

HJR 2 ERM Work Group Findings and Recommendations¹ (Preliminary draft for 2/19/14)
(updated 2/7/14 with funding subgroup notes in RED)
(other new possibilities in green)

Finding #1: Any strategies for improving ERM need to be coordinated, effective, and implemented.

Recommendations:

- 1.1 Utilize a 3rd party consultant to assess enterprise ERM, analyze business needs, and develop strategic and tactical plans (yes, clearly a cost, but unclear on amount—grants could help fund this, but it could also be presented as a necessary state investment and use of GF)
- 1.2 Require joint approval of new IT systems (purchased or homegrown) by records authority and DOA (2-6-214, MCA) (perhaps some cost in research and meeting time, but minimal)
- 1.3 Create a statutory advisory council (cost depends on how structured—membership and frequency of meetings—see below for more info on advisory council funding/structure)

Finding #2: Records management needs to be a higher priority.

Recommendations:

- 2.1 Require records management training of all public employees (cost of development of training modules, could be online, development could be contracted out; after initial development, cost would be in updating and employee time spent)
- 2.2 Strengthen qualification req'ts of agency records custodians (2-6-213, MCA) (possible costs for agencies)
- 2.3 Create or empower position with compliance authority (we discussed compliance as requiring an audit component and possible “stick” consequence; audit will have costs)
- 2.4 Include RM components in IT strategic planning and budgeting (2-17-524, MCA, for IT strategic planning)
- 2.5 Make elected or appointed officials of each agency or local government subdivision responsible for RM (2-6-213, MCA; 2-6-40?, MCA)

Finding #3: Statutes for records management need to be clarified.

Recommendations:

See separate statutory options document and recommendations 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5 (cost dependent on specific statutory change)

Finding #4: Any ERM improvements need to be adequately funded with dedicated resources (capital/technology, human).

Recommendations:

- 4.1 Funding strategies TBD (funding subgroup working on this)

Finding #5: State and local governments need more guidance.

Recommendations:

- 5.1 Improve web-based resources and increase training opportunities (similar to 2.1—development and updating costs, then training itself)
- 5.2 Further adoption of rules, standards, guidelines (cost in time researching, drafting, adopting, disseminating)

Finding #6: Montana needs a way to permanently archive electronic records both at agencies and at MHS.

¹ Note that many of the recommendations address more than one finding.

Recommendations:

6.1 Create a digital archives at MHS or contract with a vendor (yes, clearly a cost—Jodie mentioned some modest grant support is possible, and cost-sharing with other states a possibility)

6.2 Ensure agency ERM systems have permanent archiving capability (yes, cost; need to research more)

Finding #7: Montana needs to ensure that records are managed to uphold the rights of Article II, Sections 8, 9, and 10 of the Montana Constitution.

Recommendations:

TBD (and some rec's throughout: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 5.1, 5.2)

Finding #8: Montana needs to utilize technology in fulfilling ERM with collaboration from both the IT and RM communities.

Recommendations:

TBD (and some rec's throughout: 1.1, 2.4, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2)

Other ideas from 2/5/14 subgroup meeting:

- We discussed how cost-benefit did not necessarily need to be hard-and-fast numbers (ie if you spend \$X you'll see \$Y return) but could include softer evidence such as: If government manages records better, less time spent on locating information, greater public access, reduced litigation liability, more collaboration, etc.
- Jodie mentioned NHPRC grants as possibility.
- Would adding a line-item for records management to agency budgets help provide funding and make RM more of a priority?
- Could the Montana Lottery be utilized as a funding source?
- The question was raised whether the work group is leaning towards recommending an enterprise system as part of its recs or towards directing each agency to work more independently. A follow-up point was that whether enterprise or agency-specific, tools need to be open-source.
- The high cost of purchasing ITSD services was discussed.
- Tricia talked about the volume of SABHRS records which spurred discussion of the possibility of SABHRS managing records electronically/going paperless as a pilot program.

How are advisory councils funded? What options exist for the formation of an advisory council focused on coordinating RM efforts?)

Often they are the responsibility of the department/entity to which they are attached. For example, CSPAC (The Certification Standards and Practices Advisory Council) has fees paid for by applicants for certification that help (completely?) fund CSPAC (20-4-109)

IT Board is paid for by DOA (IT board responsibilities could be expanded to include RM and SOS and MHS reps added???)

Electronic government advisory council (2-17-1105) is another possibility...

SOS, DOA, or MHS could create advisory council per 2-15-122