

# CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER, OFFICE OF THE[129]

## Regulatory Analysis

Notice of Intended Action to be published: 129—Chapter 3  
“Petitions for Rulemaking”

Iowa Code section(s) or chapter(s) authorizing rulemaking: 8 and 17A

State or federal law(s) implemented by the rulemaking: Iowa Code chapters 8 and 17A

## Public Hearing

A public hearing at which persons may present their views orally or in writing will be held as follows:

August 1, 2025  
11 a.m.

Room G14  
1007 East Grand Avenue  
Des Moines, Iowa

## Public Comment

Any interested person may submit written or oral comments concerning this Regulatory Analysis, which must be received by the Department of Management (DOM) no later than 4:30 p.m. on the date of the public hearing. Comments should be directed to:

Brad Horn, General Counsel  
Iowa Department of Management  
1007 East Grand Avenue, Room G13  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
Phone: 515.414.6187  
Email: [brad.horn@dom.iowa.gov](mailto:brad.horn@dom.iowa.gov)

## Purpose and Summary

The Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) is now consolidated into DOM. Chapter 3 concerning filing petitions for rulemaking is no longer necessary and is proposed to be rescinded.

## Analysis of Impact

### 1. Persons affected by the proposed rulemaking:

- **Classes of persons that will bear the costs of the proposed rulemaking:**

Not applicable. Chapter 3 is being rescinded in its entirety.

- **Classes of persons that will benefit from the proposed rulemaking:**

The rescission of Chapter 3 simplifies the rules and reduces guidance to only that which is necessary to define the role and responsibilities of the Chief Information Officer within DOM in service to the State.

### 2. Impact of the proposed rulemaking, economic or otherwise, including the nature and amount of all the different kinds of costs that would be incurred:

- **Quantitative description of impact:**

Not applicable. The rescission of Chapter 3 is appropriate now that OCIO is consolidated under DOM.

- **Qualitative description of impact:**

The rescission of Chapter 3 improves the quality of the Iowa Administrative Code by reducing surplusage.

### 3. Costs to the State:

- **Implementation and enforcement costs borne by the agency or any other agency:**

There will be no implementation or enforcement costs since Chapter 3 is being rescinded.

- **Anticipated effect on State revenues:**

To the extent consolidation of OCIO into DOM increases efficiency and reduces redundancies, State revenues will be positively affected by the rescission of Chapter 3.

**4. Comparison of the costs and benefits of the proposed rulemaking to the costs and benefits of inaction:**

Inaction is not permissible since Chapter 3 is defunct and should be rescinded now that the OCIO is consolidated within DOM. The rescission of the chapter is a necessary step in maintaining current and easily accessible rules.

**5. Determination whether less costly methods or less intrusive methods exist for achieving the purpose of the proposed rulemaking:**

No methods exist that are less costly than rescinding this defunct chapter and eliminating outdated, unnecessary text from the rules.

**6. Alternative methods considered by the agency:**

- **Description of any alternative methods that were seriously considered by the agency:**

Not applicable. Chapter 3 is defunct and should be rescinded.

- **Reasons why alternative methods were rejected in favor of the proposed rulemaking:**

No alternative methods are available.

*Small Business Impact*

**If the rulemaking will have a substantial impact on small business, include a discussion of whether it would be feasible and practicable to do any of the following to reduce the impact of the rulemaking on small business:**

- Establish less stringent compliance or reporting requirements in the rulemaking for small business.
- Establish less stringent schedules or deadlines in the rulemaking for compliance or reporting requirements for small business.
- Consolidate or simplify the rulemaking's compliance or reporting requirements for small business.
- Establish performance standards to replace design or operational standards in the rulemaking for small business.
- Exempt small business from any or all requirements of the rulemaking.

**If legal and feasible, how does the rulemaking use a method discussed above to reduce the substantial impact on small business?**

The rescission of Chapter 3 has no substantial impact on small business.

*Text of Proposed Rulemaking*

ITEM 1. Rescind and reserve **129—Chapter 3**.