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Some info about Washington

- 147 members
- About 600 permanent staff (more staff during regular sessions)
- 43 people in LSC handling infrastructure, communications, security, customer support, training, custom applications
  - Operating systems, servers, networks, email environment, voice mail, phones, web sites, security, identity management, PCs and tablets supported by 10 staff in Technical Support Group
  - Over 100 custom applications supported by 18 staff in the Applications Support Group
  - Front-line customer support, Help Desk, classroom training, documentation, deployment of PCs and tablets, floor support when they’re in session supported by 10 staff in Customer Support Group
IT Governance Structure

Systems Committee
One legislator from each caucus
“. . . oversee the direction of the information processing and communications systems of the legislature and to enforce the policies, procedures, and standards . . .”

Administrative Committee
Chief Clerk, Secretary of the Senate, their deputies, Code Reviser
“. . . manage the information processing and communications systems of the Legislature.”

Advisory Committee
Representative from each legislative workgroup/agency
“. . . makes recommendations pertinent to and monitors the Legislature’s information systems needs, plans, priorities, and performance.”
Types of Requests

- Windows Server 2008
- Committee Sign-In
- Mobile Access
- Office 365
- Bill Drafting Tools
- Security
- Tablets

- Next phases for continuing projects
- Changes to existing systems
- New infrastructure
- New applications
- Help executing a legislative mandate
- Life-cycle maintenance
Formal Process

- Take in requests and manage them on a SharePoint list for each year
  - Requests come over the phone, via email, from customer support staff, through channels
  - Infrastructure, life-cycle management, and “next phase” requests come from LSC
- LSC takes a crack at high-level estimates and priorities
  - S-XL in size, High-Medium-Low priorities
- Advisory, Admin, and Systems committees review LSC’s suggestions as we come out of regular session
- LSC adjusts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Cloud Computing</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Lifecycle Maintenance (change requests, OS’es, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Customer Impact</td>
<td>Law-Making</td>
<td>Committee &amp; Caucus / Web</td>
<td>Admin &amp; Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SharePoint Online Governance / Migration</td>
<td>LDR for codification and publishing</td>
<td>EBB / CMD extended to non-standing Committees</td>
<td>Core back-end Data Services and Data Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailbox Permissions</td>
<td>Workroom &amp; Rostrum Integration and Streamlining</td>
<td>WS 2008 (Committee and Web apps) Internal Applications</td>
<td>Technical Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange Archiving</td>
<td>Journal System Rewrite</td>
<td>CSI for the House (?)</td>
<td>Account Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Replacements &amp; Image / Mobile Workstation Deployment</td>
<td>LawMa Maintenance (architecture, WS OS, change requests)</td>
<td>Next thing for Bill Notes</td>
<td>Complete Exchange Archival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O365 Pilot / Implementation</td>
<td>LDP Rewrite (?)</td>
<td>FAR Changes</td>
<td>Core / Personnel Portal Application to Replace Existing Core Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Account Review Process Changes</td>
<td>Budget Bill Automation</td>
<td>Bill Reports Formatting Tools</td>
<td>O365 for Exchange / Pilot Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Filter Replacements</td>
<td>Rules Pull for Senate Admin and SDC rewrite</td>
<td>Committee &amp; Web Apps Changes (remote testimony, video testimony (?))</td>
<td>Data Center Relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lync / Unified Messaging</td>
<td>Reorganize Amendment and OOC Processing</td>
<td>Public Mobile Site integration with rest of Public Site</td>
<td>Authentication Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UELMA Research</td>
<td>Mobile / DMZ Architecture Initiatives</td>
<td>Network / NAC / EPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SharePoint Online</td>
<td>Security Documentation</td>
<td>Audio Server Upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Bill Comments Integration</td>
<td>Public Mobile Site integration with rest of Public Site</td>
<td>Routine Hardware / Software Upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LegSearch Update</td>
<td>Mobile / DMZ Architecture Initiatives</td>
<td>WiseTrack Consolidation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Event Notification</td>
<td>Technical Infrastructure</td>
<td>SQL Server 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SharePoint
- Windows Server 2012
- Office 365
- SQL Server 2012
Informal Process

- A request emerges after the project list has been approved
- Someone wants to use a currently non-supported tool
- Up to now the mandates for other legislative agencies have emerged outside the formal project selection process
- Technical staff in the workgroups leave and LSC inherits support

We have to think about:
The effect on scheduled projects
Possible strategic benefit in taking on the work now
Institutional perspective
Commercially-available options
What Works Well

- Building relationships between the legislative community and IT
- Representation from throughout the Legislature → cross-pollination
- All the workgroups and legislative agencies hear about each other’s projects
- Good discussion of projects, staff and budget available, legislative priorities, at least annually
- The best ideas for applications come from the legislative community
Challenges

- Level of detail that works for governing committees
- Describing the business need behind the request
- Tackling policy issues associated with IT
- Considering requests from an institutional point of view
- Level of engagement of the affected group
- It takes time to research options, costs, ramifications
- Not fun being the wet blanket