NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Information Technology Advisory Board's
Subcommittee on Governance

Locations: Washoe County Administration Complex
1001 East Ninth Street
Building C, Room 236
Reno, Nevada 89520

Simultaneous videoconference to
Clark County Government Center
500 Grand Central Parkway
Sandstone Conference Room, 4th Floor
Las Vegas, NV 89155

Date and Time: Tuesday, June 19, 2012 at 3:00 p.m.

Some members may attend telephonically.

Below is an agenda of all items to be considered. All items which are potential action items are noted as such. Items on the agenda may be taken out of order, combined for consideration, or removed from the agenda at any time at the discretion of the Committee.

1. Call to Order   **Possible Action**

Parker: So let's call this meeting to order. It's June 19, 2012, 3:06 p.m.

2. Roll Call   **Possible Action**

Parker: Let's take roll. Cory Casazza?

Casazza: Here.

Parker: Laura Fucci? Can she not hear us? We're muted. Hello, Laura?

Fucci: Hi.

Parker: Hi. We just called the meeting to order, but we didn't realize we were muted, so I'll do it again. It's June 19, 2012, 3:06 p.m. We're taking roll. Cory Casazza?

Casazza: Here.

Parker: Laura?

1

Fucci: Here.

Parker: And myself, Carrie Parker. We also have present David Gustafson.

3. Public Comment   **Information/Discussion**

Parker: So now in the Agenda we have public comment. Any public comment? Any in the south?

Fucci: No.

Parker: Okay.

Note: No vote or action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. NRS 241.020.

4. Chair remarks regarding purpose of Subcommittee   **Information/Discussion**

Parker: Hearing none, we'll move on to Agenda Item 4, chair remarks regarding the purpose of the subcommittee. So as you all know, this subcommittee was created by the Information Technology Advisory Board. We're the subcommittee on governance. And our role is to make recommendations to the full Board regarding governance, and more specifically, priorities to facilitate consolidation, what needs to be the focus, especially in relation to security. As you know from the last Board meeting, it's likely that our subcommittee will be disbanded at the next full meeting, but I thought that since we already had the meeting scheduled, it would be a good opportunity to get your opinions as you are experts in the field, and to get recommendations also from David so that as Chair I can give those to the full Board. So I thank you for meeting even though we know our subcommittee is doomed.

Casazza: Short-lived is probably a better word.

Parker: So the Chair of the main Board, Joe Marcella, requested that the subcommittees create a document similar to the one that Kevin had created in relation to application modernization and citizen enablement. So he -- Kevin had created a document that had three categories, a recommendation, an issue and an explanation, so I thought if we could create something similar to that, and I have that down as Agenda Item 8. So after we've heard the presentations and digested that, our meeting's only scheduled for an hour, so hopefully we can be nice and to the point. So that's my goal for this subcommittee that may only have one meeting. Any questions or comments?

Fucci: What were those three sections again?

Parker: Okay. The three sections are -- on Kevin's paper he had a recommendation, and that was just one sentence, and an example for citizen enablement was select and implement a common mobile application development platform for developing mobile web-based applications and develop a single citizen facing application for all agencies. And then the second category was issue. And he had two paragraphs just describing what the issue is, and briefly, mobile devices are rapidly becoming ubiquitous throughout Nevada and the country. Soon they'll be the most common types of devices and, you know, he just kind of explains the issue. And then the third category is explanation. The State has an opportunity to create a common mobile web presence across agencies and provide citizens with a single mobile application capable of delivering whatever state services may require, and then it goes on for a couple paragraphs. So I thought if we could do something similar for governance, just kind of a general view of what we identify as the main

2

issue or issues, an explanation of it, just a paragraph or two, and then what our recommendation is. That's the goal. Let's see if we can meet it. Any other questions, comments?

Gustafson: Can I speak out of turn?

Parker: Yes.

Gustafson: I think to keep it short and concise, I would probably say find a framework of such that's a common framework, and probably that would be my first recommendation. Otherwise, you're not going to fit it into a paragraph or two otherwise. I mean, you can see these presentations are...

Parker: Right.

Gustafson: …more substantial than a paragraph or two, and if you go off on the custom track, then you're definitely gonna have a lot more work cut out for you.

Parker: Right. So just kind of a common framework?

Gustafson: Yeah.

Parker: Yeah. And so the goal is also in the context of the strategic plan to give David a recommendation for -- well, to give the Board a recommendation, and the Board would give David the recommendation.

Gustafson: Don't you love how that works?

Parker: Yeah, bureaucracy.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Parker: That's what we do.

Gustafson: That's right.

Parker: Any other comments?

Fucci: No.

5. Presentation by David Gustafson, CIO, EITS   **Information/Discussion**
                                                                            Possible Action

    - current state of IT governance (15,000 foot level)
    - current process, policy and procedure for governance
    - what is needed, especially with regard to
      the strategic plan and security concerns
    - possible adoption of David's recommendations

Parker: Okay. So let's go to Agenda Item 5, the presentation by David.

Gustafson: Oh, look at that. Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair. For the record, David Gustafson. I looked at some of the things that you were asking, you need to come present on. I have some notes here, and in the sensitivity of time, I'm going to be brief and quick, and ask questions as we go here.

Casazza: And just for reference, that clock does not work, and we cannot find a AA battery anywhere in the complex, so…

Parker: Oh, so I -- when I…

Gustafson: Oh, so it's not actually 9:05 a.m.?

Parker: I even looked at it when we did the time before.

Gustafson: That's even worse. It's 3:12 now. So, yeah, what I wanted to do is, I sat down and started thinking about in the context of governance of what we were good at, some of the things we weren't so good at, some of the things we're kind of half doing and not so great, and then some things that we're just flat out not doing at all. So I wanted to start out with security because I think it's one of the better things that we do. We have an IT security committee meeting that meets every month, and they recommend policies and procedures and positions on information security. We have over 35 policies that are established for security. Those are all on our website, it.nv.gov. If you go under the governance section, you'll see our policies and procedures. Those are all of our security policies at the moment.

What this particular committee is comprised of, information security officers from executive branch agencies and they sit down and they talk about the threats that are -- that we're facing in today policies, procedures, things that are coming up, NRS changes we need to make, positions on encryption, that kind of stuff. They make recommendations through the Chair, who is Chris Ipson, the Chief Information Security Officer, that end up on my desk at some point or another. I am charged by NRS with creating and establishing these policies and procedures, and I do that through this IT security committee. I would say 90 percent plus go through the committee. I don't arbitrarily make my own security policies, but I certainly do have that authority if I needed to, but I'd like to get the recommendations through the committee to do that. Purchasing -- so that's sort of the security piece of it.

The purchasing part of it, which is another big aspect of governance, which is how do we control the spending and how are we making sure that we're spending our money wisely. Statute affords the division of enterprise, IT services, final approval on IT purchases. So we do have authority to stop purchasing, but that is in the procurement phase of purchasing, the final steps. There is in our SAM manual as we call it, the State Administrative Manual…

Parker: Yes.

Gustafson: …there's guidance established in there about what we can do, where they -- when they should be asking for further approvals and things. There's guidelines that are established already. And then the purchasing piece, we review all IT contracts, at least we're supposed to. At least all the ones -- we do see quite a bit of them, so as far as that's the purchasing piece.

When IT requests are made through the TIR process, this is what Dave Miller was presenting last time, that's the Technology Investment Request. Those are for IT projects that are 50,000 or more. Those go through a whole life cycle amongst themselves. You guys had that presentation. We also have what we call the TWE, which are the TIR Waiver for Enhancement, and those are not big enough to be a full blown project, but some hybrid of sorts in between. And so in that process, that's a dramatically reduced process,

4

and just what your expected benefits, how much is it gonna cost, you know, that kind of stuff, and those are usually a lot easier. What we don't have is -- we don't have -- how do I say this, follow through or oversight on the process after that. Even while it's in the project management lifecycle, and at the end of that where a project would say we're gonna save millions of dollars, we have no oversight to see if those benefits were actually realized. And I'll kind of -- I'll tie that back up when I talk about recommendations.

Generally speaking, we establish standards for, you know, servers, desktops, networks, programming, all that kind of stuff. We're charged with NRS to do so, and we're in the process of bringing all those to the website -- to our website. I am currently working on a state strategic plan for IT, and I've already been working on that. Also, as part of SAM, we require any project that is over $50,000 or more to have an IT project manager, a QA manager and project oversight staff already required in the State Administrative Manual.

So that's pretty much about the gist of our governance as it is. I wanted to make five recommendations to the Board. One of them is complete a real IT strategic plan. I think that's -- that's something that I'm working on now, but I think that needs to happen. The ones that we've had in the past have been lacking to say the least. I would like to see some way to get more involved in the beginning of the business processes, meaning by the time we see a purchase request in the system and we have agencies who are looking to get that approved, it's a little bit late in the game to be determining whether we already solutions in place, whether their requests are even appropriate or that the quotes they received are accurate and timely and those kinds of things. It's a little bit late in the game when you're at the final state of purchasing something.

There's no real project oversight. We used to have what we call the IT Project Oversight Committee, the ITPOC. We no longer have that, so there's no project oversight. Once a TIR is approved and it goes back to the agency and the agency kicks off their multi-million dollar project, it's just off into the sunset it goes and we have no visibility of whether it's on track, whether it's not, whether it's meeting goals or it's not, you know, all those kinds of things.

Fourth, the overall process lacks review of expected benefits. I sort of spoke about that earlier. After the project has been implemented, are we actually realizing the benefits or the ROI that was established as part of the project selection process. And then lastly, I would just say is that there's no formal asset management process, meaning we have no -- there's no real inventory of all state assets, or that these projects are intended to replace these assets that are aging or out of support or anything like that. There's no way for us to reconcile and manage our asset management inventory because it's too convoluted, there's just not enough structure around that process. So with that, those are the top things that came to my mind. I'll be happy to answer any questions. Yes.

Fucci: So, Dave, I heard four, and I thought you said you have five, so I must have missed one.

Gustafson: Yeah. Okay.

Fucci: You said complete the IT Strategic Plan.

Gustafson: Yes.

Fucci: You want IT to be more involved with the business processes so you're not just catching it at the tail end.

Gustafson: Right.

Fucci: Right now there's no project oversight after the project's approved, so you'd like to have more involvement there.

Gustafson: Correct.

Fucci: And that there's no asset management process. So what did I miss?

Gustafson: Yeah. And then number four I had -- yeah. No. Number four was process lacks review of expected benefits. So the post-mortem if you will.

Fucci: Ah. Okay. Thank you.

Gustafson: Yeah, you're welcome. So I think that we -- we do very good at the TIR process which is the actual how you get to a selection and all this kind of stuff, but then once it goes back to the agencies, it just goes into the ether, and we have no oversight of it, and we wouldn't know if the projects were ten years late and $100 million over. We would not know that.

Fucci: Great.

Gustafson: Yeah, great.

Parker: And what's the difference between number three, project oversight, and number four, review of expected benefits? Are those kind of together?

Gustafson: They can be. So to me, when I say no project oversight, meaning while the project is going on. A project has a definitive date, and so while the project is going on we have no concept of whether it's on target, if it's off target, is it red, yellow, green, is it managed correctly, are there statuses being reported timely to the stakeholders, you know, that kind of stuff. And then when I say number four, where we lack the post-mortem part of that, so the project ends and then, you know, six months or a year later, are we actually realizing the benefits of what the project was initially supposed to do.

Parker: I see.

Gustafson: Yes, Mr. Casazza?

Casazza: Three, four and five are kind of, at least in my mind, a function of a project management office.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Casazza: Is that where you would eventually like to go? And I know that's a big huge culture change, and it's not something that you can implement overnight, but is -- would that be a strategic direction that you want to get to a project management office that would have their fingers in, or at least some high level oversight on projects even if they remain -- those departments remain decentralized, or…

Gustafson: Yes. As a matter of fact, part of our budget request going into next legislative session is to establish a unit. I call them customer service relations -- customer relations, and in that is two parts really. There's a PMO and then there's a service planning part of it. And to me, that PMO is the actually bits the -- the guys on the boots are on the ground. The service planning guys are tell me more about business, what you want to do in the next couple years kind of thing. So I am requesting to create that unit that will consist

of those two parts in my budget. But I think it would be a great recommendation from the IT Advisory Board to create such an entity that would serve the businesses, don't you agree?

Casazza: Of course I do. I just -- I know we've tried a couple times in our organization to do a project management office and just don't have the resources, and I don't think our organization has the culture to be able to do it. On the customer service side, we've implemented -- we call them relationship facilitators where it's somebody not normally involved with the department and we go out and meet with those departments. Some of them monthly, some every quarter, depending on the size of the department. And a lot of it is just having a different face from our department to go meet with them, but another part is do that of what are the business processes that you have that need improvement. And it brings a ton of work out to us, but it also gives us a chance to work with those departments and prioritize them and say, okay, we have 10 things on the list, we have 40 other lists. You know, we can do number one and two and let's…

Gustafson: Right.

Casazza: And it's not a lengthy process. It's something that we'll have those meetings, they'll be, I mean, sometimes 20 minutes, 30 minutes, but it just is a good -- it gets us together and really builds that customer relationship piece where they understand we have a bunch of other projects going on, so they know what resources we can commit and which ones we can't. But then also, it gives us a monthly prioritization with them of, okay, you want this, then, you know, you see it on the list, we're bringing it up. And, you know, it's not that we're going to quit working on something, but, you know, we're juggling five things now instead of four, and it just has really helped us a lot maintain a great relationship, or improve our relationship with our user departments by doing something like that.

Gustafson: And I think as we mature as a full-fledged IT organization, you know, our focus has largely been infrastructure, and as we become more business centric, we need the business to interact with people who can bridge the gap between IT and business. And right now we have business people who are directly communicating with chief IT managers who are highly technical IT managers and it's not appropriate for them to be doing that because they sometimes talk different languages and they get things more confusing probably than they should. So we want to bridge that gap of how do we really dramatically improve our customer service and our outreach and sort of try to speak the language of the business and that's what I'm hoping to accomplish.

Casazza: Okay.

Gustafson: Something like what you have.

Casazza: We only have half of your -- we do struggle with the project management piece and it's, you know, it's just culturally in our organization we can come up with these are the priorities until a commissioner or a county manager or somebody says….

Gustafson: Layer eight, you know. Anytime layer eight gets involved, you know, it's …

Casazza: Exactly.

Gustafson: What do you do, you know? But, you know, we need to be…

Fucci: So…

Gustafson: Yeah, go ahead.

Fucci: So, you know, we have a couple of those challenges that you mentioned. We -- when I started here, I had just the infrastructure side of the house and now I have it all. Right now I have applications and infrastructure, so I have grown into that full-fledged service unit. The engagement people that you are referring to, we call -- those are our business analysts…

Gustafson: Mm-hmm.

Fucci: …that get into the details of what the business processes are and what they're -- what the department's requirements are. But I was able to establish a project management office when I got here, but we had to disband it as part of our cost cutting. So, you know, we've had -- we lost so many people and positions with the whole economic downturn that that was something that we had let go of. But we were able to build a lot of the processes, you know, like the status reporting and the, you know, the request process, the monitoring process, the peer review process, and we were able to build all that out, so we still use a lot of that. We just don't have it centralized within a single office. But there's another facet that -- there's a couple other things that we do. Because of the size of our organization, and I would think that would be a challenge with you at the state, the sheer size of your customer base, you know, how we -- how we can handle that, you know, being just one agency, how you deal with all those different disparate and diverse organizations, and so we kind of, you know, we developed the whole community of interest concept, and we grouped them into four or five community of interests, and we work with them together and that really helps them to develop some common approaches, right, and helps us to streamline some of the application sets so that we're not just all doing our own thing, and they work together better that way. The other thing is that, you know, when you talk about items two -- let's see, what is it, two, three and four all being project management, the one that has to do with getting IT more involved in the business, that really -- there's a component of that that has flowed more to portfolio management.

Gustafson: Mm-hmm.

Fucci: And I am directly involved in the portfolio management on this. So it's a little bit different than just managing the projects, and it's a little bit different than the one to one engagement that my business analysts are doing with the departments, and I'm trying to manage the whole portfolio, right? And so when requests come in and how we do the prioritization, we do that against target objectives for our portfolio as well, so you can try to not get so overwhelmed, right?

Gustafson: Yeah.

Fucci: So just some other thoughts along that.

Gustafson: And as a matter of fact, the…

Fucci: Looking at the…

Gustafson: Yeah, yeah, what I want to do, Laura, is sort of get the PMO kick started with some skeleton crew, and then really get into portfolio management, because I want to be able at any point in time, whether it be the budget director or the Governor himself, or the legislature say what's going on right now, I need to be able to just kick out a report and say here's all the projects that are going on right now, and by the way, here's the status on where they're all that. To further that, I'd like to build a web dashboard for the Governor so that he can go in at any point in time and see what projects are going on, and I like to call them those ecosystems that you're calling the communities of interest, tell me about the public safety, or tell me about the health and human services, or tell me about the revenue generating aspect of the state. Tell me,

you know, we can put those projects in those ecosystems and run reports on them. Right now it's just a free for all.

Fucci: Right. And so -- and the way that we've done that here with the economic impact is…

Gustafson: Yeah.

Fucci: …you know, we've done it with spreadsheets and not with a nice cool portfolio management system, but, you know, and then we've established our objectives in our portfolio, right, so we established what we're trying to monitor and measure against, so I have only so many large major projects going on at any one time, and I have so many small projects going on…

Gustafson: Right.

Fucci: …and I have so many projects that are impacting the justice community versus the health and human services community, and so I kind of keep an eye on all of that to make sure everybody's getting some, you know, level of service, and that I'm not just doing all major projects. I feel like I'm doing all major projects, because that's when I get involved.

Gustafson: Right.

Fucci: And so I have this feeling that that's all we do, and so it really helps me to kind of see all the work that IT is working on, right?

Gustafson: And, you know…

Fucci: So I don't know if any of that is helpful to you, but…

Gustafson: No. You talk about resource capacity planning.

Fucci: Right.

Gustafson: You are dead accurate and you are absolutely right about that. Without having to -- the portfolio view, you can't manage your resources most effectively because you need to know when there's too many dba's out there, or too many programmers that aren't allocated, or if you're way over allocating, you need to know that.

Fucci: And so probably being a, you know, the kind of cost center that you are at the state, you probably already do that, and that was something that we started to do probably about a year and a half ago is, you know, everybody in IT tracks their time. I know what everyone's doing…

Gustafson: Right.

Fucci: …per task, you know, per hour, that type of stuff. But that was all a maturing process here.

Gustafson: Right. And so what I want to do is I want to basically kick start it with a skeleton crew and watch it grow.

Fucci: Yeah.

9

Gustafson: But that would be a great recommendation, you know. I mean, if you would say something like that, that would be really, really neat, wouldn't you think, Laura?

Fucci: Yeah. You also mentioned security, and I don't know, Cory, how you're doing security. A lot of the portfolio management stuff, oh, here at the county is, you know, it's all team, it's all collaborative, there's a lot of input from all the different departments. There's an executive steering committee that has the final approval process, there's the county management team and so forth. But I haven't taken the same approach with security, you know. I don't find security to be as consensus building and collaborative.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Fucci: I find that too many cooks in the kitchen can kind of cause a messy kitchen, and so I have taken a harder stance in the area of security policy, and I kind of define it with my security officer. I have a smaller team that defines it. And then before we implement, you know, we send it out for comment and review, and see if there's any big gotchas. And I have also put in an exception process, so if somebody has an exception to the security process, I have the documented process for review of any exceptions, right, that the audit department can, you know, have on their file and so forth, and I can -- and I'm involved in approving any exceptions to security. But I just thought I'd throw that out there. For us I felt that, you know, and we're very distributed, just, you know.

Gustafson: Mm-hmm.

Fucci: I haven't gotten to the full consolidation stuff, so…

Gustafson: Yeah.

Casazza: And, Laura, we've done the same thing with security and also with infrastructure, you know, as far as file servers, network and all that equipment. We don't give anybody a choice on what they get. It's -- I mean, we control the infrastructure and we control the security. And like you said, I mean, we communicate out. We let people know why we're getting what we're getting or why we come out with those policies, but it's just we feel that the infrastructure is ours and that's something that we don't want to lose control of, otherwise we'll end up with 20 different network vendors…

Fucci: Yeah.

Casazza: …and a million different servers and it's just easier for us to maintain it sticking with one or two vendors.

Gustafson: Which is part of the problem we have actually. And part of the problem with consolidation is, you know, some of these agencies are using Hewlett Packard switches, some of them are using Juniper switches, some of them are using Cisco, some of them have Cisco equipment that's so old it's no longer supported. You know, and so we are -- it's a huge challenge of ours. It's an interesting precarious situation. But I want to say, Laura, about security, I agree with you, too many cooks in the kitchen. We actually had an LCB legislative security audit, and one of their findings was that it took too long to get things approved through the committee, because it seems like every month a new person can object to language that they agreed to like last time. It's just really kind of interesting how that works out. And so we kind of get to a place now where we kind of say, no, here's the way it's gonna be. If the majority of you say it's okay, then so be it, we're sending it off to Dave and he's gonna ink it and we're done. So we've sort of learned our lesson a little bit on that one about letting them talk too much about it, but we do want to feel -- well, and it's because of the way we're built right now. We're a fragmented IT environment, so we want to get them

involved in the process and feel like they have input, but there is a point in time when we say there's enough debating, it's time for a vote, and we're sort of learning that balance now as we go.

Fucci: We have the same issue that you have with inventory management process. You know, we have -- we track assets and SAP, but it's not the IT inventory that we need to track. I have an RFP out, responses are due this week, to have somebody help us develop the process. I really think it's around the process and not around the technology. I have technology to track it, I just need the process developed. So just to let you know that that's a -- especially when we talk about all these different, you know, points of entry and all that.

Gustafson: Yeah, you can't stop it. Aren't you guys a Symantec shop?

Fucci: For security.

Gustafson: Yeah. Are you guys using…

Fucci: Right.

Gustafson: So are you guys using Altiris?

Fucci: I think -- no. I'm not sure. I couldn't tell you.

Gustafson: So we're gonna use -- in the Department of Administration, and every consolidated agency hereafter, we're gonna use Altiris on the endpoints, and that will allow us to do third-party patching and all this kind of good stuff. It allows us to lock the endpoints down. But what it also does is it allows centralized reporting of all the -- it does -- and you can manage and everything it pulls, you know, stepping of the processors, you know. I mean, it's good, everything. So what I want to use is, I want to use Altiris to help us get the inventory under control as well. We'll have the Change Management Database, the CMDB. So -- because there's just -- it's out of control. And to your point, anybody that I'm aware of right now can go buy an iPad at the Apple store under their, you know, their credit card, charge it back to the state for reimbursement to whatever and away they go. You know, nobody would even know they bought it.

Casazza: Or bring in their one from home.

Gustafson: Or bring it their one from home or, you know, so, yeah, we have no real good way of tracking those things, but desktops, laptops and servers now, we're gonna start to use Altiris so that we can manage that infrastructure. It's -- and, you know, I mean, you get -- it's just so -- the challenge is so immense I'm not even sure where to start. You have to start one department at a time I guess. So I'd be curious to see what you -- what your result is on your RFP.

Fucci: Okay. I'll keep you posted.

Gustafson: I appreciate that.

Parker: Anything else?

Gustafson: Cory, what else?

Casazza: No. I'm just trying to think of how we can make some progress and get some things -- some recommendations that we agree on that help you out.

Gustafson: Okay.

Parker: So do you want to discuss his top five then? It sounds to me like one overarching recommendation could be to set up a PMO, and then that would grab multiple…

Gustafson: Several of them.

Parker: Mm-hmm.

Gustafson: Cory, do you agree?

Casazza: Oh, definitely. What do you think, I'm gonna say no?

Gustafson: She was waiting (inaudible).

Parker: Or…

Gustafson: Something.

Casazza: I'm just trying to think of a way to phrase the recommendation into one sentence or something short, and especially if what you're thinking of is customer service project management office, is there a name that would help legislators or help the administration understand, you know, can we call it something, implement a -- something that makes a lot of sense to them and that they can recognize?

Gustafson: I think PMO, I mean, to me PMO makes sense, for at least part of it. The Project Management Office, the PMO.

Fucci: Well, yeah. And so the PMO is about the execution, right?

Gustafson: Right.

Fucci: But that's not on the IT governance, right?

Gustafson: No, it's not.

Fucci: I mean, we need to -- we need to have something that talks about…

Gustafson: Yeah, I don't -- I don't know how you…

Fucci: …you know, how you…

Gustafson: How are you gonna do the whole enchilada though? Maybe like (inaudible) or something like that?

Fucci: Who -- wait, well, what is your -- what is your IT governance? I mean, do you have somebody over you that you report to that is composed of…

Gustafson: No.

Fucci: …your customer base or anything like that, some kind of committee, some kind of steering committee? You don't have a steering committee for IT?

Gustafson: No. That's what the ITAB was supposed to do.

Parker: We're it, huh?

Gustafson: You're it.

Fucci: We're an advisory (inaudible).

Gustafson: And I want you to know this, before…

Fucci: We're advising, we're not steering.

Gustafson: You are advising. And before one of the -- one of the positions when I was talking to the Governor was that in absence of the IT Advisory Board, it is just David doing what he wants, and I think that's inappropriate for anybody. So I serve many customers. We have 417 customers, and I need input from all the customers. And to me, the IT Advisory Board is how I get input from private sector, from people you wouldn't traditionally think such as the Attorney General's office, from our major users of our systems. And so with all of that, and even though it isn't an advisory capacity, it still should weigh heavy on where the direction of IT is steering. But I'm appointed by the Governor and there's nowhere -- there's nobody else to, you know, to tell me what to do I guess in that way. There's no, like, overarching advisory board or business unit or anything like that.

Casazza: So for recommendation is it -- are you looking for just like…

Gustafson: How about…

Casazza: Go ahead.

Gustafson: How about -- I mean, what about -- have you guys thought about Cobit or something like that? How do you guys, you know, they have the whole maturity model around governance and things. I mean, there's Cobit, there's…

Casazza: Itil.

Gustafson: …Itil.

Casazza: Laura has a lot.

Fucci: That's what -- those are like security standards, Itil's a process, the framework that you would follow for IT practices.

Gustafson: Service, yeah. That's why I say I don't know that you're gonna have one sentence that says implement blah and you're done. I mean, I think you're probably going to have a couple of them (inaudible).

Casazza: Yeah. But what would the recommendations be to implement like a customer service project management division group that provides project oversight on all IT projects including post-implementation reviews.

Gustafson: Let me distill it even more, that -- to focus on -- and by the way, I just built these descriptions for my budget so let me see if I get this right. To focus on the customer needs, in our case to build operational plans in the service planning unit which is then translated into projects for the business and tracked from concept to implementation in the world according to David.

Casazza: Cradle to grave.

Gustafson: That's right. You know, and what I want to do is I want a unit that somebody wakes up in the middle of the night or falls out of the bed and says, ah-ha, I've got an idea. They can call this team and this team says, that's a great idea, let's start the process. The next thing you know, that goes from a concept, an idea, all the way through to project prioritization to a project that is implemented -- that is tracked, you know, designed, implemented and then followed through at some point. You know, project review if you would. And what I want this unit to do in the world according to me is to manage in a weird way the other more technical units of the department or the division. So there could be programming aspects, there could be networking pieces and servers and infrastructure and storage and enterprise architecture is one that, you know, we didn't talk about. There's security aspects of every project, so who's that overarching entity that would coordinate all that stuff?

Casazza: I mean, it probably has to be that group.

Gustafson: Yeah, of course I think that…

Casazza: I mean, it's your PMO or -- it has to be that group.

Gustafson: Correct.

Fucci: So you're saying your PMO would oversee your operations group?

Gustafson: No, for projects.

Fucci: Okay.

Gustafson: Yeah, but they would coordinate developers, server guys, all this kind of stuff to make sure that their tasks were on time and on schedule as they related to the project, and then report back, but to the business units.

Casazza: But not the day-to-day oversight of those units.

Gustafson: No.

Casazza: Just more of a…

Gustafson: Project based.

Casazza: Okay.

Gustafson: Great. Anymore questions?

Parker: So we'll need a motion. I'll entertain a motion. We have, you know, we can combine these Agenda items, so Agenda Item 8 is creation of subcommittee's recommendations. We also have under Agenda Item 5, possible adoption of David's recommendations. So…

Gustafson: Do you guys want to run through your stuff? Or do you think you -- that you have enough out of me?

Casazza: That's a -- I'm not going to answer that.

Gustafson: I mean, let me just say, you guys are both CIOs. You already know what I'm talking about. Carrie does -- she's not an IT person. So you guys need to take the lead on what, you know, these things are she, you know, so what do you think you'd recommend? Boy, you're lucky I'm not rolling the news on News at 5:00, Cory Casazza.

Casazza: That's why I'm never in front of the camera.

Gustafson: Oh.

Casazza: You know, I think it has to start out with the customer service piece or the relationship piece of getting with the departments and getting their needs, prioritizing the needs with the department and, I mean, like you mentioned that taking it through the whole process and -- but also being able to say, no, that's a stupid idea, we're not going to do that and…

Gustafson: Oh, we already have one of those. We don't need more of them.

Casazza: Yeah. And we're not gonna track, you know, what are the projects that are worth tracking, which are the ones worth bringing forward, and then I think definitely that group needs to manage how some type of oversight of the projects that are being implemented, whether they're for your department or even if they're for some other departments, because I think if you're looking at the best way to make use of state funds, there has to be that oversight. A lot of times you'll get -- how many CIOs are in the state?

Gustafson: One.

Casazza: How many other CIOs or -- besides you, how many other ones?

Gustafson: There are no other ones.

Casazza: How many other department directors are there for technology?

Gustafson: None.

Casazza: But like Mike Willden has a…

Fucci: There's other departments that have…

Casazza: … CIO doesn't he, or something like a CIO?

Gustafson: No, he does not.

15

Casazza: Who manages those people?

Gustafson: The business units, and they have IT managers.

Parker: Inside of each agency.

Gustafson: Right. So let's…

Casazza: But -- so you don't know…

Gustafson: Let me give you an example. So the Attorney General's office, they don't have a CIO person. They have an IT manager. And the IT manager is the one who is making the decisions, you know, for that specific agency.

Casazza: And there's no oversight on him, because…

Gustafson: Correct.

Casazza: …the attorney -- that would be like me managing an attorney. It would not be a good idea.

Gustafson: Well, the attorney is managing the IT people.

Casazza: That's not a good idea either.

Gustafson: Well, that could be a nice recommendation, you know.

Casazza: So you don't know -- nobody in the state knows if one of those IT managers is not performing?

Gustafson: No.

Casazza: Because it's the Attorney General's -- his core competency isn't managing technology people, so…

Gustafson: Correct.

Casazza: …you can have an IT manager that can talk circles around somebody…

Gustafson: Right.

Casazza: …and you think he's doing a great job, when he's really wasting a ton of money.

Gustafson: Correct.

Casazza: So that's why I think that PMO office has to have some type of oversight and some type of at least a high-level reach into all the other organizations to manage the technology project. And maybe manage will be too strong of a word for -- I think that's what it should be, but I'm -- I don't know that you can get that through everyone. But it's got to be at least, if not management, oversight.

Gustafson: This may be a bit off topic, but what ends up happening is, these agencies hire IT people who are not competent IT people, who create more work for the rest of us because they make really bad decisions. So I -- and this -- you guys…

Casazza: And then sooner or later they fired and you have to go in and clean it up.

Gustafson: Well, that's -- yeah, and then they hire another one to replace him, because they don't understand, they don't know IT people. In fact, I was talking to one of the other directors, I'm not going to say who is was, and I said, you're in the business of something, right? And they go, yes. I said, the governor appoints you because you're really good at one thing, right? Yeah, that's right. Okay. So how long does it take you to sniff out a bad person doing this one thing? They go, I don't know, 30 seconds. I said, okay. The Governor appointed me because I'm good at technology. How long do you think it takes me to sniff out a guy who doesn't know technology? About 30 seconds. And I said, so for you, who are really good at one thing, trying to manage technology people is like me trying to manage people that you are really good at, and I don't -- that's not my core competency. So when I said this, the guys that you are hiring to do your technology are creating a bigger mess for you. They're causing massive outages. They are making really poor decisions when it comes to technology and how they relate to other agencies, because we have dependencies across the state now. And I said, this madness has to stop, which is one of my major driving reasons to consolidate is, as I say, we've reached the end of policy. I can't fix stupid, for the record. Right, Laura?

Fucci: So -- yes, correct. I totally understand your world. So, you know, perhaps our recommendation should be focused on, you know, our outcome, which is, you know, the process, what we're trying to achieve as opposed to, you know, just create a PMO office.

Gustafson: Right.

Fucci: Right? I mean…

Gustafson: Mm-hmm.

Fucci: …the PMO office is the how, not what we're trying to achieve.

Gustafson: So how would you say -- how would you describe the relationship with the business and the IT to take a concept from beginning to end to implementation. What would you call that?

Fucci: So, you know, well, I mean, that's -- for us that's the business analysis. We're involved, you know, from the beginning of when, you know, we -- like I said, we -- I don't know how you describe that. We document their processes and work with them on what their needs are before we ever define the solution. You know, you're getting involved when the solution's defined.

Gustafson: So that -- well, I could be in concept too. Let me ask you, if one of your commissioners just said, Laura, I was at dinner last night with my spouse and I had this idea that is a really good idea. How would you describe the process of that concept or that process that they're describing through to implementation, because that's really what I need? PMO office is a vehicle, a tool, to get that done. I don't know what that overall process would look -- be called.

Fucci: Okay. Well, we would have one of our business analysts sit down with them and define their requirements. I mean, really, you know, sit down and try to talk about what they're looking for and what their -- what their needs are.

17

Gustafson: So what is that -- what is that process called for you?

Fucci: That's our business analysis process.

Gustafson: So that has to go from…

Fucci: So then how does it go from -- the requirements-- it starts with -- well, it starts with the business need definition, you know, that's kind of the first thing. We had a very high level define the business need, you know, that's kind of just like a one-page, three statement thing to make sure everybody's on page that they agree this is the need of the business, and then we start working through, you know, the specific requirements…

Gustafson: You know…

Fucci: …with their existing processes.

Gustafson: When I was in the private sector, I created that process, and to me that's the project management lifecycle. Project management starts off with some idea or some request, the three -- the scope, the estimated benefits and you expect, you know, how long do you think it's gonna be and how much, and then it goes from there to be prioritized. If it's a prioritized project by the business, then an official project manager gets assigned, where then you work more directly with the business and start narrowing down scope and statement of work and those kinds of things, reporting back to a PMO ideally so that there's some oversight of those projects, but to me that's the project management lifecycle. Cory?

Casazza: Yeah, we -- I think that's pretty much what we call it too, but we've kind of nicknamed it the cradle-to-grave process because it's something that a lot of times people don't understand what a project management lifecycle is…

Fucci: Yeah.

Casazza: …outside of our organization. So we'll just say, you know, the cradle-to-grave process so that I think it gives it just some -- I mean, for us it gives it some meaning when I'm talking to a department head that isn't familiar with technology.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Fucci: Right. And here, at least in this culture, in this world, a project's not a project until it's funded, right, until there's actual capital funding that's allocated for the thing that you're going to go out and buy.

Gustafson: Mm-hmm.

Fucci: And there's some level of work that happens before then, right?

Gustafson: Right.

Fucci: That kind of defines like we're gonna go out and get some, you know, put together the RFP, or we're gonna do something, right?

Gustafson: Mm-hmm.

Fucci: We're gonna put some resources on it. So that's more the analysis phase that happens beforehand, and so it's all about what people think of as a project here.

Gustafson: So what do you…

Fucci: And when it actually gets approved through capital funding to be a project. So it's just about the culture, right, and what people are used to calling things.

Gustafson: Well, what do you guys call it at the county? I mean, do you have a process, you know…

Fucci: Well, I don't know what this -- I mean, we're probably getting distracted because it's getting towards four o'clock, but I don't know if this is helpful to what we're trying to achieve.

Gustafson: Yeah, because Cory's trying to wrap it up into one recommendation that says implement the cradle-to-grave process.

Casazza: You know, I like what Laura said about having the recommendation outcome based, and, you know…

Gustafson: Mm-hmm.

Casazza: …the outcome is that your department needs to be more involved in the vetting out technology projects, prioritizing them, implementing them and doing a post-implementation review.

Fucci: Statewide.

Casazza: Statewide. So can we get -- I mean, I'm with you on two or three recommendations, and I think…

Gustafson: Yeah. I don't think you can get it in one.

Casazza: …you know, another needs to somehow be an IT -- I have trouble sometimes (inaudible), but IT strategic plan that somehow aligns with the state's strategic plan.

Gustafson: Yeah, and in our case, it's the Governor's priorities.

Casazza: Yeah. And a third recommendation may be something on the consolidation, you know, achieve…

Fucci: Inventory management? Somehow manage all the assets.

Gustafson: How about -- yeah.

Fucci: From purchase through disposal?

Gustafson: Yeah. Could you say asset management lifecycle? Or technology lifecycle? I'm not putting words in your mouth. I'm actually just throwing suggestions out there.

Fucci: Yeah.

Gustafson: Because if you just say inventory, then does that include software, is that hardware, is that servers, is that endpoints, is that iPads that we don't track, is it smartphones that people bring from their house, does that include…

Fucci: I think you should say hardware and software inventory -- hardware and software -- let's see. Software and hardware.

Gustafson: And does hardware include microwaves and networks and fiber in the ground and propane trucks and snow cats and…

Casazza: Yeah.

Gustafson: Okay. Great.

Fucci: Yeah.

Gustafson: Because we need it to have all that stuff.

Casazza: I mean, it's equipment. All…

Fucci: You know, the issue that we've had with saying assets is that then there's like a certain dollar minimum or, you know, nothing's an asset until it's like 1500 or whatever it is…

Gustafson: Yeah.

Fucci: …and I have a lot of stuff I want to track that's under that, and so that was the only reason that I started saying inventory. But for me it's hardware and software licenses.

Gustafson: And equipment of things that are not…

Fucci: Got my chillers in there, man. It's like why are the chillers in there?

Gustafson: Yeah, yeah. What's this propane truck? What's that doing in there? This was cute, the DRI folks were asking us if they could use our propane truck to go refill one of their mountaintops or something the other day.

Fucci: We just want your helicopter.

Gustafson: Yeah, we just want the helicopter.

Parker: So did I hear three recommendations?

Casazza: I think so, but also is -- I somehow think some of the IT consolidation effort should be wrapped into it as…

Gustafson: Look at you. You go, boy. I like that.

Casazza: I don't know that you can have two governance, or a statewide governance, as long as there's so many heads to the monster, and…

Gustafson: I agree with you. Not effectively.

Fucci: So that's what our steering, I mean, that's -- at the county, that's what the steering committee helps us mitigate. I don't know if this advisory board is the structure to do that for you.

Gustafson: No.

Casazza: No. But a -- we can maybe make a recommendation that can help at least open the freeway onramp to consolidation.

Gustafson: That's a good idea.

Casazza: Onto the consolidation highway.

Gustafson: Because of the way the state is structured, and how I'm accountable to the Governor, so there can't be a board or something over me. You know, that's just the state politics, the way it works, you know. When I serve at the pleasure of one guy, who just happens to be the guy at the top, kind of hard to put a full board or something on top of me. But I do think that it's extremely difficult to do some of these things in a vacuum when you're trying to grab the hydra.

Fucci: How about us doing a committee that is -- that makes recommendations?

Gustafson: Yeah, but that's the ITAB.

Fucci: You already have that.

Gustafson: Well, that's what ITAB is, to make -- advise and make recommendations.

Fucci: Yeah.

Casazza: But you're kind of looking…

Fucci: I'm thinking about your -- right. I'm sorry. I was just…

Casazza: You're looking for -- sorry, Laura. You're looking for recommendations from us that you can take to the legislature to justify your budget.

Gustafson: Well, I want you guys to make recommendations based on your experience and where you think we have deficiencies in the state, and then I will take your recommendations under advisement in what I bring to the legislature to ask for funding.

Casazza: I think you should consolidate and have some type of overall -- and I think you guys should get away from the cost allocation piece.

Gustafson: Yeah. Well, the rates -- that means the problem.

Casazza: The rate thing is a problem because then you'd have people going to Best Buy to buy stuff…

Gustafson: Well, that's the problem.

Casazza: …because they don't understand the need to have some standardized technology, and if you buy a Best Buy router -- wireless router and put it in, what kind of problems it's going to cause you on the network and what kind of security issues you have. So…

Gustafson: Or the reason why we don't buy a Packard Bell PCs at, you know, Comp USA.

Parker: Okay. So we're getting on four o'clock and I don't want to stunt any discussions…

Gustafson: Yeah, Cory.

Parker: …but let's get -- if it's okay with the committee…

Gustafson: The Chair would like to call this meeting back to order.

Parker: Let's get -- so I've heard, well, no motion, but discussion of I think maybe four recommendations. One was that EITS needs to be more involved in vetting, prioritizing, implementing, review statewide and post-implementation review statewide. That was one.

Gustafson: And you would say -- is that of IT projects that you were saying that about?

Casazza: Okay. Just where I'm going is, where does the radio system, you know, how -- so how do we define IT and how do we not overdefine it so that it's not something that you could never get done. Because something like the radio system, is that gonna stay with EPS no matter what forever, or…

Gustafson: Yeah. And I would -- well, it's ours. It's ours actually. I would say that to me is an IT project because there's -- now there's voice data and video over the microwave network. It's become part of our transport mesh.

Casazza: And what about the police/fire radio network too?

Gustafson: That's the same network.

Casazza: Is that the same? Okay.

Gustafson: Mm-hmm.

Casazza: So, yeah, if that's included in technology IT, yes. I don't want to cut out too much. I don't want to make it so broad that it's not something that you can get done.

Gustafson: Yeah. No. I think that's okay. I would consider that IT.

Casazza: Not knowing some of the politics and how those relationships are.

Gustafson: Yeah, I think IT's okay.

Casazza: Okay.

Gustafson: I think that's good. I would just put, you know, just say it's of IT projects.

Casazza: Okay. I agree.

Parker: Okay. The second one…

Casazza: Are you okay with that, Laura?

Fucci: Yeah.

Parker: Yeah. So I'll just read through these and then we can do motion after if people are so inclined.

Casazza: Okay.

Parker: Number 2, IT strategic plan should align with the state strategic plan and that's gonna depend on wherever the Governor prioritizes.

Casazza: And do we want it to be state strategic plan or the Governor's priorities? Is there…

Gustafson: So in -- and by concept of the strategic plan that I'm building has the Governor's priorities inside it. Because my plan is derived enables some business plan which in this case is the Governor's priorities.

Casazza: Then that's -- your plan needs to have that line of sight too so that the employee's know…

Gustafson: Yeah, absolutely.

Casazza: …I'm coming to work (inaudible).

Gustafson: I'm marching up the hill for a reason.

Casazza: Yeah.

Gustafson: And it's not unlike, you know, the county, you know, whatever you guys have, you had to have something.

Casazza: Oh, yeah. Our strategic plan is eliminate illegal dumping and that's pretty tough to come to work and say, man, I'm really helping today.

Gustafson: Well, that's kind of tough to line a lot of IT projects around, but…

Casazza: Yeah, it is.

Parker: Okay. So then the third one, this one I have some notes on so it needs to be funneled down. Achieve inventory management, and then I have asset management lifecycle, hardware, software licenses, so how do we want to word that one? Inventory and asset management including, but not limited to, hardware, software and licenses?

Casazza: Laura, your portfolio, when you call it portfolio management, do you include all parts of technology, or instead of defining out hardware or software, is it more a portfolio -- technology portfolio?

Fucci: Yeah, the portfolio management is just technology. So it's all aspects of it, and we get the (inaudible) includes the computer system that runs the sprinklers at the pool, you know, things like that, but, yeah, it just says technology. When we put out the RFP for the inventory process, you know, we specifically called out hardware and software inventory, and we were pretty clear on what that included, because it was an RFP process. We -- what we do here that helps us is I pay for all maintenance and software licensing, so it all funnels through my fund, and it's all centralized no matter who's using it. I may charge it back to them, but it helps me kind of track what's being purchased and stuff. So I have that purchasing oversight. So I have a policy around that, and that also calls it hardware and software -- hardware maintenance and software maintenance and licenses and subscription or something like that.

Casazza: Okay. But does that get -- that doesn't get your gas truck -- or propane truck, and…

Gustafson: Not necessarily, no. But it's a very good start.

Casazza: And maybe unrelated equipment, or…

Parker: Okay.

Casazza: Hardware/software and related equipment.

Gustafson: Or you could just say your hardware, software equipment. Hardware, comma, software, comma, equipment.

Casazza: Yeah.

Parker: Hardware, software -- do you want to say licenses?

Gustafson: Hardware, software…

Casazza: It should be implied in software.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Parker: Okay. So hardware, software and related equipment, or just and equipment?

Casazza: And equipment.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Fucci: Because software licenses are subscriptions.

Gustafson: Yeah, or something.

Fucci: So just leave it as software, it'll probably be covered.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Parker: So achieve inventory and assess management, including -- I don't know where we're going here.

Gustafson: You see, Carrie's got all the lawyer talk going on here, but not limited -- but not limited to…

24

Parker: Including, but not limited to….

Gustafson: …without, you know, liability and…

Parker: Yeah, assuming the risk.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Parker: Okay. So what is our third recommendation then?

Fucci: Actually, on the second one it would be -- that inventory one, is that the one you're talking about right now?

Parker: Yes.

Fucci: You would want it from request through disposal, or lifecycle.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Fucci: We need something in there that talks about that, but you want it all the way through, right? You want to be able to manage it and track it from the request process through the disposal process. At least I would think so.

Gustafson: Yeah. And I think the recommendation, Laura, on that thread should be a process, right? We will use tools to…

Fucci: Yeah.

Gustafson: …enable the process, but the recommendation should be a process.

Fucci: Right. You need a process.

Gustafson: Right.

Fucci: At least I need a process.

Gustafson: No, I agree with you.

Fucci: I don't know what you need, but I need a process.

Gustafson: I think it's -- yeah, you don't start with the tool, you start with the process.

Casazza: So would it be to implement a process to efficiently manage, or cost-effectively manage all the technology, hardware, software….

Gustafson: And equipment.

Casazza: …and equipment owned by the state?

Gustafson: Through its lifecycle.

Casazza: Through -- yeah.

Gustafson: Something like that?

Fucci: Man, I just can't believe how complicated that gets. You know, I really think that should be a really pretty simple thing, but I guess when you don't have a centralized warehouse and everything's come…

Gustafson: Yeah.

Fucci: …into the same place and you have people sitting there asset tagging everything, it just -- and then you have all these different people that are moving things around. It gets pretty complicated. And I just will not believe that, but they assure me that it does.

Casazza: And (inaudible) would make it worse.

Gustafson: Oh. And honestly, I don't want to get off on a soapbox here, but that's why I wanted Altiris, because I want to -- I want to be able to know if memory from one computer shows up in another computer, if it pops up somewhere else on a network, a PC goes missing and two weeks later just shows up, I want to know where it is and what happened to it. And so I'm using tools in this case to enable to process of I need inventory management, so…

Fucci: All right. It becomes complicated when you don't have all the domains, right?

Gustafson: Yes.

Fucci: And where Altiris can't go into that other domain that…

Gustafson: And that's why I qualified with just the Department of Administration is the only -- my focus at the moment.

Fucci: Right.

Parker: And then the fourth issue we didn't really come up with a recommendation I guess, was Cory -- he wants to wrap in consolidation. So how do we create that recommendation?

Casazza: You can tell that's my pet peeve of…

Parker: Well, and Laura mentioned the steering committee, but then David indicated besides the ITAB there's not really a mechanism.

Gustafson: No. And you know the state (inaudible).

Parker: Yeah. But we could recommend. I mean, isn't there a subcommittee on consolidation, or no? There's not a subcommittee? It was one of the priorities I thought.

Gustafson: I don't remember.

Fucci: I thought there was. I thought there was a subcommittee on consolidation.

Gustafson: Was there one? I don't remember.

Casazza: Yeah, I'm worried with who's on it though besides Joe, because I think Chris is on it, and…

Parker: Yeah, Bruce, Mike and Joe.

Gustafson: Joe can handle them, don't worry.

Casazza: I know. I said I'm not worried about Joe, but I am about the other two.

Gustafson: Having to deal with Joe?

Casazza: No. The kicking and screaming about consolidation.

Gustafson: No. I don't think that will be the case.

Parker: So our fourth recommendation can just be to achieve…

Casazza: Do you think it does any good for us to…

Parker: …true governance consolidation is…

Gustafson: Maybe you should say -- okay. Let's talk for a minute before we make a formal recommendation.

Parker: Yes. Before you…

Gustafson: Let's have a discussion on the matter even though I'm not a member of this subcommittee. Without having consolidation, it's very difficult to get these other recommendations implemented, right? They're just unachievable. And I think, Laura, you were kind of eluding to this earlier. If you don't have the whole thing…

Fucci: I think they're achievable. They're achievable. I mean, you can do this stuff. It is more difficult if it's not consolidated.

Gustafson: Right.

Fucci: But there's a lot more time, a lot more effort, there's a lot more consensus and, you know, discussion that happens.

Gustafson: So then maybe…

Fucci: I work with 80 elected officials.

Gustafson: Oh, yeah. So then maybe your recommendation should be in this (inaudible) should be that in context of the other recommendations, consolidation will enable all of those to be more efficient and streamlined, that without consolidation, those processes or those recommendations still bear fruit, but they are considerably more energy or something to that effect.

Casazza: I think it's a daunting task with an organization as big as…

Gustafson: I do too. I…

Casazza: …to do all that with an organization as big as you guys are.

Gustafson: I think Laura's underestimating the amount of energy required, but I do agree it's a lot more.

Casazza: I know how hard it is for us and we're half the size of Laura, if even that, so doing -- extrapolating it's…

Parker: So what do you think about a recommendation that just kind of says, you know, without consolidation this is going to be very difficult, and it would be better if -- something like that.

Gustafson: Right.

Parker: Okay. I'll entertain a motion.

Casazza: I'd like to make a motion…

Fucci: Well, you can say something like doing this in a reasonable timeline is unrealistic, or I think that's too many realistic, or something like that, you know, consolidation (inaudible) we can achieve these other objectives in a reasonable timeline with consolidation, something like that. But, you know, that consolidation thing is gonna take you a little bit of time.

Gustafson: Yes.

Casazza: So could I make a motion to approve the four recommendations as you have them written?

Parker: Yes.

Casazza: Or as you will have them written.

Parker: Do you want me to read -- review them? Okay. Number one, that EITS needs to be more involved in the vetting, prioritizing, implementing and post-implementation review of IT projects statewide. Number two, that the IT strategic plan should align with the state strategic plan according to the Governor's priorities. Number three, this is the one I have trouble with. Implement a process to efficiently manage all hardware, software, equipment owned by the state through its lifecycle.

Gustafson: Do you need to put IT in there anywhere?

Parker: Implement the process to efficiently manage all IT hardware, software, equipment owned by the state through its lifecycle.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Parker: And then number four, the subcommittee recommends that without consolidation it will be difficult to achieve these goals within a reasonable time.

Gustafson: Therefore, our recommendation…

Fucci: I don't know if the last one's a recommendation or a note.

Parker: A note?

Gustafson: Yeah, therefore, we recommend consolidation.

Parker: Do you want to come out and recommend consolidation? I'll have to put…

Casazza: Yes.

Parker: Okay. I'll have to put on the record that have not discussed with my own agency administration whether it is in support of consolidation.

Gustafson: Duly noted, Madam Chair.

Parker: Okay. So number four, we recommend consolidation because we believe that it would be the best way to achieve the other recommendations in a reasonable time.

Fucci: There you go.

Gustafson: Yeah.

Casazza: Perfect.

Parker: Okay.

Fucci: It's always easier to make things happen when everyone reports to you and you own all the stuff.

Parker: Okay. So we're waiting for a motion, and then if the committee agrees, I can just put for the issues David's list of five and an explanation that can kind of put together our discussion, and then our recommendations. Okay.

Fucci: I make a motion to move those forward as our recommendations as read.

Casazza: I second.

Parker: All in favor?

Group: Aye.

Parker: Motion passes.

6. Presentation by Cory Casazza and/or Laura Schmidt, Washoe Co.   **Information/Discussion**

   - Overview of Washoe County's system for governance

7. Presentation by Laura Fucci, CIO, Clark Co.   **Information/Discussion**

- Overview of Clark County's system for governance

8. Creation of Subcommittee's recommendation(s) to the **Information/Discussion**
Information Technology Advisory Board regarding governance **Possible Action**
concepts/suggestions/priorities for the strategic plan

- Recommendation may include identification of the issue(s),
  explanation of the issue(s), and the Subcommittee's
  conclusion(s)/recommendation(s) in relation to governance
  and the strategic plan.

8. Public Comment **Information/Discussion**

Note: No vote or action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. NRS 241.020.

Parker: So we -- as Chair, I'm removing the items for presentations by Cory and Laura. We've had discussions of them, and I'll now hear any public comment.

9. Adjournment **Possible Action**

Parker: Any other issues from the committee? Okay. Meeting is adjourned.

Notice of this meeting was posted in the following Carson City, Nevada locations:
Blasdel Building, 209 E. Musser St., Carson City, NV 89701
Legislative Building, 401 N. Carson St., Carson City, NV 89701
Nevada State Library and Archives, 100 Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89701

Notice of this meeting was emailed for posting to the following Las Vegas, Nevada location:
Capitol Police, Grant Sawyer Office Building, 555 E. Washington Ave, Las Vegas, NV 89101
Officer Brad Carson: bcarson@dps.state.nv.us

Notice of this meeting was posted on the internet via the it.nv.gov website:
http://it.nv.gov/Governance/dtls/ITAB/Information_Technology_Advisory_Board_(ITAB)/

We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and would like to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are required, please notify the Enterprise IT Services Division at least one working day before the meeting at (775) 684-5849 or please fax your request to (775) 687-9097.