Approved: _Deena Horst_
Date
2-26-02

MINUTES OF THE E-GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE.

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Deena Horst at 3:37 p.m. on February 19, 2002, in Room 526-S of the Capitol.

All members were present.

Committee staff present:
    Lisa Montgomery, Revisor of Statutes' Office
    Gary Deeter, Committee Secretary
    Dean Samuelson, Assistant Secretary

Conferees appearing before the Committee:
    Richard Hays, Legislative Chief Information Technology Officer

Others attending:    See attached sheet.

Richard Hays, Legislative Chief Information Technology Officer (CITO), reviewed e-Government policies related to strategic planning. (Attachment 1)  He noted the pioneering efforts of the Information Network of Kansas to provide electronic access to state services, saying that adjustments must be made to move to a further level of service to Kansas citizens.  He quoted Don Heiman, former Executive CITO, regarding the vision being carried out by the current Strategic Information Management (SIM) Plan, that ". . . all Kansas citizens will have access to necessary information and government services when and where they need it, without regard to geographic location or personal income." He further cited the goal of Dan Stanley, former Secretary of the Department of Administration, "...to provide electronic government services to all Kansans."  Mr. Hays acknowledged these goals, but stated that there has been no plan, program or implementation strategy to achieve these goals.  He made these recommendations:

    1.    Establish a task force with IT experience from state agencies to develop a strategic plan for e-Government;
    2.    Establish a steering committee from executive-level state personnel with oversight responsibilities over the strategic plan; and
    3.    Allow flexibility within certain guiding principles for each committee to accomplish its task.

Noting the difficulties in preparing for Y2K mitigation, Mr. Hays expressed concern that similar mistakes in management and inventory may be made regarding state-sponsored web sites and applications, urging the Committee to develop coordinated e-government initiatives.  He also noted that 54% of U.S. households have Internet access, saying that traditional methods of conducting state business must be maintained in tandem with e-Government deployment.

Representative Lane noted his attendance at an ITAB (Information Technology Advisory Board) meeting that afternoon, where he learned of the SIM Plan, which he noted is already in place to address Mr. Hays' first recommendation.  Representative Tafanelli commented that ITAB currently provides a governance structure for state IT, and that the ITEC (Information Technology Executive Council) is already in place, a fact which addresses Mr. Hays' second recommendation.  He said augmenting the present system within the present architecture would be more suitable.   Answering questions, Mr. Hays said that he was hired by and works under the authority of the LCC (Legislative Coordinating Council) to help staff the Joint Committee on Information Technology and the ITEC.  Representative Holmes observed that, because of the reluctance of telephone and cable companies to provide access to rural Kansas, a dual system for government services will continue to be needed.  He said another task force was unnecessary, since the problem of access is the lack of funding initiatives.  Representative Cook said the downward trend  for IT costs will continue to expand access to more citizens.  Representative McLeland noted that KAN-ED is one of the finest educational initiatives in the past 50 years.  Representative Burroughs expressed concern that e-Government initiatives maintain full accountability; he expressed appreciation for Mr. Hays' recommendations.  Answering questions, Mr. Hays said that this year e-Government policies were included in the SIM Plan.  He noted that the AccessKansas portal needed more uniformity throughout its web sites.

The Chair asked the Economy, State and Local, and Technology sub-committees to evaluate **HB 2719** to make sure the bill is satisfactory.

CONTINUATION SHEET

The minutes for the February 14, 2002, meeting were approved as printed. (Motion, Representative Goering; second, Representative Gatewood)

 The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m. to allow further meetings by sub-committees. The next e-Government Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 26, 2002, in Room 526-S.

# e-GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
## GUEST LIST
### DATE: FEBRUARY 19, 2002

| NAME | REPRESENTING |
|---|---|
| Richard Haye | Legislature |
| Kathy Sachs | SOS |
| Robert Knapp | INK |
| Jim Minihan | IMERGE |
| Whitney Damron | KS Information Consortium |
| Wally Bailey | accessKansas |
| D. KEITH MEYERS | DEPT. OF ADMINISTRATION |
| Bruce Roberts | Dept of ADMIN - Acting CITO Exec. |
| Rick Miller | DoA / KITO / CITA |
| Lisa Counts | INK |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# E-Government Committee

## Richard Hays
## Chief Information Technology Officer - Legislature
**February 19, 2002**

Madam Chair and members of the E-Government Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to address you today. I have attended most of the previous committee meetings and listened with great interest to those who have shared information, and their thoughts and opinions concerning E-Government.

The material I would like to discuss with you today deals primarily with organization, planning and coordination.

The theme I would like you to remember as I proceed through the discussion is: the lure of E-Government is in providing a means for ALL businesses and citizens to transact business with Government agencies electronically, with the state benefiting through a reduction of staff and expenses, and the customer benefiting in a savings of time, travel and expense.

As the committee is well aware, the Board of Directors for the Information Network of Kansas (INK) has a contract with the Kansas Information Consortium (KIC) to serve as the Network Manager, and to provide the hardware, software and staff for our state portal, Access Kansas. This public / private arrangement has been in place since the Legislature established INK in 1991. Since 1995, INK has been recognized numerous times for their work in advancing our state government web initiatives.

Kansas and INK certainly were early pioneers in establishing a web presence for most of our agencies to deliver information to Kansas businesses and residents. However, I believe we are now at a crossroad that was inevitable, where we must make certain adjustments if we are to move to the next level and deliver on the E-Government promise.

On January 25, 2001, Mr. Don Heiman, the former Chief Information Technology Officer for the executive branch, testified before this committee and presented 30 goals and objectives from the current Strategic Information Management Plan. The number one goal outlined was **"All Kansas citizens will have access to necessary information and government services when and where they need it, without regard to geographic location or personal income"**.

On February 8, 2001, Mr. Dan Stanley, the former Secretary of the Department of Administration also addressed this committee and stated his vision is **"For Kansas to provide electronic government services to all Kansans"**.

I think both of these gentlemen stated what we all believe to be our long-term goal of E-Government. However, there was and remains no plan, program or implementation strategy to achieve these goals. Within the state organizations, there is no consolidated plan, no cost-benefit process, no asset management procedures and no absolute assurance that compliance with privacy, security, ADA and other policies are met.

In providing guidance to this committee in January 2001, Speaker Glasscock stated that he felt the state needed a strategic plan for E-Government. I think his assessment was absolutely correct.

I would like to offer my recommendations to the committee that accomplish that goal:

1.     Establish a task force comprised of personnel with Internet experience from key state agencies charged with development of a strategic plan for E-Government for the state of Kansas. Set a target date for completion of the strategic plan.

2.     Establish a steering committee comprised of executive level state personnel to guide and oversee the development of the strategic plan and report its progress to this committee and the Joint Committee on Information Technology.

3.     Allow each group the flexibility necessary to accomplish their tasks, but provide certain guiding principles to outline the goals of the committee.

Several years ago, the state of Kansas undertook a massive and expensive project called Y2K. We all know and understand what caused the need for the tremendous amount of work that was required to prepare for Y2K. However, one of the factors that added to the complexity and made this job so difficult and expensive, was that we had not been vigilant in our overall management and inventory of these systems.

I feel we are on the threshold of making a similar mistake with our state sponsored web sites and applications. The Y2K process involved a consolidated long-term effort to identify, modify and certify all the systems that might have been affected. This effort would have been much less expensive and difficult had we established certain standards, asset management controls and policies many years prior to Y2K. **These standards, controls and guidelines would not have been in anticipation of Y2K, they would have been just good business practices.**

Like many others, I believe we are only beginning to see the potential benefits that may be achieved through a well-planned, coordinated E-Government initiative. We have the opportunity to put in place the proper organizational structure, standards, controls, policies and legislation where necessary to provide what is needed to take full advantage of all that E-Government can offer.

1-2

I believe that undertaking any citizen based E-Government initiative without the necessary procedures, guidelines, policies and most importantly the critical direction of a strategic plan, would be foolhardy at best and have significant consequences.

Let me give you one example of the possible dangers that exist without organization, planning, and coordination.

In today's environment, agencies have numerous ways of interfacing and conducting business with their many customers, be they citizens, businesses, local governments or other entities. Agencies conduct business by mail, phone, IVR, fax, face to face and in some cases over the Internet. Therefore, I believe it is a fair assumption that these traditional methods of transacting business with customers are time tested, and today ALL our customers are able to conduct state business using one of these traditional methods. It may also be a fair assumption that these various methods are in place to satisfy the diverse needs of all our customers.

A study recently released by the United States Department of Commerce reveals that approximately 54% of U.S. households have Internet access. With our population at about 2.7M households, that translates to nearly 1.2 M citizens without Internet access. As a point of reference, after nearly a century of availability the telephone is in 94% of U.S. households.

A citizen based E-Government application implemented today can only reach somewhere below 54% of Kansas citizens. To achieve anything even close to 54% today would be impossible due to factors involving awareness and psychographics. **Therefore, most if not all of the traditional methods of conducting business must be maintained until 100% of our population has Internet access.** Unless we make a conscious decision to strand a significant portion of our citizens without the traditional methods of access to services, **we will operate in a dual mode with dual expenses until such time as we reach 100%.** How long will that take? 4 years, 6 years, 10 years? At this point, I don't believe anyone can answer that question. There are possible solutions to this dilemma, but they have not been considered at this point in time.

Perhaps this one example makes clear the possibility for failure that may exist if agencies begin to undertake citizen based E-Government initiatives without a clear understanding of the full impact it may have on their organization and budgets.

I hope the committee will give serious consideration to my recommendations for a task force and steering committee. Thank you for you attention. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.