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**SUBJECT**

Proposed Ordinance 2016-0464 amends sections of the King County Code related to the Department of Information Technology (KCIT).

**SUMMARY**

Proposed Ordinance 2016-0464 amends sections of the King County Code related to information technology and recodifies them into a new chapter Title 2A. Many of the changes reflect the new organizational structure of King County’s Department of Information Technology (KCIT). In addition, there are minor changes proposed related to governance bodies for technology.

Executive and Council staff collaboratively developed a striking amendment to address drafting issues as well as to provide better clarity on the County’s project oversight process.

**BACKGROUND**

Council adopted Ordinance 17142 in July 2011, which consolidated the county’s information technology functions and responsibilities for information technology services in the executive branch into one department, the Department of Information technology (KCIT). Since then, the department has more clearly defined roles and responsibilities for each division. Proposed Ordinance 2016-0464 is intended to update the code to reflect these changes.

**ANALYSIS**

Proposed Ordinance 2016-0464 makes the following significant changes to King County Code 2.16.0755 related to KCIT:

Creates a new organizational structure for KCIT

Proposed Ordinance 2016-0464 amends K.C.C 2.16.0755 to create the Office of the Chief Information Officer, the Emergency Radio Systems division, and the Infrastructure and Operations division. The ordinance describes the functions of each of the divisions and deletes the existing organizational structure.

Proposed Ordinance 2016-0464 also changes the way in which the responsibilities of the Chief Information Officer are described. Currently, code includes a long list of the “duties of the chief information officer.” Proposed Ordinance 2016-0464 creates a new Office of the Chief Information Officer (lines 166-195) in code and lists many of the functions that had previously been listed as the duties of the chief information officer under Office of the Chief Information Officer. The description of the duties have been shortened and moved to a new section. There are several lines (line 172-181) that need further clarification in order to understand the intent. This clarification has been provided in the striking amendment.

Changes the reporting requirement for the Strategic Technology Plan

Proposed Ordinance 2016-0464 would change the reporting requirement for the Strategic Technology Plan from every three years to every four years (lines 260-265) to align with the biennial budget process.

Specifies a voting process at governance meetings

At the request of the County Clerk, the proposed ordinance specifies the voting process for meetings of the Technology Management Board (lines 362-398), the Business Management Council (lines 318-354), the Project Review Board (lines 406-428), and the Strategic Advisory Council (lines 282-311).

Specify voting members of the Strategic Advisory Council

Lines 283-293 specify that County Strategic Advisory Council (SAC) representatives are voting members and external SAC representatives are non-voting advisory members. The distinction is made in order to avoid a potential conflict of interest if any of the external members have technology contracts with the County.

The proposed ordinance also adds the Director of Elections as a member of the SAC (lines 289-90).

**Issues for Committee Consideration**

Project oversight process is not well defined

Since 2002, King County has used an oversight process for IT projects by which a project with a budget appropriation needs to seek approval from the Project Review Board (PRB) for a “funding release” prior to spending funds on a particular phase of the project. The funding release process is not specified in code and has evolved over the years. Currently, funding is generally released in three phases: (1) planning, (2) preliminary design, and (3) design and implementation. KCIT has two staff members who review the requests and provide recommendations to the PRB.

Under the current code, it is the CIO who approves most funding releases on behalf of the PRB and a formal meeting of the PRB does not occur. The CIO or a PRB member may request that PRB members review a funding release for any project and votes are recorded. Past records show the decision to release funds is based on a consensus of members.

The requirement that a project seek a funding release from the PRB is not in current code or in Proposed Ordinance 2016-0464. Additionally, the current code and the proposed ordinance do not specifically mention funding releases as part of the PRB function. Instead, this function is listed as part of the duties of the CIO in the current code and as part of the function of the Office of the CIO in PO 2016-0464. This lack of clarity around the role of the PRB has resulted in some confusion by stakeholders in understanding how the process works. Proposed Ordinance 2016-0464 does not clarify the responsibilities regarding funding releases.

Council staff worked collaboratively with Executive staff to address these concerns and provide more clarity on the project oversight process in the striking amendment discussed below.

**STRIKING AMENDMENT**

The attached striking amendment makes changes throughout the proposed ordinance. Most of the changes within the striking amendment are simply intended to improve the drafting of the proposed code change and do not change the underlying substance of proposed ordinance.

The most substantive changes in the amendment are those addressing the concerns discussed above related to the PRB.

**Lines 399-401** add a requirement that all information technology capital projects shall participate in the project oversight process. This is a new addition to the code, but reflects current practice.

**Lines 404-412** replace the general language of PRB responsibilities with a more detailed list of responsibilities. The list is reflective of the current responsibilities of PRB.

**Lines 169-172** clarifies that the PRB is advisory to the CIO in making decisions about funding releases, recommending budgetary changes, or suspensions or general shutdown of information technology projects. This is an important distinction to make because it is not clear in either the existing code or practice who is ultimately responsible for a funding release decision.

The following table summarizes the proposed amendment changes by line number.

**Striking Amendment Changes to PO 2016-0464**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Line numbers** | **Explanation** |
| 143-144  | Deletes redundant language. |
| 150-153  | This language on the role of CIO is moved from lines 69-74 to 150-153 to better match the organization of this section of code. |
| 156-157  | Clarifies the role of the Office of Chief Information Officer as providing support to the CIO. |
| 163-167  | Revises the description of the project oversight role in the office of the CIO. |
| 177  | Changes verb tense.  |
| 162-183 | Renumbers the list of items, changes the verb tense and clarifies the role of the Office of the CIO in recommending information technology policies and standards. Deletes the responsibility from the CIO duties of recommending technology equipment standards. This is assumed to be part of the duties of the infrastructure and operations division (lines 208-210). |
| 175-183 | Adds a business engagement and service delivery role to the office of the chief information officer. |
| 200-204  | Clarifies the description of the project management role in the enterprise business services division. |
| 251-252  | Better states the requirement for the strategic information technology plan to include a vision for coordination of technology management and investment.  |
| 250-260 | Renumbers the list of items. |
| 259 | Insert the word “objectives” to clarify the sentence. |
| 260-261 | Adds a requirement to include performance metrics in the strategic technology plan. |
| 373-375 | Clarifies that the technology management board reviews all information technology policies, standards and guidelines and that only information technology projects with business implications are passed to the Business Management Council for review. |
| 393-396  | Adds a requirement that all information technology capital projects shall participate in project oversight (see discussion above). |
| 397-406 | Replaces the general language of project review board responsibilities with a list of more detailed responsibilities. The list matches current practices. |
| 422-426 | Moves repealer to end of ordinance. |
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