Review of Information and Communication Technology for the Parliament

Michael Roche

August 2012

CONTENTS

Terms of reference iii

INTRODUCTION
- Background 1
- Issues for consideration 2
- Approach 2
- Scope 2

CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS
- What ICT capability is provided? Under what authority? 4
- Who is responsible for delivering ICT capability? 4
- Corporate Systems 5
- Business Systems 6
- Infrastructure 6
- ICT resourcing – financial 6
- Staffing 7
- Governance arrangements 7
- Planning and user requirements 9
- Planning and implementing change 9

DO THE CURRENT ARRANGMENTS MEET THE REQUIREMENTS?
- Stakeholder interviews 11
- Business context 11
- The business drivers 11
- One stop shop 12
- Flexible access to ICT technology 12
- Security 13
- Office support 13
- Electorate offices 14
- Help desk 2020 15
- Ministerial wing 15
- Video conferencing 16
- Strategic vision for chamber and committee business systems 16
- Service levels 16
- ICT organisation 16
- Business continuity 17
- Overall conclusions 17

OTHER SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS 19

POSSIBLE FUTURE ARRANGMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
- Key issues 21
- Strategic planning and governance 21
- Consultative groups 22

An ICT Strategic Plan 23
A ‘one stop shop’ for office systems and networked devices 24
Departmental issues 24
Corporate Systems 26
Business systems development 27
Other networked devices 28
The ICT organisation 28
Security 28
Flexibility in the selection of electorate office IT 30
New technology 31

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS 32

ATTACHMENTS
A Service provision by department 34
B PCN users by location 36
C Expenditure by service type 37
D ICT Staffing 38
E Request approval process 39
F POITAG terms of reference 44
G POITAG proposed terms of reference 45
H Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board – proposed terms of reference 46
I ICT skill mix benchmarks 50
J Instrument of authorisation – Special Minister of State 51
K Stakeholder interview list 53

Terms of Reference

In November 2011, the Presiding Officers agreed to a review of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) for the Parliament.

The terms of reference for the review were:

The Review should examine the management and delivery of information and communication technology related services and equipment to the Parliament, each House, Committees of the Parliament, Members, Senators, their staff and the parliamentary departments including:

(a) The operating context
- *Where does the ICT structure interface with the stakeholders and their requirements?*
- *How is change conceived and implemented?*

(b) The current arrangements and resourcing
- *Who provides what?*
- *How much does it cost?*

(c) The services and equipment provided

(d) The organisational responsibilities
- *The governance and consultative arrangements*

(e) The objectives for ICT service delivery

(f) The challenges

(g) Security issues

(h) Future institutional arrangements

- *Other Australian and international models*
- *Options for a more efficient, cost effective service.*

The Review will consider ways in which the provision of ICT services to the Parliament can be enhanced and made more efficient. Although the Review will focus on the arrangements currently administered by the Parliamentary Departments it should include the equipment and services provided by the Department of Finance and Deregulation

INTRODUCTION

Background

In 2002, the Presiding Officers commissioned the then Parliamentary Services Commissioner, Andrew Podger, to review the administration of the Parliament. In his final report, *Review by the Parliamentary Services Commissioner of Aspects of the Administration of the Parliament* (the Podger Report), he commented that "*There would seem to be little benefit in fundamental changes to the arrangements for provision of ICT services"*.

This was against the background of five parliamentary departments and arrangements under which the Department of the Parliamentary Reporting Staff (DPRS) acted as a shared service provider.

However, the Report did note that "*some changes could be warranted".*

In particular, the Podger Report recommended that the Senior Management Coordination Group (SMCG) "*assume greater responsibility for coordinating strategic ICT issues, supported by DPRS in consultation with departmental ICT directors".* In the event, this recommendation was not adopted.

In June 2006 the Australian National Audit Office [1] considered that there "*there may be merit"* in the recommendation and again, in 2008, the Parliamentary Services Commissioner recommended the "*the terms of reference for SMCG be amended to include oversight of Strategic ICT for the whole of Parliament".* [2] These recommendations were not adopted at the time, but in February 2012, the heads of the parliamentary departments agreed to a revised terms of reference for the SMCG that included, inter alia, *"Provide Strategic Guidance on the information and communications technology (ICT) requirements of the Parliament, including the parliamentary departments."*

The Podger Report also noted that the parliamentary departments maintained, supported and operated their own corporate systems (finance, human resources and payroll, and registry). The report commented that transfer of these functions, and the associated transactional processing, into a shared service centre could provide the potential for more cost effective operations.

Finally, the Podger Report suggested that parliamentary departments seeking enhanced ICT technical skills could contract with DPRS for out-posted professional ICT staff.

Since the Podger Report, the need for an effective ICT environment for Parliament has become even more important. Sophisticated mobile personal computing devices are more widely available as is high speed broadband. Government and business are increasingly using ICT and the internet as a primary channel for the delivery of services and information,

---

[1] Australian National Audit Office, Implementation of the Parliamentary Resolutions Arising From the *Review of the Parliamentary Service Commissioner of Aspects of the Administration of the Parliament*, Audit Report No. 51 2005-06.

[2] Lynelle Briggs, Review of the Implementation of the Amalgamation of the Former Joint Departments", June 2008.

and are now moving further into the use of social networks. Both parliamentarians and an increasingly technically aware community expect to be able to use the capability of the new technologies to the full within Parliament and externally.

This position has been reinforced by the government's acceptance in 2010 of the Report of the Government 2.0 Task Force. A key point of that report was that *"Government 2.0 or the use of the new collaborative tools and approaches of Web 2.0 offers an unprecedented opportunity to achieve more open, accountable, responsive and efficient government*".

Issues for Consideration

The key issue to be considered by the review is how to plan for and manage the delivery of ICT services to the Parliament in a way that best meets the differing requirements and priorities of the key stakeholders both effectively and efficiently.

The technical issues, apart from those normally involved in the provision of services on this scale, including availability, responsiveness and reliability, involve the tension between the requirement for flexibility of access and use (a wide reaching network, the need for multi-mode mobile access, the pressure to adopt new technology and allow wide choices of technology and software for Members and Senators) and the obvious requirements to keep parliamentary and members' data secure and to protect the system from intrusion, all within an agreed budget.

Approach

The review was undertaken in three phases.

The first phase focused on examining and documenting the current operational arrangements, addressing paragraphs *a, b, c* and *d* of the Terms of Reference.

The second phase focussed on the business requirements, including service delivery standards, for the full range of users and addresses paragraphs *e* and *f* of the Terms of Reference. This phase also considered the effectiveness of the current arrangements. A range of stakeholders, particularly parliamentarians, was interviewed as part of this phase.

The third phase considered future operating models with particular reference to meeting the service delivery expectations of key stakeholders. It also included consideration of the security issues posed by the nature of the services to be provided. Other models for the provision of parliamentary ICT were also considered. This phase addressed paragraphs *g* and *h* of the Terms of Reference.

Scope

The scope of the review included the Parliamentary Computing Network (PCN) and the services delivered by that network, both in Parliament House and in parliamentarians' electorate offices.

It included web based services, mobile and other devices capable of connecting to the PCN such as tablets and smart phones.

It also included audio visual services to the extent that they are digitised and available over the PCN.

It did not include the dedicated Building Management System for Parliament House or the dedicated Parliament House Security System.

While legislation to establish the Department of the Parliamentary Budget Office has been passed and an inaugural head appointed, the Office was not fully operational at the time of this review. Consequently it was not possible to examine the new agency's ICT requirements in detail although the department head has made some 'in principle' decisions in relation to ICT and support services and these are reflected in this review.

CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS

What ICT capability is provided? Under what authority?

As noted in the Review of Parliamentary Entitlements[3], the existing arrangements for provision of services and facilities to Senators and Members are complex and governed by a "mix of legislation, regulations, determinations, procedural rules, executive decisions, accepted conventions and administrative practises". And, in the case of ICT, to that should be added "and delivered by multiple agencies".

Broadly speaking, the ICT facilities and services provided for Senators and Members can be broken down into:

- ICT equipment and software for use in their electorate offices.
  The Special Minister of State has delegated his powers to the Presiding Officers to approve electorate office ICT equipment and facilities under sub-item 7(1), Part 1, Schedule 1 to the *Parliamentary Entitlements ACT 1990*[4]. Funding for this purpose is currently provided through a drawing right for a capped annual amount.

- ICT equipment and software for use in their parliament house offices.
  The Presiding Officers approve the provision of ICT equipment and facilities in parliament house administratively. Funding is provided through annual appropriations to the chamber departments.

- Network services.
  Network services are approved administratively by the Department of Parliamentary Services (DPS) and funded through that department's annual appropriations.

- Mobile services.
  The Special Minister of State approves the provision of smart phones (currently Blackberries) under the *Parliamentary Entitlements ACT 1990.* The phones are provided, and the plans funded, by the Department of Finance and Deregulation. Support is provided by DPS with reimbursement from the Department of Finance and Deregulation.

Who is responsible for delivering ICT capability?

Following the transfer of responsibility for Electorate Office Information Technology (EOIT) from the Department of Finance and Deregulation to the Presiding Officers on 1 September 2011, responsibility for the delivery of parliamentary ICT infrastructure is currently as follows:

- The Department of the Senate and the Department of the House of Representatives provide desktop equipment (including office software) for parliamentarians and staff in their parliamentary suites, and for departmental staff;

[3] The 'Belcher Report' April 2010
[4] See Attachment J

- The Department of Parliamentary Services provides desktop services for parliamentarians and their staff in their electorate offices;

- The Department of Parliamentary Services provides the parliamentary computing network (PCN) within Parliament House and the wide area network linking the electoral offices. It is proposed that DPS will also provide a protected level network for the Parliamentary Budget Office. It also provides desktop services for its own staff. The department has primary responsibility for IT security and the standard operating environment for the network. It provides the 2020 Helpdesk;

- The Department of Finance and Deregulation provides the networked multi function printer/scanners in electorate offices, 'smart' phones for parliamentarians and a basic mobile phone for staffers; and

- Portfolio departments provide ICT support to their ministers and parliamentary secretaries.

In addition, parliamentarians and their staff often provide their own ICT equipment, principally iPhones and iPads, many of which interface to the PCN as 'unmanaged' devices.

Further detail of each department's responsibility for service provision is at Attachment A.

Corporate systems

While the current responsibilities for the provision of ICT infrastructure are well established, if somewhat fragmented and complex, responsibility for the provision of corporate and business systems software is dependent on decision making by the individual parliamentary departments and the availability of funding.

Corporate systems, financial management, human resources and payroll, and registry systems are provided as follows:

- The Department of Parliamentary Services provides its own financial and asset management services (SAP) and its own registry system (TRIM);

- The Department of the House of Representatives provides its own financial management system (Finance 1), and its own registry system (TRIM). It provides payroll services (Chris21) and the administration of various allowances for members. It provides human resource and payroll services (Chris21) for its own staff and for the Department of Parliamentary Services; and

- The Department of the Senate provides its own financial management services (Finance 1) and its own registry system (TRIM). It provides payroll services (Chris21) and the administration of various allowances for senators and human resource and payroll services for its own staff.

The Parliamentary Budget Office does not propose to operate its own corporate systems but to source these services from the other parliamentary departments on a shared service basis.

Business systems

Business application systems have been developed either by individual departments or sometimes as co-operative ventures between two or more departments. In many (most) cases external contractors have been used for system development. Where individual departments develop systems, DPS frequently provides project management resources to the project team.

Business systems are hosted on the PCN with infrastructure support provided by DPS. System administration is usually the responsibility of the end user department while applications support arrangements vary from in-house support to external contractors.

Infrastructure

The PCN is essentially a Microsoft Windows based network servicing some 4848 users[5] in Parliament House Canberra and, via a wide area network (WAN), in parliamentarians' electorate offices. A breakdown of PCN users is at Attachment B.

At the heart of the network is the Central Computer Centre located in Parliament House with some 266 physical file servers (331 virtual servers) and 800 terabytes of storage. A further 265 file servers are located in electorate offices across Australia. The network supports 4378 end user desktop and laptop computers. See Attachment B for a breakdown of the locations of terminal equipment.

The current WAN provides a 2 Mbps connection to each electorate office and a 100Mbps link to the PCN. DPS is currently out to tender for WAN solutions that will provide electorate office connections of at least 4Mbps.

ICT resourcing - financial

Identifying the cost of delivering ICT services and capability is not straightforward. As ICT penetrates more deeply into the operations of an organisation, separating ICT expenditure from normal business operational expenditure becomes more difficult. Capital expenditure can vary quite significantly from year to year as major projects are initiated, developed and then implemented. Replacement of ICT infrastructure can be driven as much by the available budget as by technical need.

Notwithstanding those difficulties, the annual benchmarking data provided by the parliamentary departments to the Australian Government Information Management Office

[5] End June 2012

(AGIMO) provides a useful basis for consideration. Note that the newly established Parliamentary Budget Office has not provided data for the benchmarking exercise.

ICT expenditure reported to AGIMO by the three departments during 2010-11 was as follows (a more detailed breakdown of expenditure is at Attachment C):

ICT Expenditure $ (2010-11)	Department of the Senate	Department of the House of Representatives	Department of Parliamentary Services[6]
Operating Expenditure	987,500	836,814	9,126,334
Capital Expenditure	296,000	841,042	5,995,327
Depreciation	452,000	798,078	8,795,182
Totals	**1,735,500**	**2,475,934**	**23,916,843**

Staffing

Similar difficulties are involved in establishing the numbers of staff involved in delivering ICT capability within the three departments. Again, the staffing information provided to AGIMO for the annual cross agency ICT benchmark exercise is a useful staring point (further detail on staffing numbers is at Attachment D).

ICT Staffing FTE (2010-11)	Department of the Senate	Department of the House of Representatives	Department of Parliamentary Services
Staffing	6.00	5.50	83.60
Contractors	1.00	0.30	22.00
Totals	7.00	5.80	105.60

Governance arrangements

The current governance arrangements covering the delivery of ICT to the Parliament are fragmented and do not cover all aspects of the ICT service delivery life cycle. Notwithstanding the fact that there is a single overarching objective for parliamentary ICT—that is to support the work of the Parliament and its members—there is no one governance body charged with the planning for and co-ordination of ICT across the parliamentary departments.

There is no parliament-wide IT strategic plan nor is there any formal mechanism for agreeing, prioritising, resourcing and oversighting such a plan[7]. There is no formal mechanism to ensure that critical and/or strategic ICT decisions are dealt with at the appropriate level. And there is no formal process to ensure that decisions by one parliamentary department do not impact the other departments adversely.

[6] The expenditure by the Department of Parliamentary Services has been adjusted to include funds totalling $14m to be transferred from the Department of Finance and Deregulation following the transfer of responsibility for Electorate Office IT on 1 September 2011.
[7] Noting that since February 2012 the SMCG has had the responsibility for providing “strategic guidance” on parliamentary ICT requirements.

There is no Chief Information Officer to provide leadership on ICT issues across Parliament.

The Presiding Officer's Information Technology Advisory Group (POITAG) has the role "*to assist the Presiding Officers in ensuring that the Parliament has international standard information and communications technology (ICT) facilities to allow the Parliament to meet its objectives, including greater public electronic access to information from and about the Parliament*." The terms of reference for POITAG are at Attachment F.

However, in the absence of a parliament-wide ICT strategic plan and without specific advice on strategic issues, POITAG is limited in its ability to advise the Presiding Officers on strategic ICT issues.

DPS has in place a set of procedures by which it prioritises and selects projects for delivery, including ICT projects. The Request Approval Process (see Attachment E) does involve the chamber departments as well as DPS in the Project Assessment Committee, but the process only covers DPS funded projects. More importantly, it is project driven and, as a result, in the absence of a parliament-wide strategic ICT plan, it is not possible to be certain that projects are aligned with the strategic objectives of the Parliament or that priorities are appropriate.

The chamber departments fund significantly fewer ICT projects on their own behalf and utilise their normal executive management processes to approve these projects. Joint projects, such as the Table Office Production System (TOPS) are agreed and co-ordinated on a case by case basis.

While recognising the constitutional and institutional independence of the houses, the common high level ICT objective of support for Parliament and parliamentarians, the integrated nature of the Parliamentary Computing Network and the commonality of many of the business requirements and services across the Parliament all point to the need for better practice ICT governance arrangements if the best use is to be made of limited ICT resources.

The need for strategic parliament-wide ICT governance was recognised in the Podger Report[8] in 2002, and again in the ANAO Report on the implementation of the Parliamentary Resolutions arising from that report in 2006[9] and finally in the Briggs Report[10] in 2008. All three reports recommended that the Senior Management Co-ordination Group (SMCG) assume greater responsibility for strategic ICT issues. Notwithstanding the inclusion of provision of strategic guidance on parliamentary ICT requirements in SMCG's terms of reference in February 2012, ten years on from the original recommendation, the need for parliament-wide ICT governance has increased to the point where a dedicated ICT governance body is justified.

[8] Review by the Parliamentary Services Commissioner of Aspects of the Administration of the Parliament – Final Report.
[9] ANAO Audit Report No.51 2005-06.
[10] Lynelle Briggs, Review of the Implementation of the Amalgamation of the Former Joint Departments", June 2008.

Planning and user requirements

Stakeholder requirements do not appear to drive the project approval process in any systematic way. There does not appear to be a proactive process of considering emerging technology and its likely impact on the Parliament, nor of conducting a regular structured dialogue with parliamentarians and their staff to identify emerging user requirements and any shortfalls in the current offering.

That said, much good work has been done with specific initiatives and in specific areas to develop systems supporting the work of the chambers and committees. What is missing is a systematic approach to identifying and prioritising stakeholder requirements across the board, an architecture to optimise the investment in user capability, a mechanism to ensure that identified stakeholder requirements are not lost sight of and a way of communicating agreed priorities to the stakeholder community.

While many of the larger projects are delivered as a turn-key package including the provision of support, it is not clear that there has been or is a formal process requiring consideration of whole of life costs and support responsibilities for all new initiatives across all parliamentary departments

A more significant issue in responding to stakeholder requirements is that the chamber departments have a close working relationship with the end users of most services, but DPS as a major deliverer of services is one stage removed from the stakeholder.

Possibly as a result of this divide, both external benchmarking and internal skills gap analyses in DPS have identified a significant shortfall in higher level business systems analysis and design capability. There is a clear need for this capability in terms of developing a strategic plan for business systems that meets the needs of the key stakeholders and that will help drive the technology planning process. A high level approach to business systems design will also help drive a business systems architecture that provides for interoperability between applications, maximises the investment in individual systems and assists in future proofing ICT applications investments.

Planning and implementing change

DPS is in the process of updating its IT Change Management Process to standardise the procedures for managing change and to ensure that proposed changes are "*consistently and comprehensively assessed, authorised, prioritised, planned, tested and documented*"[11]. The new processes are essentially a work in progress and are achieving some improvements in compliance and commensurate reductions in risk.

In the longer term, the processes would be improved by a somewhat longer release cycle than weekly and by the more formal involvement of other stakeholders, including the chamber departments.

An issue that arose frequently in the stakeholder discussions was a lack of notice of changes to the PCN or the standard operating environment. Again, the introduction of changed and

[11] *IT Change Management Process* March 2012, version 0.4

new capability would be enhanced by longer planning time frames and more advanced notice for users of the PCN. The fact that the issue arose so frequently supports the initiative to update the change management processes.

As previously noted, the processes of planning and implementing change are constrained in the absence of a parliament-wide ICT strategic plan.

DO THE CURRENT ARRANGMENTS MEET THE REQUIREMENTS?

Stakeholder interviews

In the course of this review, discussions were conducted with a wide range of stakeholders. These included 24 parliamentarians from both houses of parliament, 21 staff from parliamentarians' offices (including staff in 5 electorate offices), 45 officials from the parliamentary departments and 15 officials from external departments. A list of stakeholders consulted is at Attachment K.

From these interviews, a number of consistent themes emerged.

Business context

A number of stakeholders characterised the nature of the parliamentarian's job as akin to that of an independent operator of a small business, albeit with a short learning curve for new entrants.

There was strong agreement that the nature of the job had changed and that parliamentarians now operated in a much more mobile fashion with less focus on the traditional office.

All stakeholders commented on the growth of digital communications with most reporting that in excess of 80 per cent of all communications were now being received by email or other electronic means. At the same time the volume of communications to individual parliamentarians was growing, particularly during organised campaigns when thousands of emails could be received in a day.

A number of parliamentarians commented that their constituents were now used to conducting much of their business and social interaction electronically and, as a consequence, expected to be able to interact with their parliamentarians in much the same way. Many noted that this expectation was driving a significant increase in the use of social media to communicate with constituents both individually and in groups.

The business drivers

Although not formally documented, there was a level of agreement from stakeholders that the main drivers for ICT provision in the Parliament are:

(a) the specific business requirements of the two chambers to enable Parliament to function effectively;
(b) the requirements of the parliamentary committees;
(c) facilities and support to enable individual parliamentarians to carry out their duties; and
(d) corporate and administrative support required by parliamentarians and by the three parliamentary departments.

These drivers in turn translate into a set of service delivery requirements or objectives. These could be expressed as providing ICT services that meet client needs:

(a) reliably and securely;
(b) in a timely fashion;
(c) in parliament house, in electorate offices and 'on the road';
(d) with simple and prompt support and assistance;
(e) efficiently and cost effectively; and
(f) using up to date technology.

The need for reliability of key systems and functionality was emphasised. Email and access to the PCN were consistently identified as critical requirements, while printing and broadcasting were both seen as time critical during sitting periods.

There was a commonly identified requirement for a seamless environment encompassing both parliament house and the electorate office at a minimum, but ideally incorporating mobile computing as well.

One stop shop

There was strong support from parliamentarians for a 'one stop shop' for the provision and support of ICT capability. In that context, the transfer of the responsibility for Electorate Office IT from the Department of Finance and Deregulation to the Presiding Officers (for decision) and DPS (for delivery) was seen by all as a positive step.

Flexible access to ICT technology

There was strong agreement that the provision of ICT should be flexible as possible and be capable of being tailored to the requirements of individual members and offices. At the same time it was acknowledged that there would still be some demand for a standard office solution, and that any flexibility would necessarily be in the context of a budgetary limit.

Some parliamentarians argued for complete flexibility of choice within a budgetary limit.

There was considerable frustration expressed by parliamentarians, including members of POITAG, at delays in adopting new technology and the inflexibility of the rules covering the provision of much of their ICT capability. The iPad was the focus of much of the comment with many parliamentarians buying their own. There was a commonly held view that the delays in introducing technology such as the iPad were more related to budgetary and entitlement issues rather than security or technical issues.

Stakeholders were generally positive about the response by DPS in providing PCN connectivity for iPads via IronMountain and/or Citrix.

The Blackberries provided to parliamentarians also drew considerable comment. A substantial number of parliamentarians favoured the iPhone over the Blackberry. But there was also criticism from those who favoured the Blackberry that the functionality of the devices had been unduly restricted and that, for example, it was not possible to install additional applications, even those originating from Research in Motion (makers of the

Blackberry). Other criticisms of the Blackberries included high failure rates and complex repair and return procedures.

Those stakeholders who favoured the iPhone were critical of the length of time that it was taking to clear the phone from a security point of view and to offer it as an option. There was criticism about lack of access to iTunes for additional applications for iPhones.

While the PCN connectivity issues with the iPad have now been resolved, the increasing use of the device by senators and members is now placing pressure on linkages with systems such as COMDOCS that were not designed with the iPad in mind. If the full potential of the iPad is to be realised, then further investment will be required to simplify the linkage with chamber and committee systems.

Security

Network security issues were high on the list of concerns of many of the parliamentarian stakeholders interviewed. Many expressed the view that the levels of security were set too high and may be counter-productive. Issues raised included the complex pass code for Blackberries with a relatively short time out, complex pass codes for iPhones and iPads and multi-level security for laptops.

It was acknowledged that there had been some movement towards simplifying the pass code and lengthening the time out for Blackberries, but it was considered that it had taken too long to respond to the requirements of users in this regard.

Some of the parliamentarians interviewed expressed the view that they were ready to accept additional risk in terms of data security as a trade-off for increased usability with simpler security procedures. A smaller number accepted the need for the existing security procedures, not only on data confidentiality grounds, but, more importantly, in terms of protecting the network itself from attack.

It was clear from the stakeholder discussions that there needed to be better communication with stakeholders on security issues including further explanation of the range of risks, and continuing consideration of the ease of use/security tradeoffs as new technology was introduced and new threats emerged.

Office support

Microsoft Office is available to senators and members both in their electorate offices and in parliament house. Training in the Office suite is available for parliamentarians and staff although there is some question about the take up rates and it is not clear whether the training is tailored to the particular need of parliamentarians.

While stakeholders were generally satisfied with the software provided, a number of common issues arose relating specifically to the nature of the parliamentarians' work.

The three most common issues mentioned were the need to deal with very high volumes of email, the need for effective contact management and management of electronic

documents, all in the context of the need for multiple staffers to access email, diaries and contacts.

A number of stakeholders commented that, with the high proportion of communications received electronically, an effective electronic document management system (EDMS) would enable them to move to a paperless office.

Electorate Offices

Senators and Members and their staff were generally positive about the ICT capability provided in electorate offices. As noted above, the transfer of responsibility for electorate office information technology from the Department of Finance and De-regulation to the Department of Parliamentary Services was seen as a positive step consistent with a 'one stop shop' approach.

Again, there were a number of common themes to emerge in relation to electorate office IT. These included the Microsoft Office issues mentioned above, the speed of the WAN connection, the capacity of the shared drive, the need for a seamless desktop between parliament house and the electorate office (including access to the Adobe InDesign desktop publishing package provided in the electorate offices but not in parliament house), the need for wireless connectivity in the electorate office, mobile phones and support issues.

Virtually every interviewee mentioned the speed of the electorate office connection as an issue. In some offices it was claimed that the speed of the link was little better than dial-up. There was strong support for the provision of capacity consistent with that commonly available in the area in which the electorate office is located.

Most stakeholders noted that the shared disk available in electorate offices was significantly smaller than that available in parliament house and that management of the limited space was becoming an issue. However, some stakeholders also noted that the issue was likely to continue even with a significant enhancement of the shared disk. In particular, video and pictures were consuming significant storage as were scanned documents using the PDF format. Stakeholders commented that that without a management strategy for this type of storage, any benefit from increased storage would be short lived.

There was strong support for a seamless desktop between the electorate office and parliament house. The focus was on being able to access electorate office data and systems seamlessly from parliament house, without significant delay. A number of stakeholders noted that access to Adobe InDesign was not available in parliament house.

A number of stakeholders identified the need for wireless connectivity in the electorate offices to provide flexibility particularly for laptop users.

A common theme both in parliament house and electorate offices was the provision of mobile phones.

In addition to the issues mentioned above in relation to choice of phone (Blackberry or iPhone) maintenance issues, limitations on the use of apps, network coverage (many users

commented on coverage issues under the current contract) and the restriction of the second mobile phone provided to a basic phone only, were all raised.

Finally, while electorate office staff were positive about the support received from the 2020 help desk, a number of instances of unacceptable outages were noted. In some cases these were related to repeated attempts to repair the same equipment and in others, difficult faults involving multiple suppliers.

Help Desk—2020

Notwithstanding some commonly raised issues, stakeholders were generally positive about the support provided by the 2020 help desk with most recognising the challenging nature of the task and acknowledging improvements that had been made in the service. There was an understanding of the value of a single point of contact for technical support, even if there was occasional frustration that an issue had to be referred on.

Parliamentarians were generally satisfied with the service. Some officials and staff suggested a priority number for parliamentarians, but this was not supported by the majority of Senators and Members. The most common issues raised by Senators and Members were call-backs (often not convenient), hours of operation (Blackberry and remote access problems on weekends) and support for remote access.

As noted above, electorate office staff were generally positive about the support provided by 2020.

Other issues raised included the need for 2020 to communicate with users when addressing widespread problems, to track and monitor all problems to resolution and to analyse and escalate significant or long running problems.

Some parliamentarians noted delays in accessing logons for new staff and for installing non-standard software packages.

Ministerial wing

As noted above, departments are responsible for providing ICT facilities for their Ministers in parliament house. Normally, a single PCN connection is provided in Ministers parliament house offices. Wireless connectivity is available generally in parliament house but not in the ministerial wing.

There was support from ministers to extend the parliament house wireless network to the ministerial wing to enable ministers to use the PCN mobile capability. It was noted that as increasing access was available to parliamentary documents over the PCN such an extension would be necessary to provide mobile access for ministers.

While ministers generally may be satisfied with the arrangements under which their departments provide their ICT capability, such arrangements may be less satisfactory where a minister's responsibilities cut across portfolios. It was suggested that some ministers would prefer that their main office connections be to the PCN and that a single terminal be provided

for connection to departmental systems. If this was possible, some financial adjustment would be necessary to cover the additional cost of PCN tend user equipment.

Video conferencing

A number of senators and members identified a need for video conferencing facilities, including Skype, particularly for committee work.

Senators and Members were generally aware of the Telepresence facility in the broadcasting studio in parliament house, but not all committee members were aware that videoconferencing, including the use of Skype, is available, with advance notice, in the parliament house committee rooms. A DPS information circular outlining the facilities was issued on 24 May 2012 and it is understood that DPS has drawn the availability of the facilities to the attention of committee chairs. There might be value in drawing this information to the attention of committee chairs and secretaries again.

Strategic vision for chamber and committee business systems

Although the issue did not arise frequently, a number of respondents identified the need for a strategic vision for chamber and committee business systems to reflect new ways of working and new technology. In particular, the use of tablet devices and Wi-Fi to enable distribution of parliamentary papers more quickly and to reduce dependence on manual distribution systems for hard copy was mentioned.

Some stakeholders were concerned that, in the absence of a strategic plan and agreed strategic priorities, pressure for new technology for individual parliamentarians could displace capacity and funding that should be deployed on new chamber and committee capabilities.

Service levels

A common theme in discussions with chamber department officials was the lack of service level agreements (SLAs) covering the provision of services by DPS.

While there were some service level targets in place in DPS, these did not cover the range of services provided and were not linked to budget allocations.

Similarly, it did not appear that the chamber departments had a comprehensive set of service levels for the applications and services that they provided.

ICT organisation

Stakeholders, both within DPS and externally, found the existing DPS ICT organisational arrangements somewhat confusing. Unusually for an organisation of its size, there was no Chief Information Officer (CIO). ICT staff were located in the Infrastructure Services Branch along with building maintenance and other functions, in the Projects Branch along with building project management staff and in the Information Access Branch in the Parliamentary Library.

In the absence of a CIO, not only is there no obvious focal point for ICT related issues, but the ability to flexibly deploy ICT staff according to need is significantly constrained.

As noted above, this is reflected in both internal and external skill mix benchmarking.

As shown in Attachment I, when compared to similar sized agencies, DPS has a 'shortfall' of some 20 staff in business process analysis, design, development and programming. At the same time there is a 'surplus' of staff in systems administration and project management.

It is acknowledged that this comparison may be somewhat skewed by the fact that the parliamentary departments have, as a matter of policy, outsourced systems development and purchase turn-key solutions wherever possible. But against that, such an approach is not uncommon amongst other medium size agencies. Moreover, it was clear from stakeholder discussions that stakeholders put considerable value on system developers' knowledge of the parliamentary environment.

Business continuity

One issue to emerge during the review was the lack of backup for the servers in the central computer room in parliament house. Data backups are stored offsite, but virtually all of the PCN servers are located in a single computer centre with no offsite back-up.

It is understood that budgetary considerations precluded the establishment of a second site in parliament house or offsite.

Overall conclusions

Notwithstanding the issues identified above, it is important to recognise that the PCN provides an effective ICT capability to nearly 5,000 users in parliament house and in electorate offices across Australia.

The operation of the network is underpinned by a well-developed standard operating environment (currently being updated to Windows 7), by an effective help desk with Australia wide coverage and by up to date security processes.

The network supports a wide range of corporate, business and web-based systems.

As key stakeholders, senators and members had a consistent view of the importance of reliable and responsive ICT systems for the Parliament and of the overall objectives for parliamentary ICT.

While some stakeholders had different priorities, there was clear agreement on the need for greater flexibility in the provision of ICT to senators and members and for earlier access to new technology.

There was a clear preference for the provision of ICT capability to parliamentarians via a one stop shop and an understanding of the need for a parliament-wide strategic approach to ICT planning.

One clear conclusion was that better ICT governance arrangements, including all the parliamentary departments, together with the appointment of a Chief Information Officer and some restructuring of existing ICT resources, would significantly enhance the potential for ICT to make a more effective contribution to the operations of Parliament and the work of individual parliamentarians.

With effective overarching ICT governance, and the focus that a CIO would bring, many of the issues identified during this review could be prioritised and resolved.

OTHER SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS

It appears that service delivery models in other parliaments tend to fall into the following groups:

a) Single network with a single service delivery organisation (UK Parliament);
b) Separate network and systems for each house (US model);
c) Separate networks for the Parliament (including parliamentarians) and for parliamentary services (NZ model), and
d) Single network with some common service provision but with parliamentary and committee systems provided by the chamber departments (Australia and Canada).

The US model with separate networks for each house does not appear to offer any particular advantage in the Australian context.

Apart from the higher cost of running separate independent networks, with duplication of technical support in each chamber department, common applications (for example Hansard, library, web-site) would have to be provided through a third network or arbitrarily allocated to a chamber. A similar approach for administrative functions was considered, and rejected, in the lead up to the restructuring of the parliamentary departments in 2002.

The New Zealand model with two networks in a unicameral parliament would probably translate into a three network model in a bicameral parliament with the attendant cost issues mentioned above. Although it should be noted that, for security reasons, some parliaments are considering logical or physical separation of the network catering for individual parliamentarians from the network providing corporate and chamber systems.

The UK model with a single ICT service provider (Parliamentary ICT – PICT) would appear to be the most appropriate alternative to the existing Australian arrangements. However, some stakeholders drew attention to issues with the Parliamentary Information Systems Office (PISO) which was established in 1988 and incorporated into the Department of the Parliamentary Reporting Staff in 1990

PICT was established in 2006 as a joint department of the House of Commons and the House of Lords.

The benefits of establishing a separate ICT organisation (or department) for the Australian Parliament are not at all clear, especially as a ready ‘home’ for such an organisation already exists in the Department of Parliamentary Services.

However, in establishing PICT, the UK Parliament paid considerable attention the governance arrangements, and elements of these may well be applicable to the Australian Parliament.

These arrangements include the PICT Advisory Board (PICTAB) which includes the director of PICT and members of the individual house management boards. Its role is to provide

advice and guidance on house priorities to PICT which in turn leads into consideration of investment decisions.

PICT is, by and large, managed by its executive, but where member services are concerned PICT takes papers to the relevant select committees.

ICT strategy is proposed by PICT, approved by PICTAB and then agreed by both house management boards. It is then ratified by the relevant House Committees.

Service delivery models in other jurisdictions also vary in terms of the delivery of ICT to members of parliament.

Both Canadian and New Zealand parliamentarians chose their own ICT equipment and software within a budget cap. The UK currently provides equipment much along the lines of the Australian approach but is working towards a similar approach to Canada and New Zealand, with parliamentarians able to purchase their own equipment and software within a budget cap.

In all three countries, the allocations are set by the presiding officers.

Support would appear to be the major issue when parliamentarians are able to choose their own systems and equipment.

It is understood that the Canadian approach has led to concerns about service reliability. New Zealand encourages its parliamentarians to acquire equipment for their electoral offices from a menu of supported equipment; other equipment is supported on a best efforts basis. Similarly, if the UK moves to a flexible approach within a budget cap, support will also be on a best efforts basis

POSSIBLE FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS

Key issues

In considering the need for any change to the existing arrangements for the provision of ICT in the Australian Parliament, the key issues to emerge during this review were:

a) the lack of a parliament-wide strategic plan for ICT, together with the lack of a comprehensive ICT governance model to oversight the development of such a plan;
b) associated with the lack of a strategic plan, the lack of a strategic vision covering the development of business systems for the chambers, committees and individual parliamentarians;
c) the need for a 'one stop shop' to provide parliamentarians ICT requirements;
d) an overly regimented approach to the provision of ICT capability which limits the ability of parliamentarians to tailor their office systems to meet their individual requirements;
e) delays in accessing new technology;
f) security requirements for mobile computing; and
g) ICT staffing and management issues, including the lack of a CIO.

Strategic planning and governance

The need for a parliament-wide ICT strategic plan has been identified in previous reviews and by stakeholders in this review.

A parliament-wide ICT strategic plan is needed to ensure that stakeholder priorities are reflected in the investment decisions on technology and business systems. It is needed to ensure that the introduction of new technology is coordinated with other ICT developments and user requirements. It is also needed to ensure that the ICT plans of the four parliamentary departments are co-ordinated with broader government wide plans for interconnectivity and security.

Such a plan would assist in providing the presiding officers with the confidence that the requirements for better practice ICT delivery had been taken into account, including issues such as security and business continuity planning, as well as user business requirements.

Similarly, the need for a parliament-wide ICT governance body to co-ordinate the delivery of ICT across the three parliamentary departments has been identified by previous reviews and by stakeholders in this review.

Such a body is needed primarily to oversight the development of the parliament-wide strategic ICT plan. It is needed to assess priorities and make recommendations for ICT investment decisions that take account of both user and technical requirements across the parliament.

Previous reviews have suggested that the Senior Management Coordination Group (SMCG) would be an appropriate body to undertake this role, and SMCG's terms of reference were

updated in February 2012 to include the provision of "*strategic guidance"* on the ICT requirements of the Parliament.

However, without being critical of SMCG, the complexity of the ICT environment (including external threats) and the pervasiveness of ICT have increased significantly since the first of these reviews. At the same time, and partly in reflection of these changes, the standards for better practice ICT governance have increased.

Moreover, while taken as a whole the parliamentary ICT function is at the lower end of the so-called large agencies benchmarked by AGIMO, it does involve some unique challenges including a very high profile stakeholder group, multiple work sites across Australia and some difficult security issues.

All this argues for a separate Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board (the Advisory Board) with senior level participation to oversight the development and implementation of a parliament - wide ICT strategic plan.

A suggested terms of reference for the Advisory Board is at Attachment H.

Membership would include a very senior representative (department head or deputy level) from each of the four parliamentary departments. Increasingly, ICT and other high level governance bodies in portfolio departments include an independent member. It is suggested that the Advisory Board include an independent member with senior level experience in ICT and, preferably, in government.

Recommendation 1

That a Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board be established with membership and terms of reference as set out in Attachment H.

Consultative Groups

In parallel with the establishment of the Advisory Board, consideration should be given to the role and functions of POITAG. As noted above, in the absence of a parliament-wide ICT strategic plan, POITAG is constrained in its ability to its ability to advise the Presiding Officers on strategic ICT issues. It is also constrained by its existing terms of reference that imply but do not specify a strategic role. In the absence of a specific role in strategic planning, POITAG tends to focus more on operational issues—a consequence that is not making the best use of a key group of high level stakeholders.

A better solution would be to redefine the role of POITAG to focus solely on strategic issues across the technology and business requirements, supported by advice from the CIO and the Advisory Board. A suggested terms of reference is at Attachment G. Consideration could also be given to incorporating 'strategic' in the name of the group to emphasise its new role.

The current operational focus of POITAG could be devolved to a user group or groups, including officials from the parliamentary departments and staff from parliamentarians' offices and electorate offices. Such a group or groups could provide stakeholder input on

current operational issues and also act as a forum to discuss technical and change management issues. Membership at the SES 1/director/senior advisor level would be appropriate for such a group.

Recommendation 2

That POITAG be reconstituted with the new terms of reference set out in Attachment G to reflect its role as a strategic advisory group.

Recommendation 3

That the Department of Parliamentary Services establish a broader based user group or groups, with representatives from the parliamentary departments and from parliamentarians' staff, to provide stakeholder input on operational issues.

An ICT Strategic Plan

An early task for the Advisory Board would be to commission the development of an ICT strategic plan incorporating key business system requirements and the ICT infrastructure necessary to deliver those requirements. The plan should also address issues such as network security, the introduction of new technology including consideration of cloud solutions, network technology including Wi-Fi coverage in parliament house, and, importantly, business continuity.

While the chamber department representatives on the Advisory Board would bring a strong stakeholder focus to the development of the strategic plan, it will be important to engage more directly with members and senators in the process of developing and approving the strategic plan.

One approach would be for the Advisory Board to engage with the reconstituted Presiding Officers' IT Advisory Group.

On completion, the strategic plan could be referred to the four departmental heads for approval and then to the presiding officers for endorsement.

The plan would then form the basis for an overarching ICT investment plan and more detailed ICT operational plans.

Recommendation 4

That the Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board develops a parliament-wide ICT strategic plan, in consultation with a re-constituted POITAG, for approval by the four parliamentary department heads and endorsement by the presiding officers.

A ‘One Stop Shop’

In the course of the review, parliamentary stakeholders expressed a strong preference for a ‘one stop shop’ to deliver ICT facilities and services to the Parliament.

Nearly all parliamentary stakeholders and many departmental stakeholders were agreed that, at a minimum, the ‘one stop shop’ should include the approval, acquisition and installation of equipment and office type software in both electorate and parliament house offices, as well as the provision of networked devices, including smart phones.

Stakeholders were strongly supportive of the transfer of responsibility for electorate office IT from the Department of Finance and Deregulation to the Department of Parliamentary Services as a step towards that objective, although a number of stakeholders noted that the Department of Finance and Deregulation was still responsible for the provision of Blackberries and network connected multi-function devices.

In supporting a ‘one stop shop’, users focussed on ease of access, convenience and a single point of contact for support, while others mentioned the more efficient use of scarce technical resources and simplified systems administration and asset management.

For example, DPS is responsible for the PCN as a whole and for the installation of end user equipment in electorate offices and parliament house (DPS staff only). In total DPS is responsible for 3128 laptops and desktops.

The Department of the Senate is responsible for 450 desktops and laptops, and the Department of the House of Representatives for 800.

All three departments require trained staff to purchase, install and eventually dispose of the same equipment in the same location. All three departments need to maintain asset registers to track the equipment and all three departments have to establish asset management policies for the equipment. At the same time, all acquisitions have to be co-ordinated with the standard operating environment which is the responsibility of DPS.

In a climate of limited resources for ICT and against a background of increasing convergence of ICT technologies, a move to a one stop shop in the above terms makes obvious sense.

Departmental issues

Chamber department stakeholders were concerned that, in moving to a more comprehensive ‘one stop shop’, user requirements could be lost sight of and service standards might fall. There was frequent reference to previous examples of poor delivery of shared services. There was also concern about loss of control of funds, if financial resources for ICT were to be pooled.

Some stakeholders pointed to earlier less happy experiences with the Parliamentary Information Systems Office, although it is clear from reports by the Joint Committee of Public

Accounts [12] and the Auditor General[13] that governance and departmental head level oversight of that office were lacking.

On the other hand, there seemed to be less stakeholder concern about a limited 'one stop shop' that brought together responsibility for the acquisition, installation, support and disposal of hardware and system software.

While the concerns of the chamber departments are understood, it should be possible to address those concerns with appropriate governance arrangements underpinned by service level agreements covering the full range of shared services. Concerns about possible poor service delivery should not dominate a decision about rationalising services—rather the focus should be on ensuring that services are delivered at, or better than, the agreed levels. It is important to note that ultimately all four parliamentary departments are responsible to one or both of the Presiding Officers.

It will be important therefore that any move to a 'one stop shop' is carefully phased to build stakeholder confidence and that an appropriate performance management system with service level agreements (covering matters such as response times, refresh cycles and so on) is in place before any transfer of responsibility. It is understood that the Parliamentary Budget Office and DPS have already commenced development of a memorandum of understanding and supporting service level agreements for the provision of shared services. These documents could serve as a model for the development of similar agreements with the chamber departments.

That said, initial implementation of a 'one stop shop' for hardware and software delivery to parliamentarians should involve low levels of difficulty and low risk, and could present as an early 'win'.

Recommendation 5

That

a) a 'one stop shop' be established in the Department of Parliamentary Services for the acquisition, installation, support and disposal of hardware and system software for:
   i. parliamentarians' electorate and parliament house offices;
   ii. parliamentarians mobile computing requirements, and for
   iii. the four parliamentary departments.
b) prior to implementation, service level agreements be settled between the relevant departments, and
c) that implementation be staged and overseen by the Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board.

[12] Joint Committee of Public Accounts Report 308, *The Parliamentary Information Systems Office (PISO) 'Unofficial Account'.*
[13] Auditor General Report No 25 1989-90 *An investigation of an unofficial account operated by Parliamentary Information Systems Office*.

Corporate systems

In considering the potential for rationalisation of the corporate systems it is important to note that it is the ICT system software that is covered by the scope of this review and not the end user functions.

Three departments operate separate corporate systems for Human Resource Management and Payroll, Financial Management and Registry.

Excluding the Department of the Parliamentary Budget Office which plans to outsource its corporate system requirements, the other three parliamentary departments each operate their own financial management systems. DPS uses SAP while the chamber departments each operate their own Finance 1 system.

All three departments operate separate versions of the registry system TRIM, supported by two different external contractors.

There has been some rationalisation with HR/Payroll systems where the Department of the House of Representatives provides payroll services for DPS on its CHRIS 21 system. The department of the Senate operates a separate copy of CHRIS 21 for its own payroll.

In part, the argument in support of the current arrangements goes to each department's desire to select the corporate systems most suited to its particular requirements. There was also an issue with service levels when the corporate systems were provided on a shared service basis.

In the event, the three parliamentary departments have ended up with largely common systems. The exception is the financial management system where DPS uses the more powerful, and complex, SAP system and the chamber departments use Finance 1.

Notwithstanding the commonality of the systems, there are three licensed copies of TRIM, two licensed copies of Finance 1, two licensed copies of Chris21 and a single copy of SAP – all on the one network.

These arrangements are in contrast to the trend for smaller organisations to outsource such systems and the trend in government to consolidate corporate systems at the portfolio level. They are also difficult to justify in the context of the parliamentary workplace with all four departments established under the one act, staff employed under the same act and under essentially the same conditions, in the same location and with the all four departments reporting to one or both of the presiding officers.

Leaving aside the issue of potential efficiencies from providing shared service payroll, finance and registry functions, there are obvious benefits in at least rationalising the copies of each system.

It is true that without a detailed review of each department's licence agreements it is not possible to say whether there would be savings in having a single licensed copy of each corporate system. It is equally true that with small numbers of staff allocated to the relevant

tasks it is unlikely that a move to a comprehensive ‘one stop shop’ would produce significant staff savings.

But each department has to maintain technical proficiency in systems administration for each of these systems and that represents a burden, and a risk, for small organisations. Each department has to provide user acceptance testing for each new release.

DPS incurs significant overheads in systems administration under the current arrangements. While the departments have contracted out support for their systems, DPS is still involved in the installation, upgrading and first line support for these systems. Testing new releases has to be repeated for each licensed copy of a system and separate test environments maintained to reflect each department’s operating environment. While DPS will experience some marginal economies as it installs multiple new releases, these do not offset the cost of repeating the installation and test process up to three times for each corporate system.

Moving to a single copy of each corporate system would simplify and reduce the cost managing the system software; at the same time it would not affect the ability of the departments to continue to deliver corporate services much as they do now.

Recommendation 6

That the parliamentary departments rationalise the number of copies of corporate systems when the existing licences permit, with a view to having a single version (and ideally a single copy) of each system administered by DPS

Business systems development

Improved coordination of application systems should not present any significant difficulty and would not represent a great departure from the current practice. DPS already provides project management support for chamber department developments and much of the actual development work is routinely outsourced. The development of a parliament-wide strategic ICT plan would provide the opportunity to manage the total development portfolio in a coordinated way. It would also assist in resolving funding issues by providing a sound basis for investment decisions across all four departments.

Some rationalisation of the current project governance approaches would be necessary to ensure that the project sponsor was ‘driving’ the project and that there was appropriate co-ordination with the technical areas. It is suggested that the Advisory Board consider this at an early stage.

Recruitment of some subject matter and business systems analysis capability would enhance the current application development process by providing a more strategic approach to applications and business systems architecture, and by ensuring that crucial intellectual property remained with the parliamentary departments after applications projects are delivered.

Other networked devices

Finally, noting that Blackberries and multi-function devices are the only networked devices not included in the transfer of electorate office IT from the Department of Finance and Deregulation, it would make sense for these items to be transferred also.

Recommendation 7

That the approval of the Special Minister of State be sought to the addition of Blackberries and networked multi-function devices to the equipment and facilities listed in his Instrument of Authorisation dated 31 August 2011[1]

The ICT organisation

As noted above, there are some 100 technical and professional ICT staff in DPS but they are located across at least two branches. Moreover there is no position of Chief Information Officer to provide a focus for and leadership of ICT across Parliament or to act as a champion for ICT in discussions with external departments.

Establishing an ICT Division in DPS under a senior SES CIO would have significant advantages in terms of more flexible staffing, better professional development and the opportunity to apply contemporary ICT governance techniques across a coherent organisation. It would also improve communication both within the organisation and externally.

It is important that a senior and experienced CIO be appointed as the responsibilities of the position would include a parliament-wide role.

Recommendation 8

That

a) an ICT Division be established in DPS bringing together existing ICT resources from within DPS and relevant resources from the chamber departments, and
b) that a senior SES Chief Information Officer be appointed to lead the new division and act as a focus for parliament-wide ICT issues.

Security

A significant number of parliamentary stakeholders were concerned that the levels of security required, particularly for mobile computing, were more onerous than necessary. At the same time, there was agreement that reliability of the PCN was critical to parliamentarians. It was also acknowledged that the network was a likely target for attacks.

Some work has already been done to respond to these concerns with the introduction of shorter pass codes for mobile devices together with longer timeouts.

It is understood that DPS is also responding to these concerns by exploring the possibility of separating parliamentarians' communications traffic from other network applications with a view to being able to apply different levels of security to that traffic. Similar work is being undertaken in the UK.

Striking a balance between sensible levels of protection and ease of use of the network is a difficult task and requires access to high levels of expertise. It is important that there is a good understanding at senior levels of the nature of the risks and any trade-offs that are proposed. It is also important that the reasons for decisions on security levels are communicated, to the extent possible, to stakeholders.

The Advisory Board would be an appropriate body to deal with network security issues, in consultation with a reformed POITAG. Given that network security will continue to be a high profile and dynamic issue for the foreseeable future, consideration should be given to recruiting a senior level security advisor to the Advisory Board, possibly by secondment from another Commonwealth agency.

Under the *Parliamentary Services Act 1999,* the Security Management Board (SMB) is charged with providing "*advice as required to the Presiding Officers on security policy, and the management of security measures, for Parliament House".*

It is not clear whether, and to what extent, it was envisaged that this responsibility would include information technology security. However, it is clear that to involve this board in technical information security issues would involve significant duplication with the proposed Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board and would represent a move away from the one stop shop concept.

A possible option for dealing with this issue and avoiding significant duplication is for the proposed Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board to take responsibility for the development and oversight of IT security policy and for this board to report to SMB on significant policy and operational issues, annually and as required. This would enable SMB to consider IT security within the overall security framework but without the need for any detailed technical involvement by SMB.

Recommendation 9

That

a) the terms of reference for the Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board include approval of IT security policy and oversight of network security;
b) consideration be given to the recruitment of a senior level security advisor, and that
c) the Presiding Officers agree that the Advisory Board report to SMB on significant policy and operational issues annually and as required.

Flexibility in the selection of electorate office IT

As noted above, parliamentary stakeholders were strongly supportive of a more flexible approach to the allocation of ICT for electorate offices and in parliament house.

There was acceptance that any flexibility would need to be constrained within the budget. There was also broad agreement that a supported standard operating environment was desirable with most parliamentarians interviewed valuing the support provided through the 2020 helpdesk

The latter requirement suggests that if flexibility is to be provided then it should be by way of choice from a menu of approved equipment. Items of equipment and software on the menu would need to be 'priced' to include support and a cap set including the support costs. There was considerable support for such a proposal.

The parliamentary departments also supported this proposal, including the menu approach. DPS noted their expectation that, following their experience with iPads, the majority of parliamentarians would expect support, at least in establishing a network connection, regardless of whether the equipment or software was 'officially' supported.

A number of more experienced users did point to the increasing trend in other organisations for a completely free choice of equipment and systems limited only by a budget cap, noting that such an option was already available in some overseas parliaments. Such arrangements either placed the responsibility on the user to source, and pay for, support or involved support provided by the home organisation on a best efforts basis.

It may well be that with increasingly sophisticated security and gateway technology such an approach may be feasible without impacting network wide priorities or increasing risk. . However, given the varying levels of technical maturity across the parliamentary users and ICT organisations, and the number of important priority tasks to be tackled against a background of constrained funding, it would be premature at this stage to offer the option of a completely free choice of technology to be connected to the PCN other than for email and other limited applications.

It is suggested that this be a matter for exploration by the Advisory Board as the recommendations of this review are bedded down.

The ability to choose equipment from the menu should be cost neutral and so would need to be aligned with equipment refresh cycles, which in turn would need to be more formalised and aligned with the electoral cycle to the extent possible.

A standard configuration should be available for those parliamentarians who were satisfied with the standard offering.

A similar approach could apply to offices in parliament house, although there was less pressure for that; the main issue was software availability so that the full electorate office capability was available in parliament house if required.

Recommendation 10

That senators and members of parliament are able to select their electorate office IT equipment and systems, within the existing budget cap, from a menu of supported items, approved by the presiding officers.

New technology

New technology will continue to become available in personal and/or mobile computing at an increasing rate, and a fixed entitlement system will continue to struggle to cope as it has with iPads and iPhones.

In dealing with that type of new technology, the key issues include are the extent to which assessment of new devices has the potential to squeeze out other priorities, how to fund support for the devices (noting that any device that connects to the PCN will incur some support costs) and the means by which parliamentarians may gain access to such technology.

It should be noted that such devices typically would be relatively low cost and have a relatively short service life both in terms of susceptibility to damage and in terms of being overtaken by new technology. While a laptop may be expected to last between three to five years, some industry observers put the life of a tablet at 15-18 months before perceived obsolescence.

As noted above, it is proposed that the Advisory Board consider new technology as part of the overall strategic plan and that it make recommendations on the priority to be given to the inclusion of new devices in the list of approved or supported devices.

To the extent that new technology replaces an existing capability, there is potential to include new technology in the menu of items available for electorate offices. Parliamentarians could then elect, for example, to trade off a laptop for an iPad.

Where the new technology does not readily fit into that category, the options include parliamentarians acquiring their own devices with support being provided for devices on the ‘supported’ list or, alternatively, consideration could be given to seeking agreement from the Special Minister of State to allow parliamentarians to sacrifice an amount from an appropriate allowance sufficient to cover the cost of the device and support over its expected life.

It is noted that the Special Minister of State has already agreed to items such as data projectors being acquired from the Stationery and Office Requisites allowance.

Recommendation 11

That consideration be given to requesting the Special Minister of State to allow parliamentarians to acquire approved new mobile technology, by way of an amount to be sacrificed from their Stationery and Office Requisites Allowance.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That a Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board be established with membership and terms of reference as set out in Attachment H.

2. That POITAG be reconstituted with the new terms of reference set out in Attachment G to reflect a more strategic role for the advisory group.

3. That the Department of Parliamentary Services establish a broader based user group or groups, with representatives from the parliamentary departments and from parliamentarians' staff, to provide stakeholder input on operational issues.

4. That the Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board develops a parliament-wide ICT strategic plan, in consultation with a re-constituted POITAG, for approval by the four parliamentary department heads and endorsement by the presiding officers.

5. That
   a) a 'one stop shop' be established in the Department of Parliamentary Services for the acquisition, installation, support and disposal of hardware and system software for:
      i. parliamentarians' electorate and parliament house offices;
      ii. parliamentarians mobile computing requirements, and for
      iii. the four parliamentary departments.
   b) prior to implementation, service level agreements be settled between the relevant departments, and
   c) that implementation be staged and overseen by the Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board.

6. That the parliamentary departments rationalise the number of copies of corporate systems when the existing licences permit, with a view to having a single version (and ideally a single copy) of each system administered by DPS

7. That the approval of the Special Minister of State be sought to the addition of Blackberries and networked multi-function devices to the equipment and facilities listed in his Instrument of Authorisation dated 31 August 2011

8. That
   a) an ICT Division be established in DPS bringing together existing ICT resources from within DPS and relevant resources from the chamber departments, and
   b) that a senior SES Chief Information Officer be appointed to lead the new division and act as a focus for parliament-wide ICT issues.

9. That
   a) the terms of reference for the Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board include approval of IT security policy and oversight of network security;
   b) consideration be given to the recruitment of a senior level security advisor, and that
   c) the Presiding Officers agree that the Advisory Board report to SMB on significant policy and operational issues annually and as required.

10. That senators and members of parliament are able to select their electorate office IT equipment and systems, within the existing budget cap, from a menu of supported items, approved by the presiding officers.

11. That consideration be given to requesting the Special Minister of State to allow parliamentarians to acquire approved new mobile technology, by way of an amount to be sacrificed from their Stationery and Office Requisites Allowance.

Service provision by department

The Department of Parliamentary Services is responsible for:

a) The provision, administration and support of the equipment, facilities and systems comprising the PCN including servers, cabling, network switches, data storage and backup facilities;
b) Provision of desktop and networked equipment in Parliament House for DPS staff;
c) The Wide Area Network providing linkages to electoral offices;
d) The provision of desktop and networked printers (but not the multi function devices) and storage in electorate offices;
e) Support for 'smart' phones provided to parliamentarians by the Department of Finance and Deregulation;
f) The Standard Operating Environment installed in all managed end user equipment connected to the PCN;
g) The provision of the 2020 help desk covering all PCN users; and
h) Provision of corporate systems (excluding the Human Resource Management system) for DPS.

The Department of the Senate is responsible for:

a) Provision of desktop and end user infrastructure (laptops, printers and scanners MFDs) for senators, and staff of the department;
b) Chamber specific business applications; and
c) Corporate support applications (Finance, Human resources, including Payroll, and Registry) for Senators and departmental staff.

The Department of the House of Representatives is responsible for:

a) Provision of desktop and end user infrastructure (laptops, printers and scanners MFDs) for members, and staff of the department;
b) Chamber specific business applications;
c) Corporate support applications (Finance, Human resources, including Payroll, and Registry) for Members and departmental staff; and
d) Provision of human resource and payroll services for the department of Parliamentary Services.

The Parliamentary Librarian is responsible for:

a) Administering the APH website, and
b) Administering a wide range of information services software; including ParlInfo Search and the Electronic Media Monitoring System.

The Department of Finance and Deregulation is responsible for:

a) Fixed phone lines for electorate offices;
b) Data cabinet, structured data cabling and phone cabling in electorate offices;
c) Mobile phones and PDAs for senators and members, including call charges; and
d) Networked Multifunction Devices in electorate offices.

Portfolio Departments are responsible for:

a) Provision of end user infrastructure (desktops, laptops, printers and scanners) for Ministerial offices in Parliament House and elsewhere;
b) Access to the relevant departmental network; and
c) Provision of applications and support for Ministers and staff.

PCN users by location (June 2012)

Chamber/Department	PCN users
Senators and staff	899
Department of the Senate	187
Members and staff	2104
Department of the House of Representatives	254
Department of Parliamentary Services	1163
Other	241
Total	**4848**

Desktop and laptop equipment by location (June 2012)

Location	Desktop	Laptop	Total
Senators' offices APH	172	76	248
Members' offices APH	380	170	550
Department of the Senate	204	48	252
Department of the House of Representatives	160	40	200
Department of Parliamentary Services	1248	199	1,447
Electorate Offices	1354	327	1,681
Totals	3,518	860	4,378

Department of Parliamentary Services ICT expenditure by service type	**Operating Expenditure (Opex)**	**Capital Expenditure (Capex)**	**Depreciation**	**Total by department**
	$	**$**	**$**	
ICT Management	1,488,005	0	0	
Applications	2,453,344	4,718,236	4,427,756	
Mainframe	0	0	0	
Midrange	348,638	747,938	3,866,904	
Storage	264,762	0	0	
WAN	299,286	0	0	
Gateway	113,529	0	0	
LAN and RAS	505,544	0	0	
End user architecture	1,232,546	529,153	500,522	
Voice services	1,678,592	0	0	
Helpdesk	742,088	0	0	
Facilities	0	0	0	
Departmental total	**9,126,334**	**5,995,327**	**8,795,182**	**23,916,843**
Department of the Senate ICT expenditure by service type				
Gateway	0	0	0	
End user infrastructure	836,814	841,042	452,000	
Voice Services	5,609	0	0	
Departmental total	**842,423**	**841,042**	**452,000**	**2,481,543**
Department of the House of Representatives ICT expenditure by service type				
Gateway	0	0	0	
End user infrastructure	0	296,000	798,078	
Voice Services	40,000	0	0	
Departmental total	**40,000**	**296,000**	**798,078**	**788,000**
Total all departments	**10,008,757**	**7,132,369**	**10,045,260**	**27,186,386**

Source: Annual benchmarking data provided to AGIMO by the Parliamentary Departments

ICT Staffing 2010-11 Full Time Equivalents [14]

Contribution Area	Department of the Senate[15]	Department of the House of Representatives[16]	Department of Parliamentary Services[17]
Strategic Leadership	0.10	0.10	5.00
Procurement	0.10	0.50	1.00
Quality Assurance	0.10		2.00
Project Management	0.20	0.90	17.10
Business Process Analysis and Design	0.20	0.10	2.00
Systems Analysis and Design	0.10	0.10	3.00
Development and Programming	0.90	1.00	2.00
Web content development	2.15	1.00	3.30
Testing			5.00
Systems Integration and Deployment	0.10	0.40	7.00
Service Management	0.10		3.00
Systems Administration	0.50		16.60
Security	0.10		7.00
Networks and Telecommunications	0.10		9.00
Databases and Data	0.10	0.10	1.00
Infrastructure and Facilities	0.20	0.50	7.00
Information Knowledge Management	0.10		2.00
Helpdesk/Support	1.50	1.00	11.60
Training and Development	0.10	0.10	1.00
Total	**7.00**	**5.80**	**105.6**

Source: Annual benchmarking data provided to AGIMO by the parliamentary departments

[14] Includes contractors
[15] As at 30 June 2011
[16] As at 30 June 2011
[17] As at 30 December 2011

Request Approval Process

The Request Approval Process is a set of procedures by which the Department of Parliamentary Services prioritises and selects projects for delivery, including ICT projects. It deals with projects that are funded by DPS but does not deal with projects that are funded by the chamber departments. It does not deal with Minor Works (less than $10,000) which are covered under a separate arrangement.

The Request Approval Process involves, inter alia, evaluation by the Strategic Planning and Delivery Committee (DHS), consideration by a high level Project Assessment Committee (DHS plus the chamber departments) and final approval by the Strategy and Finance Committee (DPS). Terms of Reference and membership for the three committees are at Attachment E1.

Strategic Planning and Delivery Committee

1 The role of the Strategic Planning and Delivery Committee (SPDC) is to:

(a) assess strategic alignment against established criteria and analyse DPS's capacity to source and execute the proposed projects;

(b) examine project relationships to identify project dependencies and opportunities for a co-ordinated management approach;

(c) group project proposals into strategic or funding categories and rank them according to the investment timeframe (short, medium, long term);

(d) consider that IT proposals do not call for customisation or bespoke development of a solution, rather than use off-the-shelf approaches; and

(e) make recommendations to the Project Assessment Committee (PAC).

2 The SPDC is chaired by the Director, Project Management Office and comprises Department of Parliamentary Services (DPS) representatives from Strategy, Projects Branch (Build), and Infrastructure Services Branch (Run).

3 The SPDC meeting papers are forwarded to the Usher of the Black Rod, Deputy Black Rod, Serjeant-at-Arms and Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms prior to each SPDC meeting.

4 The SPDC will conduct a regular self-assessment of its performance and effectiveness, particularly how members are working together as a committee.

Project Assessment Committee

1) The role of the Project Assessment Committee (PAC) is to:
   a) examine project proposals within each category and timeframe and evaluate the risk versus return profile and whole-of-Parliament focus according to established criteria;
   b) develop a project portfolio mix with the greatest potential to collectively support the Parliament's strategic initiatives and achieve strategic objectives;
   c) prioritise projects; and
   d) make recommendations to the Strategy and Finance Committee (SFC).

2) Membership of the PAC comprises:

   a) Deputy Secretary, DPS (chair);
   b) Usher of the Black Rod, Department of the Senate;
   c) Serjeant-At-Arms, Department of the House of Representatives; and
   d) Director Electorate Office IT, Department of Finance and Deregulation.

3) The PAC will conduct a regular self-assessment of its performance and effectiveness, particularly how members are working together as a committee.

4) Secretariat services are provided by Project Branch.

Strategy and Finance Committee (SFC)

Role

1 The Strategy and Finance Committee (SFC) is part of DPS's corporate governance arrangements. Its role is to:

(a) decide on DPS's strategies and strategic policies;

(b) approve DPS's Strategic Plans;

(c) monitor the implementation of those strategies, policies and Plans;

(d) coordinate DPS input into whole-of-Parliament operational and strategic issues;

(e) approve DPS's people strategies and monitor their implementation;

(f) promote and monitor continuous improvement in DPS;

(g) approve business plans prepared by the Parliamentary Library and other branches;

(h) formulate DPS policy on all financial matters;

(i) allocate annual budgets, and reallocate funding during the year as required;

(j) monitor financial performance, including consideration of monthly reports;

(k) supervise spending, including by:

(i) allocating asset replacement and administered funds to approved projects to be delivered by DPS;

(ii) monitoring the progress of approved projects for expenditure of asset replacement and administered funds; and

(iii) dealing with other spending proposals as set out in this paper; and

(l) undertake any other functions assigned by the Secretary from time to time.

2 A standing agenda for SFC is at **Attachment A**.

Constitution of SFC

3 SFC consists of:

(a) the Secretary;

(b) the Deputy Secretary;

(c) the Parliamentary Librarian; (d)

the Chief Finance Officer; and

(e) the Director, Strategy Section.

Functions of SFC

Continuous improvement

4 SFC's consideration of continuous improvement issues will in some cases reflect structured improvement processes, but SFC will also consider improvement opportunities otherwise identified, whether by SFC members or other staff members, or arising out of particular proposals raised with SFC.

Business planning

5 DPS's business planning process is set out in *Governance Paper No. 4—Business Planning Policy and Framework*.

Supervision of branch budgets and spending proposals

6 DPS policy on branch budgeting and approval of spending proposals is set out in *Financial Paper No. 8—Financial governance*.

Presiding Officers' Information Technology Advisory Group (POITAG)

Role and Terms of Reference

Role

1 To assist the Presiding Officers in ensuring that the Parliament has international standard information and communications technology **(ICT)** facilities to allow the Parliament to meet its objectives, including greater public electronic access to information from and about the Parliament. In this context ICT includes sound and vision technology.

Terms of Reference

1 Identify and advise the Presiding Officers on the ICT requirements of Senators and Members.

2 Monitor and assess the performance of those areas of the parliamentary administration providing ICT-related services.

3 Advise and assist the Presiding Officers on issues relating to the efficient and cost-effective use of ICT in the Parliament.

Presiding Officers' Information Technology Advisory Group (POITAG)

Proposed Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

1. Assist in the strategic oversight of ICT for Parliament by providing advice to the Presiding Officers on the ICT needs of parliamentarians and on strategic priorities for parliamentary ICT.

   Provide advice to the Presiding Officers on any other strategic issues relating to the efficient and cost-effective use of ICT in the Parliament.

Note that in these terms of reference, ICT includes sound and vision technology but does not include the parliamentary security network.

Alternative

Presiding Officers' Information Technology Advisory Group (POITAG)

Proposed Terms of Reference

Role

To assist the Presiding Officers in their consideration of the Strategic Plan for Parliamentary Information Communications Technology (ICT), ensuring that it efficiently and effectively meets the needs of parliamentarians and of the Parliament,

In these terms of reference, ICT includes sound and vision technology but does not include the parliamentary security network.

Terms of Reference

1. Assist in the development of the Strategic Plan by providing advice on the ICT needs of parliamentarians and on strategic priorities to the Presiding Officers and to the Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board.
2. Review the draft Strategic Plan and provide advice to the Presiding Officers as appropriate.
3. Review progress against the Strategic Plan on an annual basis and report to the Presiding Officers.
4. Provide advice to the Presiding Officers on any other strategic issues relating to the efficient and cost-effective use of ICT in the Parliament.

Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board

Proposed Terms of Reference

ROLE

The role of the Parliamentary ICT Advisory Board (the Board) is to:

a) Oversee the development of the Strategic Plan for Parliamentary ICT by the Chief Information Officer CIO) of the Department of Parliamentary Services;
b) Provide guidance to the CIO on the overall strategic objectives and required outcomes:
c) Regularly review progress against the Strategic Plan;
d) Oversee the regular review and updating of the Strategic Plan;
e) Provide advice to the Presiding Officers on the menu of electorate office information technology equipment and facilities and on the introduction of new technology for parliamentarians, and
f) Provide advice on strategic ICT issues, including governance, security and risk, to the Presiding Officers and the Heads of the Parliamentary Departments.

The Strategic Plan will incorporate investment priorities. However it is not the role of the Board to approve funding or to manage ICT resources; that is the role of the CIO and line management.

In carrying out its role, the Board will consult closely with the Presiding Officers' Strategic Information Technology Advisory Group.

GUIDANCE

In oversighting the development of the Strategic Plan, the Board will give consideration to the following issues (the list is not exhaustive):

a) Strategic Alignment – Ensure that the plan is aligned with the strategic objectives of the Parliament;
b) Stakeholder Engagement – Ensure that the stakeholders have been consulted and that their priorities are reflected as appropriate in the plan;
c) Parliament-wide focus – Ensure that the plan covers all aspects of the Parliament and that it is underpinned by appropriate systems and applications architectures to maximise the benefits of the ICT investment;
d) Knowledge and Information Strategy – Ensure that the plan incorporates a strategy to maximise the value of Parliamentary knowledge and information within the Parliamentary Computer Network.
e) Efficiency and Effectiveness – Ensure that the plan promotes the efficient and effective use of ICT resources;
f) Risk Management – Ensure that the plan provides for the identification and management of risk;
g) Security – Ensure that the plan comprehensively addresses the requirements for, and principles of, network and data security, and

h) Governance – Ensure that the plan is underpinned by effective ICT governance arrangements including service level agreements where required.

MEMBERSHIP

The Board will consist of five members; an independent member and the heads, or their deputies, of:

a) The Department of Parliamentary Services (chair);
b) The Department of the Senate;
c) The Department of the House of Representatives; and
d) The Parliamentary Budget Office.

The independent member shall be appointed by the Presiding Officers. The independent member will have high level of ICT or business systems experience and a good understanding of the working of the Parliament.

The CIO will act as an advisor to the Board.

Substitutes may only be nominated with the agreement of the chair.

MEETINGS

Meetings shall be held at least quarterly. A quorum for meetings will be four members.

SECRETARIAT

The secretariat will be provided by the Department of Parliamentary Services.

REVIEW

The terms of reference, membership and operation of the Board shall be reviewed every second year to ensure that the Board remains relevant.

PRIORITY TASKS FOR THE PARLIAMENTARY ICT ADVISORY BOARD

The key task of the Advisory Board is to oversee the development of the Strategic Plan for Parliamentary ICT.

However, it would also be appropriate for the Board to provide early advice on the implementation of the recommendations of this report and, in particular, on how they might be phased to reduce implementation risk.

In addition, the following issues will require early attention by the Advisory Board.

a) Business continuity plans for the PCN, including backup for the existing server farm and consideration of the use of off-site data centres or cloud computing.
b) The strategic approach to be taken to PCN security, including clear advice on the risk/usability tradeoffs.
c) Consideration of the plans for, and oversight of, the implementation of the one stop shop.
d) Advice to the Presiding Officers on the ‘menu’ for electorate office IT and priorities for the introduction of new technology.
e) The strategic approach to parliament-wide business systems planning and the development of an appropriate architecture.
f) Skill mix and resource requirements to support the strategic plan.
g) Changes to the operational ICT governance arrangements necessary to support a one stop shop (including change management and project approval).

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR PARLIAMENTARY ICT

The following is a suggested high level process for the development of the Strategic Plan for Parliamentary ICT.

a) Initial meeting of the Advisory Board and CIO. The CIO briefs the Advisory Board on technical issues to be included in the plan. The Advisory Board provides strategic guidance to the CIO on business systems, technical and other priorities. Consultation with POITAG at this stage would be of value.
b) The CIO develops a draft Strategic Plan after consultation with stakeholders. Draft plan considered by the Advisory Board.
c) When the draft plan is sufficiently developed, the Advisory Board meets with POITAG to consider the draft plan. POITAG may provide further input at this stage.
d) The draft plan then goes to the heads of the parliamentary departments for agreement and to the presiding officers for endorsement.
e) At this stage the plan is then promulgated.

DPS/Benchmark ICT Skill Mix

Contribution Area	Percentage of staff by contribution area		DPS Staff by contribution area		Difference
	Medium Agencies	DPS	Actual	Benchmark	
Databases and data	2.3%	0.9%	1	2	-1
Procurement and vendor relations	3.4%	0.9%	1	3	-3
Training and development	0.0%	0.9%	1	0	1
Business process Analysis/Design	5.7%	1.9%	2	6	-4
Development and Programming	15.9%	1.9%	2	16	-14
Information knowledge management	2.3%	1.9%	2	2	0
Quality assurance	1.1%	1.9%	2	1	1
Service management	3.4%	2.8%	3	3	-1
System analysis and design	5.7%	2.8%	3	6	-3
Web and multimedia content development	3.4%	3.1%	3	3	0
Strategic leadership	5.7%	4.7%	5	6	-1
Testing	2.3%	4.7%	5	2	2
Infrastructure and facilities	5.7%	6.6%	7	6	1
Security	3.4%	6.6%	7	3	3
Systems integration and deployment	1.1%	6.6%	7	1	6
Networks and telecommunications	4.5%	8.5%	9	5	4
Helpdesk/support	17.0%	11.0%	11	17	-6
Systems administration	8.0%	15.7%	16	8	8
Programme and Project Management	9.1%	16.2%	17	9	7
Total			**102**	**102**	

Source: AGIMO Benchmarking data 2010-11

Parliamentary Entitlements Act 1990

INSTRUMENT OF AUTHORISATION

PROVISION OF ELECTORATE OFFICE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TO SENATORS

I, GARY GRAY, Special Minister of State, acting under the *Parliamentary Entitlements Act 1990* ('the Act') AUTHORISE the person from time to time holding, occupying or performing the duties of President of the Senate ('the President of the Senate'), to exercise for and on my behalf my power under sub-item 7(1), Part 1, Schedule 1 to the Act to approve electorate office information technology equipment and facilities ('EOIT') for Senators, subject to the direction set out in paragraph 2 below.

1. For the purposes of this authorisation, EOIT means the following equipment and facilities:
   a. Desktop computers and peripherals;
   b. Laptop computers and peripherals;
   c. Software;
   d. Printers (including Smart Label printers);
   e. Scanners;
   f. Remote access tokens for staff of Senators;
   g. All information technology training for staff of Senators.

2. This authorisation is subject to my direction that, prior to approving any EOIT for Senators, the President of the Senate must confer with the Speaker of the House of Representatives (who is authorised to approve EOIT for Members of the House of Representatives ('MHRs')) and must be satisfied that any EOIT benefits to be provided to Senators are the same as, or are of a similar nature and value to, EOIT normally provided to MHRs.

GARY GRAY
SPECIAL MINISTER OF STATE

Dated this 31 day of August 2011

Parliamentary Entitlements Act 1990

INSTRUMENT OF AUTHORISATION

PROVISION OF ELECTORATE OFFICE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I, GARY GRAY, Special Minister of State, acting under the *Parliamentary Entitlements Act 1990* ('the Act') AUTHORISE the person from time to time holding, occupying or performing the duties of Speaker of the House of Representatives ('the Speaker of the House'), to exercise for and on my behalf my power under sub-item 7(1), Part 1, Schedule 1 to the Act to approve electorate office information technology equipment and facilities ('EOIT') for Members of the House of Representatives ('Members') subject to the direction set out in paragraph 2 below.

1. For the purposes of this authorisation, EOIT means the following equipment and facilities:
   a. Desktop computers and peripherals;
   b. Laptop computers and peripherals;
   c. Software;
   d. Printers (including Smart Label printers);
   e. Scanners;
   f. Remote access tokens for staff of Members;
   g. All information technology training for staff of Members.

2. This authorisation is subject to my direction that, prior to approving any EOIT for Members, the Speaker of the House must confer with the President of the Senate (who is authorised to approve EOIT for Senators) and must be satisfied that any EOIT benefits to be provided to Members are the same as, or are of a similar nature and value to, EOIT normally provided to Senators.

GARY GRAY
SPECIAL MINISTER OF STATE

Dated this 31 day of August 2011

Senators and Members

Senator John Hogg	President of the Senate
The Hon Peter Slipper	Speaker of the House of Representatives
Hon Gary Gray AO MP	Special Minister of State Minister for the Public Service and Integrity
Senator Louise Pratt	Senator for Western Australia Chair, POITAG
Senator Kate Lundy	Senator for the ACT Former Chair POITAG
The Hon Ian Macfarlane MP	Member for Groom (QLD)
Senator Scott Ludlam	Senator for Western Australia
Senator Stephen Parry	Senator for Tasmania
The Hon Bernie Ripoll MP	Member for Oxley (QLD)
Senator Scott Ryan	Senator for Victoria
Mr Michael Symon MP	Member for Deakin (Vic)
Senator David Bushby	Senator for Tasmania
Mr Darren Cheeseman MP	Member for Corangamite (Vic)
Senator Trish Crossin	Senator for Northern Territory
Mr Paul Fletcher MP	Member for Bradfield (NSW)
The Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP	Member for Wentworth (NSW)
The Hon Joel Fitzgibbon MP	Australian Labour Party House of Representatives Chief Government Whip
Senator Anna McEwen	Australian Labour Party Senate Chief Government Whip
Senator Gary Humphries	Senator for the ACT Co-chair of Library Committee
Mr Dick Adams MP	Member for Tasmania Co-chair of Library Committee
Senator Stephen Conroy	Senator for Victoria
Senator Helen Polley	Senator for Tasmania
Mr Anthony Byrne MP	Member for Holt, VIC
Senator Ursula Stephens	Senator for NSW

Staff of Senators and Members

Quentin Clements	Senior Adviser to the President of the Senate
Tim Knapp	Senior Adviser to the Speaker of the House of Representatives
Desmond Ko	Staff member for the Hon Gary Gray AO MP Special Minister of State Minister for the Public Service and Integrity

Elisabeth Bateson	Adviser to the Hon Gary Gray AO MP Special Minister of State Minister for the Public Service and Integrity
Justine Parker	Office representative for Senator Pratt Senator for Western Australia Chair, POITAG
Alison Boardman	Office representative for Senator Crossin Senator for Northern Territory
Richard Dowdy	Office representative for the Leader of the Opposition
Natasha Sikman	Office representative for the Hon Joel Fitzgibbon MP Australian Labour Party House of Representatives Chief Government Whip
Christine Boyd	Office representative for the Hon Joel Fitzgibbon MP Australian Labour Party House of Representatives Chief Government Whip
Kate Dennis	Chief of Staff for the Hon Warren Entsch MP Liberal Party House of Representatives Chief Opposition Whip
Brad Roswell	Senior Adviser for Senator Helen Kroger Liberal Party Senate Chief Opposition Whip
Ross Macdonald	Chief of Staff for Senator Humphries Senator for the ACT
Shaun Drabsch	Chief of Staff for Senator Conroy Senator for Victoria
Alexandra Stalder	Office representative for Mr Anthony Byrne MP Member for Holt, VIC
Alison Byrnes	Office representative for Sharon Bird MP Member for Cunningham, NSW
Mary O'Dea	Officer representative for Senator Payne Senator for NSW
Paul Murphy	Office representative for Julie Owens MP Member for Parramatta, NSW
Linda Perrett	Office representative for Laurie Ferguson MP Member for Werriwa, NSW
Maurice Campbell	Office representative for Laurie Ferguson MP Member for Werriwa, NSW
Elizabeth Dutaillis	Office representative for Senator Stephens Senator for NSW

Richard Orchard	Office representative for Alby Schultz MP Member for Hume, NSW

Electorate offices visited

Senator Marise Payne	Senator for NSW (Office in Parramatta)
Julie Owens MP	Member for Parramatta, NSW (Office in Parramatta)
Mr Laurie Ferguson MP	Member for Werriwa, NSW (Office in Ingleburn)
Senator Ursula Stephens	Senator for NSW (Office in Goulburn)
Mr Alby Schultz	Member for Hume, NSW (Office in Goulburn)

Staff of the Parliamentary Departments

Dr Rosemary Laing	Clerk of the Senate
Richard Pye	Deputy Clerk of the Senate
Brien Hallett	Black Rod
Anthony Szell	Director HR Management, Senate
Glenn Kraus	Assistant Director Senate Services, Senate
Michael York	Assistant Director IT, Senate
Maureen Weeks	Clerk Assistant (Table), Senate
Bronwyn Notzen	Clerk Assistant (Procedure), Senate
Toni Dawes	Committee secretary, Senate
Chris Reid	Clerk Assistant (Committees), Senate
Jackie Morris	Senior Clerk (Committees), Senate
Joe D'Angelo	Chief Finance and IT officer, Senate
Bernard Wright	Clerk of the House of Representatives
David Elder	Deputy Clerk of the House of Representatives
Robyn McClelland	Serjeant at Arms, House of Representatives
Claressa Surtees	Clerk Assistant (Table), House of Representatives
Joanne Towner	Clerk Assisant (Committees), House of Representatives
Ann Mackinnon	Director, House of Representatives
Carol Mills	Secretary, DPS
David Kenny	Deputy Secretary, DPS
Bronwyn Graham	Assistant Secretary Building Services Branch, DPS
Murray Thompson	Director Security, DPS
Dallas Fraser	Director Facilities, DPS
Karen Greening	Assistant Secretary Content Management Branch, DPS
Lyn Cowley	Director Hansard, DPS
Christine White	Director Hansard, DPS

Paul Oglethorpe	Director Knowledge Management, DPS
Michael Ferguson	Acting Director Broadcasting Content, DPS
Freda Hanley	Assistant Secretary Infrastructure Services Branch, DPS
Ralph Wese	Director Network Communications, DPS
Cliff Van Lohuizen	Director IT Services, DPS
David James	Director IT Strategy and Planning, DPS
Peter Collins	Director EO IT Transition, DPS
Paul Sweeney	IT Services, Electorate Officer, DPS
Nick Tate	Acting Assistant Secretary Projects Branch, DPS
Steve Campbell	Director Project Management Office, DPS
Neil Pickering	Director Technology Projects, DPS
Karen Sheppard	Assistant Secretary Corporate Branch, DPS
Dr Dianne Heriot	Parliamentary Librarian, DPS
Judy Hutchinson	Assistant Secretary Information Access Branch, DPS
Joanne James	Director Client Relations, DPS
Justin Taylor	IT technical specialist, DPS
Scott Robertson	IT technical specialist, DPS
Phil Bowen PSM	Parliamentary Budget Officer
Mathew Fox	Interim Executive Officer, Parliamentary Budget Office

Other officials

Mike Burgess	First Assistant Secretary, Cyber Information and Security, Defence Signals Directorate, Department of Defence
Jan Mason	Deputy Secretary, Department of Finance and Deregulation (DOFD)
Cheryl-Anne Moy	Assistant Secretary, Accountability & Reporting Branch, DoFD
Suzanne Pitson	Assistant Secretary, Entitlements Policy Branch, DoFD
Andrew House	Director, DoFD
Ann Steward	Deputy Secretary, AGIMO, DOFD
Scott Wallace	Acting First Assistant Secretary, AGIMO, DOFD
Gary Davis	Assistant Secretary IT skills, capability and investment, AGIMO, DOFD
John Sheridan	First Assistant Secretary Policy Planning, AGIMO, DOFD
Steve Sedgewick AO	Australian Parliamentary Service Commissioner
Penny Weir	Deputy Australian Parliamentary Service Commissioner

Others consulted

Barbara Belcher AO	Former First Assistant Secretary, Prime Minister and Cabinet
John Conde AO	President, Remuneration Tribunal
Russell Grove	Former acting Secretary DPS
Alan Thompson	Former Secretary DPS