing up' any new agency or reconfigured DII in 2018.

SOLUTION: Craft a committee bill to accomplish the following:

Designate DII as the sole arbiter of IT definitions, glossary and mandatory repository for all expenditure information related to IT plans and best practices across all state agencies and departments. This expands scope of authority below $1M of $500k.

DII Commissioner as Chair to (re)convene the working council of IT directors (CIOs) from all state agencies and departments to address and resolve conflicting issues, priorities, records production and shared service needs.

The Council On Information Technology User Services should meet bi-weekly or as necessary to complete the inventories and reporting methodologies, as well as develop the required management revisions toward the goal of a November 2017 report and recommended legislative changes proposals for the 2018 session.

The committee bill might also require that JFO complete an inventory and report on all Internal Service Funds (ISF) including the Equipment Revolving Fund, and their use in past years for IT projects such as GovNet, mainframe upgrades etc. The report would also address how the ISF spending decisions were made, by whom and the financial impacts of such decisions on the client agencies which were billed to repay those ISF expenditures.

An analysis of all existing statutory references to DII and how those would be impacted by the conversion of the Agency model proposed would also be included in the report. Specific attention is necessary to the threshold dollar amounts which presently trigger DII review and approval as well as thresholds amounts requiring Independent Expert Review (IER) and explicit scope of those IER studies.

The report and recommendations would also include consideration of DII/ADS no longer being responsible for wide area network services. This will necessitate DII cooperation to explore a scenario wherein a shared statewide managed public safety grade network would be built on available dark fiber and governed by a quasi-public statutory body where DII/ADS would be an anchor tenant rather than being responsible for network operations, management and billing. Other uses of the network would be ESI-Net/911, VIT, FirstNet, HealthNet, Research and education, etc.

In the same vein, the required report would address the possibility of DII/ADS going forward managing to a fixed appropriation with no further per-seat billing to client agencies other than billing for specific system review and project management costs for which DII has current authority to bill against specific project appropriations.

DII might also be charged with, notwithstanding 30 V.S.A. 202d, immediately procuring an independent engineering firms' services to complete the 2017 Ten Year Telecommunications Plan with DPS serving to support that effort by requiring regulated utility production of necessary information pursuant to 30 V.S.A. 202d, and not 202e.

The 10YP plan RFI/RFP and contract should be for a complete plan grounded on all visible infrastructure, including analysis or alternative financing scenarios toward accomplishing all of the goals of 30 V.S.A. 202c.

Uncovering the shadow IT expenses for all state agencies and departments requires uncovering the less visible dimensions of DII/ERF/ISF to inform the Legislature's review and approval, or a potential staged approach to such approval.

This addresses the difficult issues which have resulted in many agencies' resentment of DII and the hearty skepticism of the E/O, and institutes oversight and buy-in at an early stage (the appropriate time) to assure a more successful creation of a new information services agency.

Stephen Whitaker

2017.02.28