

MINUTES

Information Technology Advisory Board (ITAB)

February 16, 2021

1:30pm – 3:00pm

Virtual Teams Meeting that was recorded.

draft

Opening Welcome & Introductions

Travis Rail, CITA

Travis Rail welcomed everyone and announced that DeAngela will be joining late after she presents to the legislature. He asked that everyone mute their mics and use the raise your hand feature when you wish to speak. Due to the rolling blackouts, if you should get disconnected, you are welcome to join by phone.

Presentations & General Updates

Legislative Update

Samir Arif, Dept. of Administration

JCIT is being rescheduled due to the weather. Items on their agenda:

- Organizational meeting. This committee usually switches every other year between House and Senate leadership. The House will lead this year.
- [HB2188](#); Introduced by Kyle Hoffman. Requiring review by the joint committee on information technology of state agency contracts for certain information technology projects. This would require the committee to review projects before they go out to bid. This bill is currently in Appropriations. The hearing is scheduled for next week. This will have some impact on the way projects are processed and would require JCIT to see them before they go out for bid.
- Cybersecurity Bill – Asking for some technical clean up to this Bill. This will be aligning the language in the Bill with actual practices. One change is to correct by separating OITS from the Dept of Administration.
 - Question: Does the CyberSecurity bill have a Bill number yet? Answer: No, we are waiting for final draft language before it is introduced in Ways & Means.
- IT Project Reporting: from a monetary model to a risk-based model. This bill is scheduled to be introduced once the final Bill draft is done. Once he receives the Bill he will circulate.

Committees are heavily involved in budgets currently. He understands that their goal is to have them completed by March 1st.

Data Access and Support Center (DASC) Overview

Ken Nelson, DASC

- Ken's slide deck was provided with the [Agenda](#).
- The DASC was established in 1991 and is located at the Kansas Geological Survey at the University of Kansas west campus. It is a central repository of GIS databases of statewide & regional importance and operates under contract with the Office of Information Technology Services (OITS). Ken joined the team in 1995.
- In the late 80s early 90s the GIS was primarily used by water related agencies in state government and some regents' institutions. The geological survey was a heavy user of GIS for their mapping program and so the director Dr. Gerhart opted to house the program and offer support necessary to operate the program.

- They operate their Core Services under agreement with OITS.
- Their services include:
 - Database archival & distribution is the foundation of the program.
 - Database development & integration
 - GIS web application development & hosting
 - State & local government coordination & outreach
 - Coordinate & manage the state government Esri software Enterprise agreements
 - Geospatial metadata development assistance
 - Cartographic development
 - Promotion of the Kansas GIS Initiative
 - Development and maintenance of the DASC website <https://www.kansasgis.org>

He provided snapshots of their data catalog. The primary feature of their site is data distribution. They have resource centers that provide a focus on particular projects and initiatives with documents and related information.

The majority of what they archive and distribute is public domain data provided by state local and federal agencies that is published in a variety of formats that are common to GIS users by a variety of file formats. The majority is published is web mapping services rather than providing an exhausted list he added their primary data categories into one slide. IT cuts across the types of categories you would see in their catalog from administrative boundaries to high resolution elevation data, a ton of ortho rectified imagery, land surface, geology & Soils, Transportation & Water Resources.

Other projects and initiatives include supporting state agencies business needs as they support a relationship with local jurisdictions.

Some of the larger users/agencies they support: Dept of Ag, KS 911 Coordinating Council, KDOR, KDOT, Historical Society, WLPT, Dept of Ed, KS Water Office, KDHE & Emergency Mgmt.

Coordination & Outreach is important to them. Pre-Covid they held a lot of in-person user group meetings.

- GIS user groups: ArcGIS User Group & Coffee & Code User Group •
- MidAmerica GIS Consortium: Steering Committee member & Clearinghouse Summit –Planning Committee Chair
- Kansas Natural Resources GIS Technical Meeting –Planning Committee member
- National States Geographic Information Council (NSGIC), State Representative, Board of Directors, Geo Enabled Elections Steering Committee, Geospatial Maturity Assessment (GMA) Committee
- Kansas Next Generation 911 o Kansas NG911 GIS User Group, Kansas 911 Coordinating Council member (non-voting), Kansas 911 Coordinating Council Executive Committee, GIS Committee Chairperson & committee member and Technical Committee

Other Federal, local and state government relationships include:

Federal:

- National Resources Conservation Service
- US Geological Survey
- US Census Bureau

State of Kansas

- Office of Information Technology Services
- GIS Policy Board
- 911 Coordinating Council
- Information Technology Advisory Board
- Traffic Records Coordinating Council
- Numerous state agencies

Local government:

- Public Safety Answering Points
- County Appraisers
- County Clerks
- GIS/Mapping Departments

GIS service providers:

- ATCi
- GeoComm
- Kimball Mapping
- R&S Digital
- GeoComm

Imagery & LiDAR:

- Surdex
- Hexagon
- Atlantic

Software:

- Esri Enterprise Agreement

NG911 service providers:

- AT&T
- Motorola
- Intrado
- RapidDeploy

Professional organizations:

- Kansas Association of Mappers
- MidAmerica Geographic Information Consortium
- National States Geographic Information Council

Initiative highlights:

- Esri Enterprise Agreement
- Initiative highlights
- DASC Portal architecture redesign
- Kansas Next Generation 911
- Statewide orthoimagery acquisition

- ArcGIS Online Imagery beta test site

The two types of Esri GIS Software Agreements:

Master Purchase Agreement (MPA)

- Defines price schedule for all Esri products and services
- Software, consulting services, 3rd party royalty products, etc.
- Available to state and local jurisdictions

Enterprise Agreement (EA)

- Negotiated flat-rate agreement that defines access to a specific set of Esri products & services
- Unlimited access to Esricore technology
- Limited access defined for other products such as ArcGIS Online
- Kansas EA available to state agencies, boards, and commissions only

No questions asked.

They keep busy as there are constant requests for photos to be taken of the ground. They get a variety of requests. Recently they received a call from the KCC conservation division stating that the historical imagery is really important to them if they are researching a well spot, they would need an air photo from the 1930s or 1950s. Most users are looking for the highest resolution of the most recent but they do have users that use aerial photography/imagery for a different purpose.

They have an agreement with OITS, but in addition to that they provide fee for service projects to state governments that helps them flush out their staff. All of their staff is located at the geological survey on west campus at KU, however are currently working remotely.

His team consists of the below members:

Eileen Battles – DASC Manager

Kelly Emmons – Applications Developer

Asif Iqbal – System Architect

Kristen Jordan Koenig – GIS Developer

Brent Miller – GIS Specialist

Kenneth A Nelson – Geographic Information Officer, DASC Director

Shawn Saving – GIS Specialist

Two Students:

Dru Jones

Reilly Haverkamp

Ken wanted to provide their core functionality and why they exist and the variety of project they work on. He is happy to assist anyone that would like to dig in to something in more detail.

ITEC Policy Updates:

Travis Rail, CITA

The agenda had links to the draft policy language and the link for comments will allow you to leave comments for the team updating the policy.

Policy Series 2000 Update: Project Management Sara Spinks, KITO

Draft Policy: [2000](#)

Comments for this policy can be submitted here: <https://bit.ly/2ZbqGTx>

The draft statute changes will update the definition of a reportable IT project has been turned into the revisor's office for clean up and finalizing the proposed statute drafts and those will be submitted to Senate Ways & Means, hopefully very soon. She will keep everyone up-to-date on what is taking place with them. The policy team has drafted updated ITEC policy language based on those definition changes. So, if those statutes go through and the definition is changed we've included that draft language within these draft policies. ITEC & JCIT have seen these but there has been no vote and won't be until the statutes are worked. If you click on the 2000 link you can review and provide feedback in the comments link above. In the meantime, the team is working on two other projects pertaining to this policy. They are working on the workflow of this new process and how they are going to implement. They are trying to simplify as much as they can for the agencies. They are looking at the required deliverables will be for the project and how they want to fit it into an automated IT system. They hired a contract PM to help them gather the requirements, write an RFP to put out for an IT system. The hope is for agencies to use for all IT and quarterly reporting for the life of the project. They are hoping they will be able to implement dashboards for agencies to use for your project tracking. No questions asked.

Policy Series 5000 Team: Business Contingency Tracy Diel, Dept. of Administration

Draft Policy: [5300](#), [5310](#)

Comments for this policy can be submitted here: <https://bit.ly/3rxYsi2>

Tracy provided a list of Committee members: John Moyer, OITS; Anthony Fadale, DCR; Terri Clark, LAS; Jeff Maxon, KISO; David Marshall, KCJIS; Homer Manila, WU; Julie Fugett, KU; Travis White, KBOR; Travis Rail, OITS.

These two sections date back awhile (Effective 1999/Updated 2006). There was a team reviewing these policies last year but were detailed due to current events. They took that work and incorporated in current conversations. If the changes are adopted within these two sections, it will be the first significant changes since 2006.

The committee was tasked with reviewing both policies, determine whether policies need updating and determine if additional sections/policies were needed.

They started at the end of October reviewing the policies. The group decided there was no need to add policies but needed to discuss the language and ensure it was revised to be more consistent with what the state is doing today and be more consistent of the language of the IT world as they are looking at things especially with what has transpired in the world since March of 2020. You can see contingency operations for a variety of different groups within the state, local, etc. A major discussion point was taking into account that there is not just one agency or one state, but we have a lot of different sizes of agencies So, the team wanted to ensure that whatever they submitted would be some guidance but was also sufficiently flexible enough that each agency had some room to operate given that not everyone is a large agency like Revenue, Corrections or DofA but that there are a lot of smaller agencies that need to be considered.

The group has proposed updates which you can find by selecting the links above. They have gone as far as they can and encourage feedback using the comments link, also provided above. If it is not sufficient or you have a thought on where they should be focusing their time, they need to receive comments soon to keep the momentum moving rather wait a few months to get the group back together. One of their members is retiring so the sooner you review these drafts and provide feedback, the better.

Katrin Osterhaus asked if the two policies would remain separate or if there was consideration given to combining into one big policy and consolidate to make it simpler?

Tracy answered that his notes reflect that the group felt that it was better to keep the policies separate rather than combine and confuse the definitions and policies with what they might be trying to get accomplished. He invited members of the team to provide any additional comments. He also stated that it is something that they can look at as they move forward.

Jeff Maxon stated that they did keep them separate. They are following the same model as 7230 where there is a policy document and a standards document.

Travis Rail asked Tracy what the biggest change is with the policy that agencies will have to adopt?

Tracy answered that they updated the definitions which will require that agencies go back and review what they have done in the past and ensure they are keeping things current. Contingency of Operations and moving forward is always one of the last things agencies worry about on a day to day basis. When it comes to IT, it is not on Executives radar, they just do what they are told to do. His hope is that the updates will make it a little bit easier for agencies to look at what they have and understand that they need to be working in this direction and ask questions when needed.

Katrin Osterhaus asked if there is a deadline to respond to the feedback link?

Travis Rail asked that comments be submitted within the next **two weeks** however they are always open to receive feedback.

Tracy stated that due to the frequency of ITAB meetings, he would like for comments to be made soon so they can continue to work on this policy and not wait until the next meeting.

Policy Series 8000 Team: Data Administration/Governance Mark Abraham, OITS

Draft Policy: [8000](#), [8010](#), [8020](#)

Comments for this Policy can be submitted here: <https://bit.ly/36WjHIM>

49:41

The original ITEC Series 800 was approved in August of 1996 within the Kansas Information Resource Council which was a precursor to ITEC. It set aggressive deadlines for implementation, requiring agencies to establish a Data Administration policy and report on it within a year. It also required agencies to report annually on the status of their Data Administration program and the percent of data sets that were being managed under it. This policy was adopted in 1999, but no steps have been taken to support or implement it. The policy is very old and very outdated.

50:43

Some of their goals for the rewrite are to:

- Create a modern policy which adheres to best practices and provides clear guidance to agencies. As they have heard a lot of feedback from agencies that they did not have clear direction on what to do with data which created a lot of opportunity of confusion that could be resolved with some guidance.

- Align with KITO & KITA objectives.
- Incorporate modern Data Governance and Data Compliance policies for agencies to follow.
- Improve agency participation in data ownership and accountability
- Increase visibility to the data types and owners of that data to state leadership.
- Align policies to future Data Governance strategies.

This is a very complex topic to address as it stands. The new ITEC 8000 will cancel old policy and replace with a new series that aligns to the ITEC 4000 and 7000 series format of policies, enables KITO to assign a Chief Data Officer as the state's Data Governance champion instead of the CITA being responsible and provides a proactive basic Data Governance Compliance policy. They will model it after the ITEC 4000 series but will be changing the format similar to ITEC policy 7230. They are wanting to be to establish standards that represent best practices instead of definitive policies. In the world of data, it is hard to have black and white rules because there are multiple kinds of data, multiple agencies doing multiple things with the data and the sharing of data. They feel that the best service they can do at this point is to put out best practices in the form of standards and have folks follow.

Why Data Governance?

Agencies had a lot of questions about this topic. Who's accountable for their data? Do they have to classify their data? What legal instrument do they need to have in place for data? Are their processes that they should be following for data? And How can they be more organized and proactive when managing their data? There is a lot of potential upkick for the future with Data Governance and strategy with the data as well. A few things to point out is they were duplicating data where we don't need to be where we can become more efficient and maybe share data more readily. The top three common barriers are Organizational politics, Lack of resources and limited understanding of the value.

Why Data Compliance?

There are many questions and opportunities for guidance that our agencies have today about Data Privacy and Compliance. What kinds of sensitive data? What liability and exposure does the data represent? What risk for breaches? How do I safeguard my data? Do we follow applicable compliance regulations and laws with respect to the way it manages sensitive data?

This is all a big catch 22 because you have a lot of agencies that state they do not have the funding or staff to do this, but data privacy laws do not acknowledge ignorance as an excuse. The regulations and law states you much do it.

Risks: Crafting a revised new policy for data administration in the current situation risks:

- It becomes a mandate without buy-in, training and resources (technical / human).
- We will miss best practices and lessons learned (as well as unique needs / capabilities) from our own environment. Some agencies may have learned how to do something one way while another learns a different way. We want to leverage all the lessons learned and their synergies and bring them all together and truly hone our data management practices & data governance.
- One-size-fits-all represents a compromise and therefore may fall short for larger, more complex agencies. They did take into account that we have big agencies and small agencies and when things are applicable while still having some flexibility. Some agencies do not manage sensitive data so a lot of this would not apply to them.
- May require significant updates as we incorporate wider state participation and involvement.
- Data is a commodity, and the state will miss the opportunities for new efficiencies if it fails to embrace Data Governance. They actually saw that some states are creating new data governance initiatives by executive order. They learn how to make more out of their data as a commodity.

Proposed Next Steps:

- Complete the new policy and publish so those agencies that need guidance have immediate best practice direction while also aligning to the future. They still have some work to do as the drafts they have shared do not have the privacy and data retention areas sharply honed them yet. They will continue to work on them over the next few weeks to try and get them finished.
- Propose a statewide effort to create a Data Governance program and roadmap sponsored by INK, solicit feedback, and confirm sponsorship
- Solicit broader committee membership from Regents and from agencies with existing data administration programs
- Focus on a “seek first to understand” approach through outreach and surveys to generally assess the maturity of data administration across state agencies and collect best practices, identify champions
- Solicit a grant from the Information Network of Kansas to engage consulting services to help:
- Solicit and collect input from the technical and business community
- Integrate that into a roadmap and business case with recommendations on governance and funding using a phased implementation
- Incorporate feedback from the Data Governance Program/Framework as relevant into a future update of the policy.

Looking at the big picture of data governance there are several models out there. He provided one example on page 9 of his slide deck.

They are in phase zero of the Data Governance Roadmap. Mark will get the drafts to Sara Spinks so she can share with everyone. They encourage feedback for policy series 8000: <https://bit.ly/36WjHIM>

DeAngela thanked both teams for their work on these groups of policies. She encouraged everyone to give feedback by utilizing the comment links provided. It is frustrating when we take an action that impacts agencies that could have been avoided if we would have had the feedback to begin with.

DeAngela apologized for joining late as she was testifying before the subcommittees for her budgets. She reminded everyone that we are still in the throes of the pandemic and lately the cold weather emergency, so we need to think about the resources we have to support our staff. Virus testing is now more widely available across the state and vaccinations are ramping up across the state. She encourages agencies to keep the remote stance a bit longer or until there is a much more wider vaccinations across the state. She asks that we all be mindful of that. She anticipates that we will keep this stance until mid-summer. Even as we have more vaccinations we will keep up with the social distancing, masks, reduced large gatherings and remote work where we can.

Open Discussion:

Question: (Joe Mandala) Is there any action expected/needed of this group at this time in the way of advising ITEC on any of these policies? (particularly on Series 5000?) Or are all three still waiting for feedback directly to the teams before that happens?

Answer: The Action is the feedback. The feedback will be incorporated by those groups. These policies are still being worked so there is not an expectation that there will be a vote during the ITEC meeting in the next few weeks. Once the feedback is received and the groups have updated the policies they will bring to this group for final discussion before going to ITEC for a vote.

Question: (John Cahill) I have been getting a lot of questions from staff about the SoK Agencies stance beyond COVID of working remote as part of their daily job.

Answer: DeAngela has encouraged agencies to determine what makes sense for their agency for work product and production. She reminded us that the State of Kansas has had a remote work policy in place on the books for a number of years. Many agencies have had remote work policies that were adopted for their particular agency governing what remote work looks like and should include beyond COVID. We will not be sending out anything statewide but will encourage agency leadership to be thinking about the remote work policy and to do necessary analysis and determine what options are available based on the lessons learned within their agency. Long-term remote work is a two-fold conversation. It is both about the position and the functionality of that position but also about the individual. Because a position is a position that could do remote work doesn't mean it is a good fit for the individual. The state policy helps outline some of this as well as other resources that have been circulated. If she can help agencies in anyway please let her know.

DeAngela closed with an thank you for everyone that attended and encouraged everyone to conserve as much energy as they can.

Meeting Ended at 2:30pm

Note:

Sara has asked for everyone to review the ITAB [member web page](#) and provide updates to Sara.Spinks@ks.gov. Thank you.

ITAB Members: Bold names were present during the meeting.

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| Antonacci, Dave - KU Med | Howard, Laura – DCF/KDADS | Pittman, Jeff – KS Representative |
| Bachman, Dennis - KRGC | Johnson, Kelly KDOL CIO | Pratt, Gary KSU CIO |
| Branam, Mike - KPERS | Koehn, Jason – Human Services CIO | Rail, Travis – CITA |
| Burns-Wallace, DeAngela – EBIT CITO | Lane, Shawn – Dept of Ag CIO | Reinert, Todd – KCC |
| Comstock, Kevin - KSOS | Lewis, Earl - KWO | Sandberg, Andy – KDOR CIO |
| Crook, Christopher – KU COO | Mandala, Joe - KBI | Sass, Harold – KDOC CIO |
| Day, Tom – Leg Services | Marshall, David - KCJIS | Schmidt, Vicki – KID |
| Dickson, Jason – WLPT CIO | Maxon, Jeff - CISO | Standeford, Todd – BOHA |
| Dreier, Darren, Lottery | Mill, Stacy – OITS Deputy CITO | Stinson, Col Robert – KAG |
| Eamigh, Doug – KHP Interim CIO | Miller, David - WSU | Veatch, Matt - HS |
| Fadale, Anthony – ADA Coord | Jones, Nolan – Kansas.gov | Walsh, Mary - KU |
| Falldine, Cory - ESU | Neal, Jeff – KDOT CIO | White, Josh – DofA CIO |
| Friend, Duncan – INK | Nelson, Ken – KGS | White, Travis – ITSC |
| Funk, Steve, KBOR | Neria, Angela – PSU | Wiley, Lane – KDOE |
| Guerrero, Adrian - KBON | Norman, Lee - KDHE | Yancey, Glen – KDHE CIO |
| Haugh, Jim - Commerce | Oborny, Joe - KS | Unknown – SG Co IS |
| Hooper-Bears, Cindy – Treasurers Office | Osterhaus, Katrin – LPA | Unknown - FHSU |
| | | |

Other Attendees: Those joining by telephone were not identified.

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Abraham, Mark - OITS | Harmon, Ken (Guest) | Salomon, Glen (Guest) |
| Bartron, Shelly - DA | Hart, Rob (Guest) | Scott, Linda - KID |
| Burns, Hope - OITS | Hodges, Matt (Guest) | Spinks, Sara - OITS |
| Burton, Megan - KSHS | Karns, Larry G - KSBIP | Steed, Gary (Guest) |
| Cahill, John - KPERS | Mariani, Bobbi - KID | Unruh, Matt - KS Water Office |
| Calhoun, Vanessa (Guest) | Murray, Jan - KSSBEO | Wareham, Jake (Guest) |
| Crowl, John (Guest) | Moyer, John - OITS | Wehking, Michael - OITS |
| Denning, Allie - DA | Niehues, Julie - OITS | Whelan, Cheryl - OAH |
| Diel, Tracy - DAGC | Norris, Eric - KSLIB | Wilson, Angela - OITS |
| Gloeckner, Laura - KBOC | Robison, Cole - OITS | Wisner, Erik - KREC |
| Grau, Denise (Guest) | Roderick, Thomas (Guest) | Zuliani, Walt (Guest) |
| | | Brian (Guest) |

Future ITAB Meetings: Mark your calendars!

May 11, 2021

August 17, 2021

November 16, 2021

Future ITEC Meetings: Mark your calendars!

March 9, 2021

June 15, 2021

September 4, 2021

December 14, 2021