

STORAGE NAME: h1811.it.doc
DATE: April 2, 2001

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
ANALYSIS**

BILL #: HB 1811 (PCB IT 01-04)

RELATING TO: State Technology Office

SPONSOR(S): Representative(s)

TIED BILL(S): None

ORIGINATING COMMITTEE(S)/COUNCIL(S)/COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERENCE:

- (1) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
 - (2)
 - (3)
 - (4)
 - (5)
-

I. SUMMARY:

PCB IT 01-04 would amend Chapters 20, 110, 186, 216 and 282 of the Florida Statutes. In the 2000 Session, through CS/CS/SB 1334, the Legislature created the State Technology Office ("STO"), established the position of Chief Information Officer to head the STO, and mandated that the STO create an integrated system of information technology to allow citizens to effectively interact with State government and that the STO establish the organization necessary to support that system. CS/CS/SB 1334 did not provide the STO with adequate authority and resources to fulfill that mandate. The PCB would provide the additional authority and resources required to enable the STO to accomplish the CS/CS/SB 1334 mandate. The PCB would empower the STO to establish the organization needed to integrate information technology staff and resources across the executive branch of state government, would articulate the managerial responsibilities of the STO, and would establish a monitoring and reporting structure for high-risk IT projects.

More specifically, the PCB would:

- i. Clarify that the STO is a separate budget entity within the Department of Management Services that functions independently of the Department (Chapter 20 and Chapter 282);
- ii. Reclassify certain the STO employees from Career Service class to the Select Exempt Class (Chapter 110);
- iii. Task the STO, in consultation with the legislative appropriations committees and the Executive Office of the Governor, with reviewing and approving development of information technology resource strategic plans (Chapter 186);
- iv. Task the STO with reviewing and making recommendations to the legislative appropriations committees and the Executive Office of the Governor on the parts of agencies' long-range programs plans that relate to information technology (Chapter 216);
- v. Authorize the transfer of positions and appropriations identified in the STO's Agency Technology Agreements from state agencies to STO (Chapter 216);

- vi. Clarify that each agency has the primary responsibility and accountability for setting agency priorities, identifying business needs and determining services/programs to be developed (Chapter 282);
- vii. Revise, supplement and clarify the powers and duties delegated to the STO to facilitate its establishment of uniform procedures for the acquisition and use of information technology by state agencies within the executive branch (Chapter 282);
- viii. Establish the position of "Agency Chief Information Officer" for each state agency subject to the jurisdiction of the STO;
- ix. Authorize the STO, in consultation with DMS, to form Strategic Information Technology Alliances for the competitive, market-based acquisition of information technology in accord with the competitive procurement requirements of ch. 287 (Chapter 282);
- x. Task the STO, in consultation with state agency heads, with ensuring the security of all data and information technology of each state agency; and
- xi. Require that the Enterprise Project Management Office of the STO report to the Governor and the Legislature on high-risk information technology projects.

II. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

A. DOES THE BILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES:

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|
| 1. <u>Less Government</u> | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. <u>Lower Taxes</u> | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. <u>Individual Freedom</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. <u>Personal Responsibility</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. <u>Family Empowerment</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

For any principle that received a "no" above, please explain:

B. PRESENT SITUATION:

Creation of the State Technology Office

The STO was initially created and defined by s. 9, ch. 97-286, Laws of Florida, codified at ss. 282.003-282.404, F. S., otherwise known as the Information Resources Management Act ("the Act") of 1997. In the 2000 Regular Session of the Florida Legislature, CS/CS/SB 1334 was enacted and amended the Act to repeal the provision that initially created and defined the STO. CS/CS/SB 1334 re-created and re-defined the STO, delegated certain powers, duties and responsibilities to the STO, and created the position of Chief Information Officer, appointed by the Governor, to head the STO.

CS/CS/SB 1334 set forth legislative findings and intent regarding the purposes for which the STO was created. The findings state that STO was created to ensure the best management of

information resources across the executive branch of state government by providing support and guidance to enhance the state's use and management of information technology resources; designing, procuring and deploying the state's information technology resources; and managing cost effective deployment of information technology resources by state agencies.

Powers and Responsibilities of the STO

CS/CS/SB 1334 conferred certain powers and responsibilities on the STO. These included, among others, the powers and responsibilities to:

- xii. Coordinate the acquisition and use of information technology resources for state agencies;
- xiii. Integrate the information technology systems and services of state agencies and adopt technical standards for the state information technology system that assure interconnection of computer networks and information systems of state agencies;
- xiv. Assume management responsibility for any integrated information technology system or service when the STO determines that it would be economically efficient or performance-effective to do so;
- xv. Standardize policies and procedures for the use of information technology services of state agencies;
- xvi. Direct and approve the acquisition and use of all information technology equipment, services and facilities; and
- xvii. Adopt rules relating to information technology and to administer the Act.

Although enactment of CS/CS/SB 1334 increased the visibility, responsibility and authority of the STO, the Act was insufficient to confer adequate authority and resources to the STO to enable it to effectively serve the expressed legislative purposes for which it was created. For example, the Act provides that the head of each state agency has primary responsibility and accountability for planning, budgeting, acquiring, developing implementing using and managing information technology resources within the agency and that the agency has primary responsibility to determine the use of such resources in accomplishing the agency's mission. Additionally, the Act only allows STO to use or acquire information technology facilities or communications equipment and facilities owned or operated by a state agency when the agency concurs in such use or acquisition.

Conclusions of the IT Task Force

The Information Service Technology Development Task Force ("Task Force"), in its 2001 Annual Report to the Legislature, emphasized the importance of integration, consolidation and an enterprise approach to information technology management across state government. See 2001 Annual Report to the Legislature, Information Service Technology Development Task Force § 7.4.2, available at http://www.itflorida.com/pdfs/2001_legislative_report.pdf (February 14, 2001). The Task Force stated, in pertinent part:

"In its 2000 Annual Report to the Legislature, the Task Force recommended that the State of Florida create a centralized information technology organization. The Task Force identified the creation of a centralized IT organization as high impact, achievable, and an essential step toward the cost-effective deployment of technology across the enterprise."

“During the 2000 Legislative Session, the Florida Legislature took action on this recommendation in the form of SB 1334. Prior to the passage of the 2000 legislation, each state agency was responsible for the management of its own IT resources, its applications, its data, its asset management, its budgeting, its staff. This translated into:

- 4700 + IT workers with over 500 vacancies
- \$811 + million budget
- 27 different data centers
- 90,000 PCs
- 1000 + legacy databases
- 150 + different agency web sites”

“This type of IT management structure facilitated, from the citizen’s perspective, the following:

- an inability to identify an appropriate state contact point for a particular governmental service;
- an inability to achieve economics of scale in procurements and operations;
- an inability to provide IT services with speed and agility;
- an inability for citizens to enjoy/benefit from their experience with state government”

“Clearly one of the advantages of a centralized IT organizational structure is the ability to consolidate and maximize resources. Prior to the centralization of information technology in Florida, the money lost to purchasing inefficiencies and lack of coordination can be demonstrated. Currently the State spends more than \$1 billion a year on information technology. It is critical to leverage purchasing power to create eGovernment efficiencies. Through the 2000 legislation, the State Technology Office was charged with the development of mechanisms for online procurement; one component being online bidding (s. 287.057(22)(a) F.S.) The State Technology Office has initially pursued one specific aspect of online bidding, that being the online bidding of commodities and contractual services. The State Technology Office engaged in one of the first ever online bidding pilot projects by a state government and successfully conducted four bidding events. Overall, the 90-day pilot yielded an estimated \$3.8 million in savings; equating to an average savings of 13%.”

“The benefits of leveraging resources come from the State’s ability to negotiate volume pricing, decrease acquisition-processing costs, decrease support and training costs by supporting fewer systems, improve the enterprise’s ability to share data and applications, and increase end-user availability due to faster resolution of common problems. In addition, the flexible use of resources will occur at an enterprise level. Existing resources and technologies will then be employed more effectively.”

“Government is being driven to adapt enterprise methods in delivering services to its’ customers. These driving forces include increasing demands from taxpayers, emergence of the Internet, economic development and global competition, and the need to improve government efficiency. Technology is producing rapid, continuous change, and the emergence of the digital citizen has created a requirement for rapid, continuous transformation in government. Florida’s businesses and citizens are demanding better, faster and cheaper services. In an effort to make these services available, Florida government is being transformed by implementing an

enterprise model. With 40 separate entities being viewed as a single enterprise, the model ensures the focus of government is on its' customers--the citizens and businesses of Florida. The enterprise model also ensures redundant business functions are eliminated while increasing productivity and value by leveraging similar services across the enterprise. "

"The State of Florida, consisting of 140,000 employees throughout the enterprise and a \$51 billion state budget, is Florida's largest "corporation." By implementing an Enterprise approach that treats state government as a single enterprise, Florida is making government simpler, more efficient, and better able to serve the citizens of the state."

C. EFFECTS OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

PCB IT 01-04 would provide the STO with the authority and resources required to enable to establish the organization needed to integrate information technology, and IT staff and resources, across the executive branch of state government. The PCB would: establish the STO as a separate budget entity within the Department of Management Services (Chapter 20 and Chapter 282); reclassify certain STO employees from Career Service to the Select Exempt Class (Chapter 110); task the STO, in consultation with the legislative appropriations committees and the Executive Office of the Governor, with revitalizing and approving developments of information technology resource strategic plans (Chapter 186); task the STO with reviewing and making recommendations to the legislative appropriations committees and the Executive Office of the Governor on the part of agencies' long-range program plans that relate to information technology (Chapter 216); authorize the transfer of IT positions and appropriations identified in the STO's Agency Technology Agreements (Chapter 216) from state agencies to the STO; revise, supplement and clarify the powers and duties delegated to the STO to facilitate its establishment of uniform procedures for the acquisition and use of information technology by state agencies within the executive branch (Chapter 282).

The PCB has the following core purposes:

- xviii. The adoption of an enterprise-wide vision and mission for the development, deployment and utilization of information technology across state government, including architecture and security protocols, systems design, project management, licensing and procurement;
- xix. The consolidated management of information technology in state government;
- xx. Collaborative decision-making and elimination of the "silo" mentality;
- xxi. Decrease the turnover of the state's information technology workers and increase the ability to competitively retain and recruit these employees;
- xxii. Consolidated asset management and aggregated, enterprise-wide procurement and cost recovery;
- xxiii. Making state government consistently more responsive to the needs of Florida's citizens and businesses; and
- xxiv. Decreasing the cost of state government to the taxpayers.

D. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:

Section 1: s. 20.22

Section 1 would establish the STO as a separate budget entity within the Department of Management Services and would task the STO with managing the Technology Resource Center.

Section 2: s. 110.205

Section 2 would reclassify certain STO employees from Career Service class to the Select Exempt Class. This would enable the state to better retain, more effectively recruit, and more competitively compensate state IT workers.

Section 3: s. 186.022

Section 3 would responsibly involve the STO, in consultation with the legislative appropriations committees and the Executive Office of the Governor, in reviewing and approving development of information technology resource strategic plans.

Section 4: s. 216.013

Section 4 would substitute the STO for the Technology Review Workgroup.

Section 5: s. 216.0446

Section 5 would substitute the STO for the Technology Review Workgroup and would task the STO with reviewing and making recommendations to the legislative appropriations committees and the Executive Office of the Governor on the parts of agencies' long-range program plans that relate to information technology resources and information technology projects. Section 5 would also establish the title of the State Annual Report on Enterprise Resource Planning and Management.

Section 6: s. 216.181

Section 6 would substitute the STO for the Technology Review Workgroup and would provide for STO review of certain IT-related budget amendments

Section 7: s. 216.235

Section 7 would transfer the Innovation Investment Program from the Department of Management Services to the Office of Tourism, Trade and Economic Development ("OTTED") and would add as members the Chief Information Officer of STO, the Director of OTTED and the Chair of itflorida.com., Inc.

Section 8: s. 216.292

Section 8 would authorize transfer of IT positions and appropriations identified in the STO's Agency Technology Agreements from state agencies to the STO.

Section 9: s. 282.005

Section 9 would revise and supplement the legislative intent expressed in s. 282.005 to clarify the STO's mission and role in state government. Section 9 would amend subsections (4), (6), (9), and (10) to replace the term "information resources" with the term "information technology" to be consistent with the definition for "information technology" the PCB proposes for s. 282.101. Section 9 would amend subsection (5) to provide that the STO, rather than each agency head, has primary responsibility for providing information technology to the agency. Section 9 would express the Legislature's intent that agency heads are responsible for setting agency priorities, determining business needs, and determining substantive services and programs to be developed under the laws they administer. Under Section 9, the STO, rather than the agency, would be viewed as the state's expert in providing information technology. Agencies, within the executive branch of state government would be STO's customers and would negotiate agreements with the STO for the information technology services. Section 9 would also amend subsection (5) to provide that STO shall use the state's information technology in the best interests of the state as a whole and shall make use of shared data and related resources whenever appropriate. This proposed language would charge STO with eliminating redundancy in the state's information technology resources and would focus on enterprise-wide resource utilization effectiveness.

Section 9 of s. 282.005 would eliminate subsection (7) and renumber the remaining subsections accordingly. Section 9 would amend subsection (8) to provide that STO is the vehicle through which the state shall develop its information technology planning, management and infrastructure.

Section 10: s. 282.101

Currently, the definitional section for Part I of ch. 282 is s. 282.303. Section 10 would move that definitional section forward in Chapter 282. Section 10 would revise new s. 282.101 to make that section the definitional section for Part I of ch. 282 and would revise and renumber s. 282.303 to replace s. 282.101.

Section 10 would revise definitions currently existing in s. 282.303. Additionally, Section 10 would renumber the subsections of s. 282.303 to list the terms in alphabetical order. Section 10 would amend the definition of "Agency" to mean those entities described in s. 216.011(1)(qq) to correct an erroneous cross-reference. Section 10 would rename "Chief Information Officer" to "Agency Chief Information Officer" to conform to changes the PCB proposes to make to s. 282.3055. Under Section 1, "Agency Chief Information Officer" would mean the person appointed by the STO to coordinate and manage information technology for each state agency subject to STO's jurisdiction. Section 10 would rename "Chief Information Officers Council" to "Agency Chief Information Officers Council."

Section 10 would redefine the term "information technology" to mean: equipment, hardware, software, firmware, programs, systems, networks, infrastructure, media and related material used to automatically, electronically or wirelessly collect, receive, access, transmit, display, store, record, retrieve, analyze, evaluate, process, classify, manipulate, manage, assimilate, control, exchange, communicate, exchange, convert, converge, interface, switch, or disseminate information of any kind or form.

This broad definition is intended to encompass all current and future notions of what constitutes information technology. The definition does not include personnel or facilities. Section 10 would also eliminate definitions for "data processing software," "information technology hardware," "information technology services," and "information technology resources" because those definitions are either no longer necessary or are encompassed within the definition of "information technology."

Section 10 would also remove the definition of the term "Technology Review Workgroup."

Section 11: s. 282.102

Section 282.102 defines the powers and duties of the STO. Section 11 would revise s. 282.102 to alter the current organizational structure within which STO is placed. Currently, STO is an office within the Department of Management Services. Although the PCB would maintain STO as an office within DMS, the PCB proposes to make STO a separate budget entity. Additionally, Section 11 would amend s. 282.102 to provide that the CIO, as the head of the STO, would be considered an agency head for all purposes. Under Section 11, STO would not be subject to the control, supervision, or direction of DMS. The language proposed by Section 11 is modeled after the language authorizing the Department of Administrative Hearings and the Agency for Workforce Innovation, both of which are also organizational units of the executive branch of state government that are within DMS. See s. 20.50, 120.65, F.S.

Section 11 would revise several of the powers and duties of the STO. Section 11 would revise subsection (2) to permit STO to adopt policies and procedures implementing best practices to be followed by agencies in acquiring, using or disposing of information technology. Currently STO is only charged with the ability to coordinate the purchase, lease and use of information technology by agencies. Section 11 would strengthen STO's role to enable it to ensure that information technology resources are standardized across all state agencies and that state agencies acquire resources from vendors who have formed strategic alliances with the state. Section 11 would insert a new subsection (4) in s. 282.102 to state that STO, in consultation with each state agency, shall perform the enterprise resource planning and management function for the agency. Section 11 would amend subsections (11) and (12) to permit STO to apply for, receive, and hold patents, copyrights, trademarks, and service marks and authorize STO to assist state agencies in acquiring these types of intellectual property. Section 11 would also clarify the language in subsection (14) of s. 282.102 to allow STO to delegate the authority to acquire information technology to agencies as deemed necessary by STO. Section 11 would also amend subsection (15) of s. 282.102 to allow STO to acquire ownership of communications equipment and facilities without the concurrence of the agency that currently possesses the equipment and facilities, as the STO deems necessary to carry out its duties as provided in ch. 282.

Section 12: s. 282.103

Section 12 would amend subsection (3) of s. 282.103 to provide that if the STO is unable to meet an agency's requirements by enhancing Suncom service, the STO may grant the agency an exemption from the required use of Suncom. The current version of s. 282.103 requires STO to grant the exemption. Section 12 would make various technical amendments to s. 282.103 to ensure consistency with other proposed changes. For instance, Section (12) would remove the phrase "of the Department of Management Services" from references to the STO.

Section 13: s. 282.104

Section 13 would make various technical amendments to s. 282.104 to ensure consistency with other proposed changes. For instance, PCB IT 01-04 would remove the phrase "of the Department of Management Services" from references to the STO.

Section 14: s. 282.105

Section 14 would remove the phrase "of the Department of Management Services" from references to the STO.

Section 15: s. 282.106

Section 15 would remove the phrase “of the Department of Management Services” from references to the STO.

Section 16: s. 282.1095

Section 16 would provide for bifurcation of the existing Law Enforcement Radio System Trust Fund into an operating trust fund and a revenue trust fund. Section 16 would amend subsection (2)(f) and (2)(g) of s. 282.106 to rename the State Agency Law Enforcement Radio System Trust Fund the Law Enforcement Operating Trust Fund. Section 16 would also amend subsection (3) of s. 282.106 to remove the existing language allowing the Joint Task Force on State Agency Law Enforcement Communications to appropriate trust funds to law enforcement agencies to enhance their communications systems beyond their existing budgets. The current appropriations practice requires that each user-agency, rather than the task force, act as the owner of its equipment and that improvements be made through the agency’s budget. Thus, the Task Force’s power to allocate trust funds is obsolete, and Section 16 seeks to align subsection (3) to the current appropriations practice. Section 16 would also remove subsection (5)(b) of s. 282.106 which currently provides that the STO can establish positions necessary to accomplish its duties under s. 282.1095 through the budget process and that the positions are to be funded by the trust fund. This requirement is no longer necessary because the number of positions allocated to this activity is established by the Legislature through the appropriations process.

Section 16 would also make various technical amendments to s. 282.106 to ensure consistency with other proposed changes. For instance, Section 16 would remove the phrase “of the Department of Management Services” from references to the STO.

Section 17: s. 282.111

Section 17 would remove the phrase “of the Department of Management Services” from references to the STO.

Section 18: s. 282.20

Section 18 would remove the definition of “office” from subsection (1)(b)1 of s. 282.20 because the PCB would define that word for purposes ch. 282 in s. 282.101. Section 18 would also remove subsection (4) of s. 282.20 and renumber the remaining subsections accordingly. Subsection (4), s. 282.20 currently provides that any new Technology Resource Center (“TRC”) customer other than a state agency that is expected to pay more than 5% of the TRC’s revenues be approved by the Office of Planning and Budget. In 1997, when the customer base of TRCs was expanded to all customers eligible for Suncom service, including counties and cities, concerns were raised that a customer that was too demanding could hamper service. Since that time, the participation by these customers has been minimal, and no non-agency customer currently shares more than 5% of a TRC customer base. Thus, the approval process is no longer necessary. Section 18 would also amend subsection (6) of s. 282.20 to specify that the working capital trust fund for TRCs is the Technology Enterprise Operating Trust Fund.

Section 18 would also remove the phrase “of the Department of Management Services” from references to the STO.

Section 19: s. 282.21

Section 19 would remove the phrase “of the Department of Management Services” from references to the STO.

Section 20: s. 282.22

Section 20 would revise the statute’s title to read “Production, dissemination and ownership of materials and products by the STO.”

Currently, the products and services that STO develops can only be utilized by entities authorized to use the Suncom network. Section 20 would remove this requirement. As the evolution of digital government progresses, the STO will be charged with developing an array products and services for Florida citizens. Other state governments seeking to offer similar services to their citizens could use many of these products and services. Section 20 would allow the STO to recover development costs by charging outside entities for use of the product or service. By broadening its customer base, the STO could reduce the burden on Florida government entities by lowering technology costs. Section 20 would retain the requirement that such charges shall only be those sufficient to recover the essential cost of producing and disseminating the product or service.

Section 20 would remove the phrase “of the Department of Management Services” from references to the STO.

Section 21: s. 282.23

Section 21 would create s. 282.32 to permit the STO, in consultation with DMS, to form State Strategic Information Technology Alliances for the acquisition of information technology in accordance with the competitive procurement practices established in ch. 287.

According to the STO, significant time and effort is spent re-training and educating information technology vendors about the sophisticated needs of state government. The alliances would serve to maintain continuity and to allow vendors to gain expertise in providing information technology to the state. In creating such an alliance, the STO would establish qualifications for vendors seeking to become an alliance member. The STO would, by competitive procurement basis, select several vendors to provide an array of services to the state. Once selected, vendors would be permitted to enter into long-term contracts with the STO to provide state government with information technology rather than being required to go through the competitive procurement process for each individual project.

Section 22: s. 282.3041

Currently, s. 282.3041 allocates the responsibility for enterprise resource planning and management to each agency head, in consultation with the STO. “Enterprise resource planning and management” is defined in the current version of s. 282.303(11) to mean the planning, developing, acquiring and control of government information technology. Because the PCB would allocate this function to the STO and fully describe the function in the delineation of STO’s powers and duties in s. 282.102, s. 282.3041 would no longer be necessary and would be repealed by Section 22.

Section 23: s. 282.3055

Section 282.3055 defines the duties of the chief information officer in each agency. Section 23 would revise s. 282.3055 to provide that the Agency Chief Information Officer for each state agency subject to STO and jurisdiction shall be appointed by the Chief Information Officer rather than by the head of each such agency. Section 23 would replace “Chief Information Officer” with “Agency Chief Information Officer” where appropriate. Additionally, Section 23 would amend subsection

(2)(c) of s. 282.3055 to ensure that Agency Chief Information Officers implement policies, procedures, and standards in accord with the STO's policies and procedures.

Section 24: s. 282.3063

Section 24 would require that Agency Chief Information Officers prepare and submit to the STO an Agency Annual Enterprise Resource Planning and Management Report.

Section 25: s. 282.315

Section 25 establishes the Agency Chief Information Officers Council. Section 25 would replace the "Chief Information Officer" with the "Agency Chief Information Officer" where appropriate. The chair of the Geographic Information Board would be removed from the council because the PCB would repeal s. 282.404 creating that board.

Section 26: s. 282.318

Section 26 would amend s. 282.318 to provide that the STO, in consultation with each agency head, would be responsible for assuring an adequate level of security for all data and information technology resources. Currently, agency heads, in consultation with the STO, are required to assure the security of their data and information technology systems. Because the STO will own and design the systems and employ the personnel that service the systems, requiring that the STO ensure the security of the data and systems is consistent with the STO's mission.

Section 27: s. 282.322

Section 282.322 currently provides for a special monitoring process for each information technology project designated for special monitoring by the General Appropriations Act. The Technology Review Workgroup, a group within the Legislature is charged with monitoring designated projects.

Because the PCB would reassign the responsibility for monitoring information technology projects from the TRW to the STO, Section 27 would amend s. 282.322 to provide that the Enterprise Project Management Office within the STO would report to the Governor and the Legislature on any information technology project that the STO identifies as "high-risk" and that the STO would assess the levels of risk associated with proceeding to the next stage of the project.

Section 28: Proviso Language

Section 28 would authorize the transfer of IT personnel and resources identified in agreements with the State Technology Office from state agencies to the STO.

Section 29: s. 282.404

Section 29 would repeal s. 282.404, which creates the Geographic Information Board because that Board has never been constituted and has never functioned.

III. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

N/A

2. Expenditures:

PCB IT 01-04 would require no additional expenditures by the state. The PCB would authorize the transfer of certain personnel and funds to the STO, but such transfers would not require additional expenditures by the state.

The consolidation and integration of IT functions and resources in the STO will likely generate substantial cost savings for the state. For example, a 90-day online bidding pilot projects have yielded an estimated \$3.8 million in savings for the state.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

N/A

2. Expenditures:

N/A

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

N/A

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

N/A

IV. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

N/A

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

N/A

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

N/A

V. COMMENTS:

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

N/A

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

N/A

C. OTHER COMMENTS:

N/A

VI. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

Amendment 1 conforms language to the House Appropriations Budget.

VII. SIGNATURES:

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY:

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

John A. Barley, Chief Legislative Analyst

Charles Davidson

Richard Martin, Legislative Analyst

VIII. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

A. DOES THE BILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES:

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. <u>Less Government</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. <u>Lower Taxes</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. <u>Individual Freedom</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. <u>Personal Responsibility</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. <u>Family Empowerment</u> | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> | N/A <input type="checkbox"/> |

For any principle that received a "no" above, please explain:

B. PRESENT SITUATION:

N/A

C. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

N/A

D. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:

This section need be completed only in the discretion of the Committee.

IX. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues:

N/A

2. Expenditures:

N/A

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues:

N/A

2. Expenditures:

N/A

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

N/A

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

N/A

X. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

N/A

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

N/A

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

N/A

XI. COMMENTS:

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

N/A

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

N/A

C. OTHER COMMENTS:

N/A

XII. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

N/A

XIII. SIGNATURES:

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY:

Prepared by:

Staff Director:

John A. Barley/Richard Martin

Charles M. Davidson