

**State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations
INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BOARD
Meeting Report
February 17, 2005**

Member	Affiliation	Attended	
		Yes	No
James Berard (Acting Chair)	DoIT-RI Department of Administration	X	
Stephen Alves	RI Senate		X
Alice Barrows	Library Board of Rhode Island		X
Ed Giroux	RI Department of Elementary and Secondary Education		X
Maggie Janik	Office of Higher Education	X	
Michael Hogan	RI House of Representatives—Policy Office	X	
Nicholas Leporacci	RI Department of Mental Health, Retardation and Hospitals	X	
Janet Levesque	RI League of Cities and Towns		X
Raymond McKay	City of Warwick		X
Dexter Merry	Public Telecommunications Authority		X
James R. Monti, Jr.	West Warwick School District		X
Thomas Mullaney	Budget Office-RI Department of Administration		X
Michael Shaughnessy	University of Rhode Island	X	
Phil Silva	For Department of Labor and Training	X	
A.T. Wall	RI Department of Corrections		X
James Willis	Secretary of State's Office		X
Don Wolfe	Member-at-Large		X
William Wray	Citizens Financial Group		X
Other Attendees	Affiliation		
Carol Ciotola	DoIT-RI Department of Administration		
Fernando Dias	TEK Systems		
Joan Gammon	RI.gov		
Connie McGreavy	RI Water Resources Board		
Karen Mellor	Library Programs-RI Department of Administration		
Beth Perry	Library Programs-RI Department of Administration		

Action Items—

- The draft January 20, 2005, Meeting Report, will be corrected to include the following under the “Motions Approved” item: Approved URI’s Online RAM Account Deposits via Credit Card application.
- A policy recommendation on portal links to nongovernmental sites will be presented to the Board at its meeting in March.

Chair’s Report—J. Berard announced that the Director of Administration asked him to Chair this Board until the CIO’s position is filled.

Approval of the January 20, 2005, Meeting Report—The January 20 Meeting Report was distributed for review. M. Shaughnessy noted that though the IRMB had approved URI’s Online RAM Account Deposits via Credit Card application at its January 20 meeting, it was not listed under the “Motions Approved” item. The draft report will be corrected to list it as such; but due to the lack of a quorum, the Chair deferred action to approve the meeting report to the next meeting.

Updates: IT Architecture Team/Web Data Sharing Committee—Since C. Cyr was unable to attend this meeting, the Chair deferred updates until the next meeting.

Portal Review Committee (PRC) Report—H. Boksenbaum reported that: (1) The Committee received a presentation on the portal's upgrade (V3), scheduled to go live in May. A presentation on this upgrade could be made to the Board prior to V3 going live. (2) A policy recommendation on portal links to nongovernmental sites will be presented to the IRMB at its next meeting, including a protocol to identify any links to nongovernmental sites. (3) A subcommittee will be formed to recommend a search engine that would ensure that users are able to find out what is contained within the portal. Recommendations resulting from the subcommittee's work will be presented to the Board for review. RI.gov was also asked to work towards developing a search engine based on an available open-source solution for the portal's upgrade. (4) A recommendation will be presented to the Board in April with respect to expanding the PRC. Noting that the State's contract with NEI expires in June 2006, there is a stipulation in the contract that requires the State to declare whether or not it intends to renew. He'd like to have the additional members appointed to the Committee in time to consider this matter. (5) The Scope Document for the Rhode Island Vehicle Inspection Portal was distributed and reviewed by J. Gammon. H. Boksenbaum, noted that formal approval was not necessary since no fee or revenue to the portal was involved. He asked, instead, that RI.gov be allowed to move forward with this application. The sense of the Board was to do so, and no objections were noted. (6) J. Gammon distributed and briefly reviewed the General Manager's Report.

Fiscal Fitness Program IT Activities—M. Treat deferred reporting on these activities to a later agenda item.

Communications Working Group (CWG) Report—H. Boksenbaum reported that: (1) A question as to whether or not this Working Group, which reports to the Disaster Preparedness Subcommittee, is subject to the Open Meeting Rules. If so, then meeting reports would need to be posted to the Secretary of State's Web Site within 35 days after meetings. (2) EDC reported on its Rhode Island Wireless Innovation Network (RI-WINs), a public-private partnership created to evaluate the opportunity for the creation of a statewide border-to-border broadband wireless network. Feedback is welcomed with respect to this study; anyone interested in being interviewed should contact him. (3) The FCC announced that it will be rebanding its 800 MHz frequencies. With respect to the radio frequencies being used for public safety and public communications in Rhode Island, a subcommittee will be created to develop a plan and to obtain additional representation on FCC's Regional Advisory Group. (4) Regarding the RITERN radios that run on DOT's system, he stated that fire personnel have consistently not responded. The CWG will present another public relations campaign to the Fire Chiefs' Association in this regard. (5) The Washington County Project is in its implementation stage. Additional money will be necessary to attach extra towers to the microwave network. Within the next month this project should be operational. Once completed, the command center will be housed at Police Headquarters in Scituate. In this effort, RITERN 800MHz radios will need to be reprogrammed. The Department of Health agreed to fund the reprogramming of RITERN radios for hospitals within reach of the Washington County Project while the statewide community system will need to be built incrementally. (6) With respect to the Ten-Year Communications Plan, it was discovered that bioterrorism money available to fund work on this plan was drastically reduced—to \$40,000. In place of the RFP process, which has been attempted on two occasions, the Committee plans to engage the consultant that had prepared the RFP to create a guide plan.

News and Announcements from the Board—(1) The Chair distributed a memo from Director Najarian regarding last month's meeting report for review and possible comment. M. Treat added that it was in response to the motion made by a member to send a letter to the Director stating the Board's dissatisfaction with her decision to fire T. Collins and to cite its dissatisfaction that the Board was not consulted in that decision.

- P. Silva disagreed with the reason for the motion, feeling that it was not the place of this Board to be involved with administrative decisions. Thus, he concurred with the Director's statements. He did not feel that the Board needed to rule on such a decision or even comment on it. H. Boksenbaum

disagreed. The Board, by mandate in the law, has an obligation to comment. M. Treat disagreed strongly with H. Boksenbaum. He felt that the law creating this Board is unconstitutional. With respect to the role and mission of the Board, he presented the following comments. First, he felt that the Portal Review Committee should be eliminated and that consideration of this action should be placed on the Board's agenda for discussion at its next meeting. The Committee in and of itself has no authority. Approving projects is a normal service process and an administrative function of IT. To the extent there are fees involved, those would need to be reviewed by the Board because of the consumer element involved; but there still would be no need for the Committee. Second, this Board needs to think about its mission and composition. In the past this Board has approved administrative items that in his opinion should not have been approved by a legislative body. It might make more sense to have the mission of this Board deal with inter-branch entities or municipalities. The Board also needs to look at its mission with respect to the separation of powers law. As part of that effort, this Board should make recommendations to modify existing legislation as to its composition. These issues need to be flushed out.

- P. Silva asked about the legal mandate of the Board regarding administrative powers. M. Treat replied that it must approve a strategic plan and create standards with respect to technology. It does not involve administrative overview of hiring or firing decisions. He felt, too, that decisions with respect to prioritizing projects and defining the state's architecture should not necessarily be on the agenda of this Board. Operational policies and procedures should be designated by the Office of the Chief Information Officer. This Board should not serve as a way to circumvent those agencies that do not wish to follow the project approval process set forth. If agencies have project concerns, they need to be presented to the Director and the Governor. It is his sense that the Board has not had a strong focus in terms of its mission. That mission needs to be identified in order to set the Board's agenda. It would behoove this Board to make recommendations to the Governor's Office in this regard.
- H. Boksenbaum separated the two issues being discussed. The first is that this Board needs to have a discussion about its mission. The second is to determine whether the legislation creating the Board is constitutional. He was unsure as to whether or not the second issue was an appropriate one for the Board. P. Silva argued that a discussion about the legislation is appropriate within the purview of the Board's comments on hiring and firing. H. Boksenbaum disagreed. Though the Board lacks the power to rule on these types of decisions, unless there is a gag rule imposed, he stated that it should be allowed to react to an issue if it feels the need to do so. M. Treat argued that members on an individual basis could react, but the Board should not comment in a public forum. He reiterated the Board's lack of focus on what it should achieve and what steps need to be taken to achieve identified goals. H. Boksenbaum, recognizing that he is not a Board member and speaking in the abstract, felt that in this culture and society, being denied the right to discuss certain matters is not how things are done in the United States.
- M. Hogan asked if M. Treat felt that the Board was formed illegally. M. Treat explained that with the separation of powers now in place, the legislation creating the Board is unconstitutional. Although not an attorney, he felt fairly confident that many things in the current legislation are beyond the purview of the mission of this Board.

The Chair tabled further discussion to the next meeting.

(2) C. McGreavy brought Bill S-0209, An Act Relating to State Affairs—The Electronic Government Services Act—to the attention of the Board. The bill was distributed for members' information and review. She noted that it refers to competition between public and private entities in terms of electronic commerce and that it had been referred to the Senate Financial, Technology and Regulatory Issues Committee. She offered to track this bill, and the Chair accepted her offer. H. Boksenbaum presented this bill's history, in that, this was the fourth year that it had been introduced; as yet, no action has been taken. He informed members that Peter Dennehy, Esq., within the Department of Administration is

responsible for distributing bills to various staff within Administration that he believes to be germane to them. H. Boksenbaum received this bill several weeks ago and has drafted a response.

Next Meeting—Thursday, March 17, 2005, at 3 p.m. in Conference Room “C” (2d floor), DOA.

Adjournment—The Chair adjourned this meeting at 3:45 p.m.