



Neutral Testimony concerning SB 342  
Senate Committee on Ways and Means  
Presented by Alexandra Blasi, Executive Secretary  
On behalf of  
The Kansas State Board of Pharmacy  
February 1, 2018

Madam Chair and Members of the Committee:

The Kansas State Board of Pharmacy appreciates the opportunity to provide neutral testimony regarding Senate Bill 342. The mission of the Board is to ensure that all persons and entities conducting business relating to the practice of pharmacy in Kansas are properly licensed and registered. The Board licenses and registers approximately 6,000 pharmacists, 8,000 pharmacy technicians, and 5,600 pharmacies and facilities in and outside of Kansas. The Board's duties also include conducting regular facility inspections, processing changes and renewals, and investigating all complaints. In addition, the Board administers the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (K-TRACS), which tracks all controlled substance prescriptions for Kansas patients.

The Board supports the intent to increase cybersecurity measures for the state and strives to meet all state and industry standards. Though the Board believes our systems currently meet such standards, we intend to maintain compliance with state rules and policies, including mandates from this bill. Similarly, the Board strives to provide enhanced customer service and ease of access to our licensees, recently implementing a new licensing system customized for Boards of Pharmacy, and contracting with the vendor Appriss Health, Inc. to maintain the K-TRACS platform.

The Board appreciates the opportunity to work with State IT leadership to review and provide feedback on this bill. As a result, many questions have already been answered and certain language clarified. However, the Board still has the following concerns:

- **Project Prioritization:** The Board is concerned that projects vital to statutory functions may not be prioritized compared to larger agencies. The Board appreciates the need to assess risk/need and prioritize accordingly, but small agencies often operate faster and more efficiently, which translates to a need for KISO to provide timely responses and assistance. The Board wonders if a timeline for response/determination would assure agency operations are not inadvertently slowed or stalled. As stewards of licensee dollars, the Board does not want to compromise the efficiency of state-mandated programs designed to protect public health and safety.
- **Background Checks:** At the discretion of the CISO, this provision could require each Board employee undergo a criminal background check. We currently have 13 employees (both full and part-time) that have access to some type of personal information, as defined by the bill. Limiting access is not an option in a small agency, and conducting a background check for all employees seems overly burdensome. Though the Board understands the use of the information gleaned would be limited, the Board also wonders about the unintended consequences of an unrelated hire/fire decision when the agency is in possession of this information.

The Board appreciates your careful consideration of these points. Respectfully submitted.