MINUTES OF THE __House__ COMMITTEE ON __Computers, Communications&Technology__

The meeting was called to order by ___George Dean___
Chairperson

__7:30__ a.m./p̶x̶x̶x̶ on __March 28__ , 19_91_in room __529-S__ of the Capit

All members were present except:
Rep. Kline

Committee staff present:
Norman Furse, Revisor of Statutes
Julian Efird, Research
Diane Duffy, Research
Mary Valdivia, Committee Secretary

Conferees appearing before the committee:
Mr. Ray Hauke, Director of Planning & Budget, Ks. Board of Regents
Arthur Griggs, Acting Director, Dept. of Administration
Jean Turner, Project Dict KAFIS

Chairman George Dean opened the meeting at 7:30 AM.

HB 2579

Mr. Ray Hauke, Director of Planning and Budget, Kansas Board of Regents, handed out written testimony concerning HB 2579 to the Committee (Attmt #1).

Mr. Hauke elaborated on Section 3 and Section 4 of the Bill as they amend K.S.A. 75-4705 and K.S.A. 75-4706.

Section 1 and Section 2: The committee might want to give some thought of inserting a substantial threshold, so the committee would not be encumbered by each and every proposal for software.

Q.   Have you ever been refused any requests by DISC?

A.   Yes, do not know how many. There is a big one that has been pending for a long time that pertains to purchase of some software pertaining to the personnel and payroll areas. That has been held by DOA for quite a while.

Q.   Substantial threshold, can you describe "substantial"?

A.   Of course that to some degree is for the committee to decide, what your threshold of concern is. It strikes me that a whole lot of the consideration and the thought that goes into the bill, concerns a few very large computing acquisitions which in the mind of legislators has gone sour, and those instances it is big bucks. It would strike me that a threshold of $100,000 would allow a committee to review every big upgrade to its mainframes, any substantial addition to the capabilities for processing in the disk pack and tape drive. A threshold on that order would focus the committee on the mainframes and larger acquisitions to projects.

MINUTES OF THE ___House___ COMMITTEE ON _Computers, Communications & Technology_

room __529-S__, Statehouse, at __7:30__ a.m.XXX on ___March 28___ , 19_1_

Mr. Arthur Griggs testified on the HB 2579 at this time.

The two sections that Mr. Hauke addressed, Section 3 and 4, on striking the language on Pg 3, Lines 36 thru 37, similar amendments are on Page 4 striking the language on lines 11 thru 13, both those amendments have the affect of bringing additional regents into the approval process. Section 3 being just on centralized computing. In my own thinking Section 3 should remain like a moot issue, except as it may relate to payroll and personnel issues. Basically they do all their mainframe computing right now, so not sure what the intent of the sponsors of the bill are on Section 3. Page 4, DISC would have to approve those specifications, question the need for striking the language.

Section 2 is a data processing budget procedure and certainly endorse that and is consistent with previous testimony to this committee. One point on Section 2 that I raise for your consideration, is the timing of when reports would be submitted. Section 2 as written provides for July 1 date, that is akin with what is done with capital improvements projects right now. I would suggest for your consideration September 15 date to tie in with agencies budget submissions.

Section I is too broad. Believe get too much of small detail items the way it is drafted now. In requiring any data processing equipment or software has a 30 prior to acquisition filing requirement in it, think prior submission as opposed to review of what has actually been purchased, oversteps the oversight role. Would suggest change Section 1 to limited to software purchase and software development projects above some minimal dollar threshold. On equipment would recommend amending Section to require reports to the committee of what has been purchased on after the fact kind of basis.

Q. You indicate Section I is too broad; we have agencies out there buying machines and equipment thinking it will solve their problems instead of identifying the problem. How do you stop the proliferation of lower end computers?

A. I have focused on large software development projects. Point I was trying to make was that if you have an oversight committee and look 30 days in advance of any purchase of any computer equipment and going to review everyone of those, the committee is going to get swamped with more detail than can be handled on that 30 days basis. By not separating out larger expenditure items, the committee is just going to get swamped. Dollar thresholds would narrow it down.

Some committee members had to leave for another committee meeting and Chairman Dean asked Mr. Griggs to return on March 29, 1991. Minutes of March 21 and March 26, 1991, meetings were presented to the committee. Motion made by Rep. Rock and Seconded by Rep. Roper to accept minutes. Motion passed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:10 AM.

Next meeting scheduled for March 29, 1991, 7:30 AM, Room 529-S.

COMMITTEE: _CCT_   DATE: 3.28-91

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	ADDRESS	COMPANY/ORGANIZATION
Ray Hauke	Topeka	Ks Board of Regents
Jim Green	Topeka	KDHE
Jim Cantrell	Topeka	KDHR
Wayne Thomas	Topeka	KDHR
Jack Grashuis	Overland Park	IBM
Fred Lauver	Topeka	Ks Brd of Agri
Kathy Martin	Topeka	Sec of State
Tom Day	Topeka	KCC
Jerry Sloan	"	OJA
	"	CRS
	"	SRS
Eric Soxton	Wichita	Wichita State
Pat Hubbell	Topeka	Apple
Mike Reecht	Topeka	ATT
Julie Akin	"	Unisys
George Yowell	Overland Park	Apple
Tom Boardmore	Topeka	Computerland

COMMENTS CONCERNING HOUSE BILL 2579
TO
HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, COMPUTERS AND TECHNOLOGY
BY
RAY HAUKE, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND BUDGET
KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

March 28, 1991

The Regents understand the Legislature's concern related to the cost
of computing operations. A viable option to improve legislative
oversight is a Committee which reviews data processing acquisitions in
a manner similar to the Joint Committee on State Building
Construction's oversight of capital improvements. The Joint Building
Committee has been a valuable tool to improve legislative information
gathering and therefore decisionmaking on capital improvement issues.
A Joint Committee on Computing could be equally valuable. We do have
suggestions concerning Sections 1 and 2, contained at the conclusion
of this testimony, which we believe would improve the functioning of
the proposed Committee.

The Regents institutions are most concerned with the provisions of
Sections 3 and 4 of H.B. 2579. These sections eliminate provisions,
which we believe were carefully inserted to allow the institutions
operation of separate computing sites.

To elaborate upon this point, I would like to first review the impact
of Sections 3 and 4 and then review with you the Department of
Administration's existing authority over data processing activities at
Regents institutions.

The Impact of Section 3 and Section 4

Section 3 amends K.S.A. 75-4705 to eliminate a Regents exclusion from
mandatory participation in the Division of Information Systems and
Communications (DISC) central computing site. Section 4 amends K.S.A.
75-4706 to eliminate a Regents exclusion from requirements for the
Director of DISC to prepare the specifications for all data processing
acquisitions.

Seemingly, the existing wording of K.S.A. 75-4705 and K.S.A. 75-4706
is necessary to assure a viable central computing site, by mandating
that the Director of DISC has authority to control the DISC mainframe
and participation in it. However, that wording recognizes that the
Regents have large scale computing operations which are too large to
be served by DISC and which are located in eight cities, remote from
the central site. Therefore, requiring Regents preparation of all
programming in accordance with DISC specifications and requiring the
Director of DISC to prepare the specifications for Regents acquisi-
tions is not a useful exercise. The existing Regents exclusions are
reasonable. Eliminating those exclusions would only increase the
bureaucracy and paperwork, as it is unlikely that DISC could assume
any of the processing presently done at the campus locations.

CCT
3-28-91
attmt #1

Present DISC Oversight

Although the Regents are excluded from statutory participation in the central computing site, they ARE NOT excluded from the provisions of K.S.A. 75-4706 requiring the Secretary of Administration's approval of any purchase (or lease) of data processing hardware or software. While the Regents are not required to participate in the central computing site or develop programs in accordance with DISC protocols, they must seek DISC approval for computer hardware or software acquisition. Further, this oversight is not taken for granted by the Regents nor is Department of Administration approval automatic.

Legislative Oversight of Computing Acquisitions

The Regents have fewer concerns related to Sections 1 and 2 of H.B. 2579, than Sections 3 and 4. Nevertheless, it seems appropriate for the Legislature to review whether its objectives would be served by the magnitude of oversight suggested in these sections.

The concept of Sections 1 and 2 is creation of a Committee to be the computing equivalent of the Joint Committee on State Building Construction. Initially the comparison may appear equivalent, however, certain differences are also evident. The Joint Building Committee reviews those improvements for which agencies seek appropriations. Minor improvements are made by each agency's maintenance staff. The Joint Building Committee does not review those minor projects, since an appropriations request is not made for them. Consequently, the Joint Building Committee's functioning is improved, as it focuses upon the large projects having major fiscal implications. The Joint Committee's success in reviewing these large projects would undoubtedly be diminished if it had to allocate time to review every proposed door frame relocation or every wall an agency wanted to paint.

The present wording of Section 1 and 2 would cause the proposed Joint Computing Committee to be involved in every computing acquisition, including the smallest microcomputer. This level of review would likely focus both the Committee and its staff on a very large number of applications for which it could devote relatively little time. Seemingly, it would be more efficient for the proposed Committee to establish a substantial threshold below which it would not review acquisitions. Such a threshold would permit the Committee to allocate its time to review of large mainframe upgrades and significant software enhancements. The concerns leading to creation of this Committee appear to largely surround the cost of a few very large acquisitions, which have been very costly. Properly organized, the Committee could spend its time addressing such very large projects, rather than ones having relatively minor impact.

1-2