

Technology Advisory Board (TAB) Meeting – 10/26/2017

Present at meeting: Scott Tingley, Reid Demman, Zach Posner, Adam Gardiner, Carlton Christensen, Scott Baird, Rick Graham, Megan Hillyard, Scott Carver, Brad Kendrick, Wayne Cushing, Lisa Ashman, Erin Litvack, Chris Stavros

NOTES:

Ordinance Review – Megan Hillyard

- Revisions approved by Council on 10/17/17

Proposed TAB Structure Zach Posner

- Zach Posner: SRB and TAB Structure, Oversight and new working groups. Want a functional working group to make it useful to make decisions and recommendations. Pretty good job in past year and a half. Not sure if they are any different, suspect reason why we came to those questions is because we weren't given appropriate tools and recommendations. Should expand TAB, "Purpose of Tab is to establish policy standards to ensure effective information technology to achieve technology goal and stakeholders".
- We need significant organizational input. IS has been in the basement and need governance help. Asking for more integration. Came up with concept for 3 working groups that exist under technology group. In order to enable these things and not make them rigid, we need a better governance policy. Ensure county as a whole is making collective decisions.
- Proposing update to SRB, provide that technical insight. Technology solution makes sense. What technology makes sense and what doesn't? To be able to say, significant cost, we need to evaluate projects differently.
- Portfolio working group focused both on portfolio roadmap. Where we should be going with projects and providing project status? We can work those details out.

Governance Working Group:

- Output: overall strategy and policy. Should we stay on this or that platform? Make requests to other working groups.
- Outputs:
 - o IT Strategies & Policies
 - o Direction Statements & County Wide Roadmaps
 - o Governance Risk / Budget Implications
 - o Requests to other Working Groups

-

Solution and Technology Working Group

- Providing standards and initiative.
- Outputs:

- SLCO Technologies & Solutions List Modifications
- Technologies for Solutions
- Technology & Solution Standards
- Technology & Solution Roadmaps
- Technology & Solutions Risk / Budget Implications
- Requests to other Working Groups

-

Portfolio & Project Working Group

- Outputs:
 - Impact Considerations (Technology, Risk & Budget)
 - Project Prioritization
 - Project & Portfolio Standards
 - Recommendations on Overall Project & Portfolio Roadmaps
 - Recommendations on Major Project Issues (red)
 - Project & Portfolio Risk / Budget Implications
 - Requests to other Working Groups
- Project recommendations.
- To be able to bring decisions to TAB for recommendations. Greater input and help us make better decisions.
- Most of us get emotionally tied to project and it's hard to let go. Make recommendation to TAB that it isn't working, and killing them early.

Z: Want these groups to be 5-7 people, small group. IS leader, and initiator. Each one will have its own people. Ability to reach out.

Adam: Membership based on change or project?

Z: It will be the same people.

Scott Carver: There's been sometimes that where we have staff that comes up with ideas and what was the county standard? Having some kind of forward thinking and discussion will help a lot of conversations. How are you going to go about choosing the folks? Because you want the right people.

Z: For governance, it will be a partnership between Trevor and help go out and find those people. Care about the most, some sense of skill or some infinity of the group they are in. Want it to be an actual working group.

Scott Carver: Can you walk through, how this will work if bringing a project forward. How do these groups influence?

Z: Let's say you have an initiative going forward, through the BTP we come back and see if it's viable. Once it looks like a real thing, we want to use Governance Group to set standard; those standards will

guide the work. Great idea but does it fit in with technology of the county? Then project and portfolio takes over, and if it makes sense, providing that the project is well and effective.

Scott Carver: Time frame that it will take? Beneficial once we have that need, we put people on notice. And the that project is more developed and refined, so I am assuming before RFP goes out it will go through some process, right?

Z: Yes, some of your folks might be in the group as well. One of my challenges is speed to innovation is a big challenge for me. We are often not able to turn the ship quickly. We were trying to do everything as well as we can. We talked a lot about whether concept documents were good enough; we got a quarter of the budget we asked for. I think if we got a group earlier on, they probably could have said that of the 30ish concept documents submitted, we know that the council might just approve 5 of them. Early pass but we can only fund so much. I think there would be a process of first base of what we really want to focus on.

Trevor: One point I want to make, talking about lead time, technology existing used, it will go through the system faster. If we have to evaluate newer technology, it will take a longer lead time. Use what we have to see if it's appropriate first, and often that's the way we advance in technology, those exceptions of what the business thinks opposed to what we think they need.

Z: As we get more mature of our standards, we can accelerate. Whereas if it's out of our standard it will be a greater cost.

Scott Carver: So there are projects that are external that can affect us, such as Hexagon. State has multiple demands and requests coming to us. They will say this is the process. Is there a different process or we come and identify our priority?

Lisa Ashman: We have no choice to comply so it will be good to understand how we address those types of things. Many times, we can't go through lengthy process that traditional model of this group can get done.

Scott Tingley: We are required to comply with short turnaround, so we face the same challenges as well. Ad hock and call IS and something we need to be aware of.

Lisa Ashman: No control over that process.

Megan Hillyard: Not a new technology implementation and it's a business process?

Lisa: Can do both. Can be rule changes and governance and organizations. And nobody knew about it until recently. That happened so we need to roll that in to consideration implementing that requirement.

Zach Posner: If it's a mandate, then it's a mandate. I think we need to be flexible.

Tony Jolley: Give exposure and accounting of where we can get our capability. Another reason why it will be effective and helpful to us.

Erin Litvack: We should be notifying fiscal and proactively unfunded mandate aren't all that uncommon, it provides protection to Mayor and influences if they support the legislation. Something we are always monitoring.

Zach Posner: reiterate the point, we want the group to be small because we can call the group and chomp it out pretty quickly.

Tony Jolley: As Megan mentioned earlier, a few months ago we did surveys and we got 60 ideas on how to improve TAB. As we have gone through this process, what were the top 10 issues and how we are going to approach that with suggestions by those that participated in that survey. How do we understand what needs to be done to keep the lights on? Existing processes, minimize as much as we can and spend more time on new initiatives. How can TAB help us with that? Critical success factor and we will be monitoring that. Maturity of any IS, we have numbers already but they're not solid enough to show yet. Stay tuned on that one.

Tony Jolley: Not getting much involvement beyond those on the board, expanded TAB membership. Need to be more than review meeting, any project that needs IS resources, discuss with working group that will be bringing updates/suggestions to TAB.

Tony Jolley: How does library fit in TAB? Library will have a voice now.

Project Scoring, you will be getting feedback and understand where the project scores and we put something on hold and what needs to be done.

Budget Approval taking longer, we will need to bring the process earlier. Business Technology group, we can work on it better.

Focus on bigger picture, review projects too much instead of strategy, Portfolio management group will work on that.

8. Should be on agenda on how we are going to do that.

9. For the CIO presentation on critical issues should be on TAB agenda, what should go before the Council and go in front of the Mayor? Regular issue.

10. In the past we have done it by delivery area, portfolio group can take care of that.

T: Will be happy to answer any more questions. We heard your concerns and try to figure out a way to respond to them.

Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair-Megan

Megan: Important that this body is owned by the business, we started Tab a year and a half ago. We matured enough that business directs this meeting. Proper course to accept nomination for chair and vice. Open vocal votes.

Scott Baird: Can we review voting member are?

M: Every elected office will have membership and designate whoever you feel is appropriate. Then the mayor portfolio has 5 designations, representative is Rick Graham, Erin Litvack, Kimmie will take over for Megan in a month or so. Reid made the motion for Adam to be the chair.

Carlton: Second.

Adam: Nominate Carl Christensen for vice chair.

Scott: Second

M: All in favor to close.

M: All in favor voting Adam to be chair for TAB. (Passed unanimously)

All in favor Carlton Christensen as vice chair. (Passed unanimously)

Meeting Schedule for 2017 and 2018

Ginger: Next meeting, November 13th.

Do these dates still work for the group?

Propose the 4th Thursday for 2018, get that setup that would be great.

Good to schedule.

Adam: Before we move on, do we want to careful about adopting working groups as official groups, meetings. Do we want to take motion that we accept that motion on these working groups with Zach.

Reid: Move.

Erin: Second.

Issues to Communicate to Mayor

Scott Carver: Notified by the court, as of this week, we're mandating that all probable cause statement from jail needs to be electronically submitted. Weren't notified of date, haven't established system. Court did back off, hard date no longer in place, giving us time to establish system in the jail. Huge thing because we're booking basically 100 people a day. Big deal, our internal staff.

Jerome: We do try to communicate, Zach has meeting with sheriff office to get bigger in that issue.

Scott Carver: With the Hexagon project, Hexagon has to establish connection, electronically work. They were unaware of it as well. Nobody was aware.

Z: Told by who?

Lisa: The State.

Scott Carver: I am assuming everyone is up to speed on Hexagon, so nothing of concern there, right? Nobody has raised concerns about the County involvement. Greg Morris is our IS liaison.

Jerome: Beg to differ, there's always issues. Marvin Conrad, departed and left that on Jerome. We have a lot of conversations.

Lisa: We participated in that as well.

Z: Is it appropriate to get into Mayor's cabinet to let people be aware? So as these come up, follow up and make sure general awareness of issues out there.

Rick Graham: top 10 lists, are there issues existing keeping the lights on that we need to address?

Z: Longer conversation but were done during budget process.

Scott Baird: Mainframe migration, is that keep the lights on thing?

Z: I agree.

Tony: It's little of both, we certainly asked for more funding than that. But there was good news for project manager. We're using the time on that we have resource and availability. Certainly does not speed the process but not losing continuity.

Scott Baird: Who's the project manager on that?

Tony: Angela Cortese.

Adam: Do we have a date of when mainframe migration completed?

Tony: Contingent. We have a chart for that.

Z: Issue of funding as well. Asked for funds primarily for consulting knowledge, we got the PM to help direct internal resources, not a firm date.

Scott Baird: Do we have a summary of what successfully moved over and what we have left?

Tony: I can speak on how many we have left those that have been moved.

Trevor: 10-20 moved effectively.

Tony: 14 that are left, and we have a meeting on that today. Actively pursuing that, elephant on the table is Harris.

Trevor: Still information residing on mainframe, so when I refer to 10-20 its real components. There's other smaller, but there's still information on it so it's a complex question.

Megan: Part of what we review is budget bucket. To keep that continuity, larger bucket in ideal situation gotten for mass migration was \$600k, pretty unlikely so hoping to continue with Angela to keep progress going.

Adams: Let's not approve the groups, but use a motion to give go ahead to form group.

Motion: Reid

Second: Erin

All approve.

Action Items:

Create working groups for IS.

Form Groups.