

# ITMC MEETING

February 22, 2001

1. Welcome and Introductions – Leon Schwartz welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked everyone to introduce themselves.
2. ICN update – Tony Crandell reported that the 2 new servers have improved speed for the video scheduling software and everything is running much more smoothly.
3. Purchasing update – Ken Paulsen introduced Ashley Super as the new General Services purchasing agent handling technology purchases. Ashley can be reached at 281-7073 or email her at [Ashley.Super@dgs.state.ia.us](mailto:Ashley.Super@dgs.state.ia.us). Ashley will coordinate purchasing efforts with Jim Day of ITD. Pam Dickey and Ken gave an update on the WSCA Contracts. They provided a purchasing procedures handout. For more information you may visit their website [www.state.ia.us/iowapurchasing](http://www.state.ia.us/iowapurchasing).
4. ITD update – Bill Haigh reported that the ITD budget for FY02 was still in subcommittee. The current Fiscal Year de-appropriations bill affects many agencies.

ITD gave a quick update on the Web Sponsorships, if the lowAccess portal/navigation pages are used the monies will go to the whole enterprise. If an agency uses it's own pages the agency will get the revenue, which the agency can use as credit for services or for the funding of technology.

Dan Combs said that ITD would be contacting various departments to do initial interviews relating to PKI and the identity project. Dan also asked all agencies to please help him by identifying their Chief Technology Officers. Leon responded that the ITMC would be collecting the same information. Dan agreed to coordinate this information collection.

Russ Rozinek reported that due to interest in Windows 2000 that ITD had facilitated an enterprise strategy meeting. Russ clearly stated that this meeting was meant to provide information exchange and education. It was not meant to transmit a direction statement from ITD on this topic. Russ also announced that Dave Rowen is a new consulting resource for network configuration and related technologies and if you are in need of consulting in this area please contact Pat Clark or Russ.

5. Return on Investment Program – Paul Carlson of ITD gave an update on the status of the ROI program. He distributed the ITD/DOM responses to the list of questions that the ITMC ROI Committee had submitted on 28 September 2000. Many of these questions and answers dealt with process issues, while some of these dealt with policy issues. Attached to these minutes is a copy of the document distributed by

Paul. The ITMC ROI Committee led by JoAnn Naples will review these responses and determine if additional clarification is needed.

Paul also sought feedback on the revised ROI documents that had been sent electronically to the ITMC earlier in the week. These documents will be presented to the ITC for their approval at their 8 March 2001 meeting. The majority of the discussion centered around the ITD suggested deadline of 15 June 2001 for FY03 packages. Rich Varn stated that this date had been selected to ensure that the funding requests could be integrated into the Enterprise Planning process. All comments on these proposed documents should be sent directly to Paul Carlson ASAP.

All completed ROI's go to Paul at ITD first, at which time he will route them accordingly.

There will be ROI Process training sessions provided by ITD in the near future. A website with a calendar will be developed after more customer input has been incorporated.

6. Standards – Enterprise Standards Process – A discussion of the enterprise standards setting process and the role of the ITMC was held. This role will be further defined following the adoption of administrative rules by ITD.

The status of administrative rules to establish and modify enterprise IT standards was discussed by ITD staff. The rules are still in draft form within ITD. As soon as the rules are filed for public comment, ITD will provide them to all ITMC members.

It was proposed that after the administrative rules are set that the ITMC and ITD would establish an inclusive method for ITMC involvement in establishing future and modifying existing standards.

Leon stated that he had received comments from ITMC members that they were concerned that standards were being issued from ITD, which stated that the ITMC had approved these standards. A subset of the ITMC has been receiving draft copies of standards and had been asked for comments, however, these standards had not been reviewed by the full ITMC.

It was agreed that a formal ITMC Standards Committee would be established. If you would like to serve on this committee please notify Leon. Until this committee is in place ITD was asked to send draft standards to all ITMC members.

Standards – Email Naming Standard – The NAG Task Force that had been asked at the December 2000 ITMC meeting to provide recommendations had those recommendations electronically distributed to the ITMC members prior the meeting. In addition, ITD also provided a response to the recommendations. Both of these documents are attached to these minutes.

The NAG report identified three primary areas of concern.

1. Duplicate name confusion - A discussion of this area included both technical and policy issues. Terri Nelson of the ICN reported there are approximately 400 duplicate names of the 16,000 now using the Mail Hub. The problem of messages being delivered to the wrong person was discussed. It was agreed that the current usage of email for confidential transmissions should be examined.
2. Routing of mail from distributed to central server – Concerns were expressed that sending email through a central server would add another hop in the route and create a central point of failure. ITD responded that this was a technical issue that can be addressed.
3. Increased costs to implement – This concern is related to Issue #2 and addresses the additional cost to create a central system with sufficient redundancy to meet customers needs. ITD responded that they believed such a system could be build for less than \$240,000.00, their estimate of annual income to the IowaHub.

The NAG report listed three recommendations:

1. Maintain the current email address with the agency identifier.

The NAG recommendation greatly reduces the number of duplicate name problems and addresses their first concern area. ITD reported that the current email addresses were included as a part of the standard. ITD also believes that this additional flattened email address provides better customer service to the citizens. There was disagreement from several members on this point.

2. Route email directly to an agency post office and not through a central server.

The NAG Group felt this provided the best defense against a single point of failure and prevented an extra hop. ITD responded that they estimated that 90% of all emails would continue to flow directly to the agency with emails that include the agency identifier. The remaining 10% that used the flattened address would be housed on a sufficiently redundant central server.

3. Post email addresses for both names and processes on the web.

The NAG Group felt that the best customer service to the citizen would be achieved by providing them an online directory where they could identify by either name or process the area of government that they wanted to communicate with. ITD whole-heartedly agreed with the creation of this type of directory. Discussion was held that agencies should probably be utilizing email aliases

more often to better facilitate staff/name changes. This recommendation seemed to be the focal point for addressing the stated goal of the standard. Implementation issues were the primary concern for this recommendation.

Following the discussion of these concerns and recommendations ITD was asked to work with the NAG Task Force and specifically the ICN in developing an implementation plan. They were asked to bring that plan back to the ITMC to ensure that agencies had a full understanding of the implications of the plan for them. In addition, once the enterprise standards process is established, agencies would then have a mechanism to request changes to the standard itself if their concerns are not addressed in the implementation plan.

Leon thanked the NAG Task Force for all their time and hard work.

7. 100% E by 2003 – Phil Dunshee thanked the members for the feedback on the draft survey. The survey will be online next week and needs to be shared with key staff and program managers. The target date for responses is March 16<sup>th</sup>. Phil offered to be available again at the March ITMC meeting to keep us informed on the project.
8. Other issues – Dan Combs reported that he has interns doing a research project and possibly building a website based on state by state and country by country applications and processes. If there are any suggestions please contact him.

Leon announced that the Information Technology component of the Government Performance Project ratings for 2000 in Governing magazine gave Iowa a “B” which was a significant improvement from the “C+” in 1999.

Leon reminded all agencies that the old clover leaf and state outline logo on the state letterhead has been replaced. The Department of General Services Printing Division can provide a copy of the new Governor approved logo.