

# SENATE STAFF ANALYSIS AND ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

(This document is based on the provisions contained in the legislation as of the latest date listed below.)

BILL: CS/SB 874  
 SPONSOR: Governmental Oversight & Productivity and Senator Garcia  
 SUBJECT: State Technology Office  
 DATE: April 5, 2001                      REVISED: \_\_\_\_\_

	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR	REFERENCE	ACTION
1.	Rhea	Wilson	GO	Favorable/CS
2.	_____	_____	AGG	_____
3.	_____	_____	AP	_____
4.	_____	_____	RC	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____

**I. Summary:**

The committee substitute would: establish the STO as a separate budget entity within the Department of Management Services (DMS); reclassify certain STO employees from Career Service to the Select Exempt Class; 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; 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; authorize the transfer of IT positions and appropriations identified in the STO's Agency Technology Agreements 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.

The committee substitute amends the following sections of the Florida Statutes: 20.22, 110.205, 186.022, 216.013, 216.0446, 216.181, 216.235, 216.292, 282.005, 282.303, 282.102, 282.103, 282.104, 282.105, 282.106, 282.1095, 282.111, 282.20, 282.21, 282.22, 282.23, 282.3041, 282.3055, 282.3063, 282.315, 282.318, 282.322, and 282.404.

**II. Present Situation:**

Section 20.02(1), F.S., provides:

The State Constitution contemplates the separation of powers within state government among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the government. The legislative branch has the broad purpose of determining policies and programs and reviewing

program performance. The executive branch has the purpose of executing the programs and policies adopted by the Legislature and of making policy recommendations to the Legislature. The judicial branch has the purpose of determining the constitutional propriety of the policies and programs and of adjudicating any conflicts arising from the interpretation or application of the laws.

Section 20.02(3), F.S., notes that structural reorganization must be a continuing process through careful executive and legislative appraisal of the placement of new programs and the coordination of existing programs in response to public needs.

Under 20.02(6), F.S., the management and coordination of state services must be improved and overlapping activities eliminated. Further, s. 20.02(4), F.S., requires that responsibility within the executive branch of government for the implementation of programs and policies must be clearly fixed and ascertainable.

Chapter 20, F.S., also establishes requirements for the structural organization of departments. Typically, the department is the principal administrative unit of the executive branch. For their internal structure, departments must adhere to a standard organizational structure, unless exempt under s. 20.04(3), F.S. The principal unit of a department is a division, which is headed by a division director; the principal unit of a division, is a bureau, headed by a bureau chief; the principal unit of the bureau is a section, headed by an administrator.

**The Department of Management Services and the Information Technology Program** - The Department of Management Services (DMS) is created in s. 20.22, F.S. The DMS is exempt from the standard organizational structure required of departments under s. 20.04(3), F.S. The DMS contains the following divisions and programs:

- (a) Facilities Program.
- (b) Information Technology Program.
- (c) Workforce Program.
- (d) 1. Support Program.  
2. Federal Property Assistance Program.
- (e) Administration Program.
- (f) Division of Administrative Hearings.
- (g) Division of Retirement.
- (h) Division of State Group Insurance.

**The State Technology Office** - The State Technology Office (STO) was initially created in the 1997 legislative session with the enactment of the Information Resources Management Act.<sup>1</sup> During the 2000 session, the provision that initially created and defined the STO was repealed and the STO was re-created and re-defined.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, the position of Chief Information Officer (CIO) was created to head the STO. The CIO is appointed by the Governor.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 9, ch. 97-286, L.O.F.

<sup>2</sup> CS/CS/SB 1334.

The 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.

**Information Service Technology Development 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.<sup>3</sup> The report notes in 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 economies 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

---

<sup>3</sup> See, 2001 Annual Report to the Legislature, Information Service Technology Development Task Force, s. 7.4.2 (February 14, 2001); available at [http://www.itflorida.com/pdfs/2001\\_legislative\\_report.pdf](http://www.itflorida.com/pdfs/2001_legislative_report.pdf).

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.”

**Information Resource Strategic Plan** - Section 186.022, F.S., requires the Geographic Information Board, the Financial Management Information Board, the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Systems Council, and the Health Information Systems Council each to develop and submit an information resource strategic plan to the Executive Office of the Governor (EOG) in a form and manner prescribed in written instructions prepared by the EOG in consultation with the legislative appropriations committees. The EOG is required to review the strategic plan and is authorized to comment within 30 days. The EOG must consider all comments and findings of the Technology Review Workgroups as to whether the plan is consistent with the State Annual Report on Information Resources Management and statewide policies recommended by the State Technology Council. If revisions are required, boards and councils have 30 days to incorporate the revisions and return the plan to the EOG.

**Long-range Program Plan** - Section 216.013(1), F.S., requires state agencies to develop long-range program plans to achieve state goals using an interagency planning process that

includes the development of integrated agency program service outcomes. A plan must cover five fiscal years and is effective July 1 of each year. Long-range program plans provide the framework for the development of agency budget requests and:

- < Identify agency programs and address how agency programs will be used to implement state policy, achieve state goals and program component objectives;
- < Identify and describe agency functions and how they will be used to achieve designated outcomes;
- < Identify demand, output, total costs, and unit costs for each function;
- < Provide information regarding performance measurement;
- < Identify and justify facility and fixed capital outlay projects and associated costs; and,
- < Identify and justify information technology infrastructure and applications and their associated costs for information technology projects or initiatives.

Long-range program plans must be submitted to the EOG by August 1 of each year in a form and manner prescribed by the EOG and the chairs of the legislative appropriations committees. The EOG reviews the plans for executive agencies to ensure that they are consistent with the state's goals and objectives and other requirements as specified in the written instructions and they provide the framework and context for the agency's budget request. In its review, the EOG is required to consider the findings of the Technology Review Workgroup as to the consistency of the information technology portion of long-range program plans with the State Annual Report on Information Resources Management and statewide policies recommended by the State Technology Council and the state's plan for facility needs. Based upon the review, the EOG may require an agency to revise a plan. Revisions must be incorporated within 14 working days. Long-range program plans are expressly determined by the Legislature not to be rules subject to the requirements of ch. 120, F.S.

**Technology Review Workgroup** – The Technology Review Workgroup is created in s. 216.0446, F.S., within the Legislature. The workgroup is required to review and make recommendations with respect to the portion of agencies' long-range program plans which pertains to information resources management needs and with respect to agencies' legislative budget requests for information resources management. The workgroup is responsible to the chairs of the legislative appropriations committees.

The workgroup evaluates information resource management needs identified in the agency long-range program plans for consistency with the State Annual Report on Information Resources Management and statewide policies recommended by the State Technology Council, and makes recommendations to the legislative appropriations committees.

It also reviews and makes recommendations to the chairs of the legislative appropriations committees on proposed budget amendments and agency transfers associated with information resources management initiatives or projects that involve more than one agency, that have an outcome that impacts another agency, or that exceed \$500,000 in total cost over a 1-year period.

**Innovation Investment Program Act** – Section 216.235, F.S., creates the Innovation Investment Program Act. In the act, the Legislature finds that each state agency should be encouraged to pursue innovative investment projects which demonstrate a novel, creative, and

entrepreneurial approach to conducting the agency's normal business processes. The Legislature also finds that investment in innovation can produce longer-term savings and that funds for investment should be available to assist agencies in investing in innovations that produce a cost savings or improve services. Eligible savings realized as a result of the program should be made available for other innovation investments.

Under the act, agencies submit a proposed innovative investment project to the DMS. Any agency developing an innovative investment project proposal that involves information technology resources may consult with and seek technical assistance from the Information Resource Commission.<sup>4</sup> The DMS is required to consult with the commission for any project proposal that involves information resource technology.

**State Agency Law Enforcement Radio Trust Fund** – Section 282.1095, F.S., authorizes the State Technology Office of the DMS to acquire and implement a statewide radio communications system to serve law enforcement units of state agencies, and to serve local law enforcement agencies through a mutual aid channel. The section provides for the creation of the State Agency Law Enforcement Radio Trust Fund in the STO and the trust fund is funded from surcharges collected under ss. 320.0802 and 328.72, F.S. Upon appropriation, moneys in the trust fund may be used by the STO to acquire by competitive procurement the equipment; software; and engineering, administrative, and maintenance services it needs to construct, operate, and maintain the statewide radio system. Currently, moneys in the trust fund may be appropriated to maintain and enhance, over and above existing agency budgets, existing radio equipment systems of the state agencies represented by the task force members,<sup>5</sup> in an amount not to exceed 10 percent per year per agency.

**Geographic Information Board** – Section 282.404, F.S., provides for the creation of the Geographic Information Board in the State Technology Office. The purpose of the board is to facilitate the identification, coordination, collection, and sharing of geographic information among federal, state, regional, and local agencies, and the private sector. The board is required to develop solutions, policies, and standards to increase the value and usefulness of geographic information concerning Florida.

### III. Effect of Proposed Changes:

Under the committee substitute, the State Technology Office (STO), which is currently a program in the Department of Management Services (DMS), is designated an "office." The committee substitute amends s. 282.102, F.S., to create the STO as a separate budget entity that is not subject to the control, supervision, or direction by the DMS in any manner, including, but not limited to, personnel, procurement, transactions involving real or person property, and

---

<sup>4</sup> Section 282.304, F.S., which provided for the creation of the Information Resource Commission, was repealed by s. 18, ch. 97-286, L.O.F.

<sup>5</sup> The Joint Task Force on State Agency Law Enforcement Communications consist of eight members who are representatives of the: (1) Division of Alcoholic Beverages and Tobacco of the Department of Business and professional Regulation; (2) Division of Florida Highway Patrol of the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles; (3) Department of Law Enforcement; (4) Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission; (5) Division of Law Enforcement of the Department of Environmental Protection; (6) Department of Corrections; (7) Division of State Fire Marshal of the Department of Insurance; and (8) Department of Transportation.

planning and budget matters. The Chief Information Officer, who is appointed by the Governor, is designated as agency head for all purposes. The committee substitute designates the STO with the responsibility of managing the Technology Resource Center.

The committee substitute requires that the salary and benefits of the Chief Information Officer, deputy chief information officers, chief technology officers, and deputy chief technology officers to be set in accordance with the rules of the Senior Management Service. Managers, supervisors and employees of the STO are reclassified from the Career Service Class to the Select Exempt in order to better retain, more effectively recruit, and more competitively compensate state IT workers.

The STO, in consultation with the legislative appropriations committees and the Executive Office of the Governor, is assigned the responsibility for reviewing and approving development of information technology resource strategic plans.

The STO is substituted for the Technology Review Workgroup. The STO is assigned the responsibility for 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. Additionally, the STO would be required to review IT-related budget amendments.

The committee substitute transfers the Innovation Investment Program from the DMS to the Office of Tourism, Trade and Economic Development (OTTED) and adds the Chief Information Officer of STO, the Director of OTTED and the Chair of itFlorida.com., Inc., as members.

The committee substitute authorizes transfer of IT positions and appropriations identified in the STO's Agency Technology Agreements from state agencies to the STO.

The committee substitute revises and supplements the legislative intent expressed in s. 282.005 to clarify the STO's mission and role in state government. Section 9. amends 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 bill provides for in s. 282.101, F.S. Subsection (5) is amended to provide that the STO, rather than each agency head, has primary responsibility for providing information technology to the agency. The committee substitute expressly provides 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 the committee substitute, 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 information technology services. Subsection (5) is also amended to provide that the STO shall use the state's information technology in the best interests of the state as a whole, and in compliance with the requirements of ch.119, F.S., and must make use of shared data and related resources whenever appropriate. This language charges the STO with eliminating redundancy in the state's information technology resources and to focus on enterprise-wide resource utilization effectiveness.

Under the committee substitute, the STO is the vehicle through which the state is to develop its information technology planning, management and infrastructure.

Currently, the definitional section for Part I of ch. 282, F.S., is in s. 282.303, F.S. The committee substitute moves that definitional section forward in ch. 282. The new s. 282.101, F.S., is revised to make that section the definitional section for Part I of ch. 282, F.S., and revises and renumbers s. 282.303, F.S., to replace s. 282.101, F.S.

The committee substitute revises definitions currently existing in s. 282.303, F.S. Additionally, the subsections contained in s. 282.303, F.S., are listed in alphabetical order. The definition of “agency” is revised to mean those entities described in s. 216.011(1)(qq), F.S., to correct an erroneous cross-reference. Additionally, the term *Chief Information Officer* is redesignated as *Agency Chief Information Officer* to conform to changes made to s. 282.3055, F.S. Under Section 1., *Agency Chief Information Officer* means the person appointed by the STO to coordinate and manage information technology for each state agency subject to the STO’s jurisdiction. Further, the *Chief Information Officers Council* is renamed as the *Agency Chief Information Officers Council*.

The committee substitute also redefines 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. Definitions for *data processing software*, *information technology hardware*, *information technology services*, and *information technology resources* are eliminated because those definitions are either no longer necessary or are encompassed within the definition of *information technology*.

The committee substitute revises several of the powers and duties of the STO. Subsection (2) is revised to permit the STO to adopt policies and procedures implementing best practices to be followed by agencies in acquiring, using, or disposing of information technology. Currently, the STO is only charged with the ability to coordinate the purchase, lease and use of information technology by agencies. Section 11. would strengthen the 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. The committee substitute inserts a new subsection (4) in s. 282.102, F.S., to state that the STO, in consultation with each state agency, shall perform the enterprise resource planning and management function for the agency.

Further, subsections (11) and (12) are amended to permit the STO to apply for, receive, and hold patents, copyrights, trademarks, and service marks and authorize the 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, F.S., to allow the STO to delegate the authority to acquire information technology to agencies as deemed necessary by the STO. Subsection (15) of



s. 282.102, F.S., is also amended to allow the 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, F.S.

Subsection (3) of s. 282.103, F.S., is amended 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, F.S., requires the STO to grant the exemption. Section 12. makes various technical amendments to ss. 282.103 and 282.104, F.S., to ensure consistency with other proposed changes. For instance, the phrase "of the Department of Management Services" is removed from references to the STO.

The committee substitute provides for bifurcation of the existing Law Enforcement Radio System Trust Fund into an operating trust fund and a revenue trust fund. Subsection (3) of s. 282.106, F.S., is also amended 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. of the committee substitute seeks to align subsection (3) to the current appropriations practice. Section 16. also removes paragraph (5)(b) of s. 282.106, F.S., which currently provides that the STO can establish positions necessary to accomplish its duties under s. 282.1095, F.S., 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.

The committee substitute also makes various technical amendments to s. 282.106, F.S., to ensure consistency with other proposed changes. For instance, the phrase "of the Department of Management Services" is removed from references to the STO.

The committee substitute removes the definition of *office* from subsection (1)(b)1 of s. 282.20, F.S., because the bill defines that word for purposes ch. 282, F.S., in s. 282.101, F.S. Section 18. removes subsection (4) of s. 282.20, F.S., and renumbers the remaining subsections accordingly. Section 282.20(4), F.S., currently provides that any new Technology Resource Center ("TRC") customer other than a state agency that is expected to pay more than 5 percent 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 percent of a TRC customer base. Thus, the approval process is no longer necessary. Section 18. would also amend subsection (6) of s. 282.20, F.S., to specify that the working capital trust fund for TRCs is the Technology Enterprise Operating Trust Fund.

Currently, the products and services that the STO develops can only be utilized by entities authorized to use the Suncom network. Section 20. removes this requirement. As the evolution of

digital government progresses, the STO will be charged with developing an array of 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. allows 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. retains the requirement that such charges shall only be those sufficient to recover the essential cost of producing and disseminating the product or service.

Section 21. creates s. 282.32, F.S., 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, F.S.

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.

Currently, s. 282.3041, F.S., 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), F.S., to mean the planning, developing, acquiring and control of government information technology. Because the committee substitute allocates this function to the STO and fully describes the function in the delineation of the STO's powers and duties in s. 282.102, F.S., s. 282.3041, F.S., would no longer be necessary and is repealed by Section 22.

Section 282.3055, F.S., defines the duties of the chief information officer in each agency. The section is revised to provide that the Agency Chief Information Officer for each state agency subject to the STO and jurisdiction must 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, s. 282.3055(2)(c), F.S., would be amended to ensure that Agency Chief Information Officers implement policies, procedures, and standards in accord with the STO's policies and procedures.

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

The committee substitute establishes the Agency Chief Information Officers Council. The chair of the Geographic Information Board would be removed from the council because s. 282.404, F.S., which creates that board, is repealed.

Section 282.318, F.S., is amended to provide that the STO, in consultation with each agency head, is 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.

The committee substitute 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 committee substitute reassigns the responsibility for monitoring information technology projects from the TRW to the STO, s. 282.322, F.S., is amended 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.

The committee substitute provides for the establishment of an eLibrary in a municipality. It requires the STO, in coordination with the Division of Library and Information Services, to make a report on the creation of a statewide, integrated eLibrary system.

The committee substitute authorizes the transfer of IT personnel and resources identified in agreements with the State Technology Office from state agencies to the STO.

The committee substitute repeals s. 282.404, F.S., which creates the Geographic Information Board because that Board has never been constituted and has never functioned.

#### **IV. Constitutional Issues:**

##### **A. Municipality/County Mandates Restrictions:**

None.

##### **B. Public Records/Open Meetings Issues:**

None.

##### **C. Trust Funds Restrictions:**

None.

#### **V. Economic Impact and Fiscal Note:**

##### **A. Tax/Fee Issues:**

None.

**B. Private Sector Impact:**

None.

**C. Government Sector Impact:**

Procurement of technology resources under one consolidated state system could save the State significant amounts of money, as well as encourage compatible computer systems.

**VI. Technical Deficiencies:**

None.

**VII. Related Issues:**

None.

**VIII. Amendments:**

None.

---

This Senate staff analysis does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill's sponsor or the Florida Senate.

---