PUBLIC MEETING

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

LOCATIONS: Legislative Counsel Bureau   Grant Sawyer Building
                   401 South Carson Street   555 E. Washington Avenue
                   Room 2134   Room 4412
                   Carson City, Nevada 89701   Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

If you cannot attend the meeting, you can listen to it live over the internet. The address for the legislative websites is http://www.leg.state.nv.us. Click on the link "Live Meetings"- Listen or View.

DATE AND TIME: June 6, 2018, 1:00 p.m.

Below is an agenda of all items to be considered. Items on the agenda may be taken out of the order presented, items may be combined for consideration by the public body; and items may be pulled or removed from the agenda at any time at the discretion of the Chair.

<u>MINUTES</u>

1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

Chairman Diflo: Okay, thank you, everybody, for your patience. It looks like through the magic of 2018 technology, we'll be able to do this virtually. Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to call the June 6th ITAB Meeting to order, and we'll start -- I'll ask Leslie if you can take a roll call.

Leslie Olson:	Assemblyman Hambrick?
John Hambrick:	Here.
Leslie Olson:	Senator Denis? Chairman Diflo?
Chairman Diflo:	Here.
Leslie Olson:	Director Cates?
Director Cates:	Here.
Leslie Olson:	Director Whitley?
Director Whitley:	Here.
Leslie Olson:	Director Malfabon?
Director Malfabon:	Here.

Leslie Olson:	Mr. Humm
Hum:	Here.
Leslie Olson:	Mr. Betts?
Craig Betts:	Here.
Leslie Olson:	Mr. Marcella?
Joseph Marcella:	Here.
Leslie Olson:	Chairman, we have a quorum.
Chairman Diflo:	Thank you, Leslie.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS *(for discussion only)* – No 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. Public comments may be limited to 3 minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. The Chair may, at its discretion, hold this agenda item open in order to receive public comments under other agenda items.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, Leslie. That'll take us to Agenda Item No. 2, which are Public Comments. So, I'd like to start in the North. Are there any public comments here in Reno -- or in Carson? Seeing none, I will ask if there's any public comments in the South.

Speaker: Mr. Chair, we have no guests in the room today.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. Thank you very much. We'll go ahead and keep this item open until we get down to No. 11, and we'll see if we have additional public comments, and then we can close it out.

3. STATE CIO/DEPUTY DIRECTOR INTRODUCTION – Patrick Cates, Director, Department of Administration

Chairman Diflo: With that, I would like to look to Director Cates. He would like to introduce us to our new State CIO and Deputy Director at this time.

Director Cates: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the record, Patrick Cates. We conducted a rather lengthy search for a new CIO. I believe at the last meeting, I articulated to the Board a little bit of change in staffing, how we're approaching the CIO role, of how we were taking the Deputy Director position, which previously had been a Deputy Director over multiple divisions in the Department and dedicate that position to the CIO function and keeping the administrator position separate, more of as a Chief Operating Officer for Enterprise IT Services. I'm very happy with Michael Dietrich, the person that we have selected for the position. He comes to us with a very strong private sector technology background, something that I was particularly interested in. Michael most recently was at LinkedIn. He has a very long resume that includes a long tenure with Microsoft, and early in his career, he was with Greater Nevada Credit Union as their CIO.

David Haws has been promoted from the Deputy Administrator position into the Administrator position. Michael has been on board for a few weeks now, and he's hit the ground running and I'm really enjoying that perspective that he brings from the private sector, and he's not as wedded into the culture of the state and how we've done our technology. Part of my purpose in having somebody with a private sector background is I think they get a holistic view of technology, and people from the private sector are often surprised at how siloed the state's IT technology infrastructure is, and so that's why I selected him. If you'd like to maybe come up and say a few words, Michael?

Michael Dietrich: Hello. For the record, Michael Dietrich, State CIO. Thank you, Patrick, for the kind introduction. It's really great to meet all of you. Some of you I've met before, had the opportunity to meet before. I look forward to working with this group. As Patrick said, there's a lot of new things to learn and experience in the state. There's a lot of things that I certainly see that I would love to influence change around, and it's great that this group convenes as one of the forums to talk about that potential change. So, I look forward to working with everyone. Thank you.

Director Cates: Thank you. If I could maybe just add one last comment. The former CIO, Shanna Rahming I recently learned that she has accepted a position with the State of Illinois. It sounds like a really good opportunity for her. You know, she served as the CIO for about three years, and I'm certainly grateful for her service and just want to let people know where she's ended up.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, Director Cates.

4. COMMENTS BY THE CHAIR *(for discussion only)* – Chair, Paul Diflo.

Chairman Diflo: Take us down to Agenda Item No. 4. If you recall at our last meeting on February 14th, we reviewed the ITAB charter. We established that we would leverage this Board to endorse or not endorse proposals from EITS and the Department of Administration. We also asked for input regarding future Agenda items, and based on those suggestions, you will see that we listened, and we will be receiving status on the strategic initiatives Director Cates presented at the last meeting. We will receive a review of the project dashboard from the State CIO, and we had scheduled a presentation from David Haws on the technological Crime Advisory Board update, but a personal matter came up, and David is not available for this meeting. So, we will put that on the Agenda for the August meeting. Also, on the Agenda today, Director Cates will present a proposed bill draft request regarding a new committee and some adjustments to ITAB. I would encourage you to ask questions so we can fully understand the purpose of this committee, and at the end of this, I will ask for a vote to endorse or not endorse.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES *(for discussion and possible action)* – Chair, Paul Diflo.
   Discussion and decision to approve minutes of the meeting on February 14, 2018.

Chairman Diflo: With that, I will move on to Agenda No. 5 and ask for the approval of meeting minutes from February 14th. If I can get a motion to approve.

Assemblyman Hambrick: So moved, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Diflo: And a second?

Craig Betts: I'll second. This is Craig Betts.

Chairman Diflo: All those in favor. [ayes around] All those opposed? All those opposed? Hearing nothing, motion carried.

6. ITOC/ITAB BILL DRAFT REQUEST *(for discussion and possible action)* – Patrick Cates, Director, Department of Administration

Chairman Diflo: And as promised, Agenda Item 6, Director Cates will review the ITOC/ITAB Bill Draft Request.

Director Cates: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. I'm not sure if hard copies of this have been received by the Members down South yet, but hopefully, you can view it on the screen. We did submit a bill draft request for the Governor's consideration to include in his suite of BDRs that he'll submit for the legislature. We've had some discussions with the Governor's Office about this. I don't know yet if they're supporting us or not. They have a limited number of bills, and they don't always accept everything, but basically, what this BDR does is changes the composition of the ITAB and let me find that language for you. It's in here. So, basically, what this does is it removes the state members of ITAB.

So, the Department's representatives would be removed from ITAB, and it would increase the number of private sector representatives on the ITAB so that ITAB would be composed solely of legislative appointments, local government representatives, and private sector representatives. Not looking to change any of the duties of ITAB in statute, making some reference changes regarding the duties, that they're advising the CIO and the Division and not just the Division, just to make that clear since the CIO is actually separate from the Division at this point. And then what we are trying to establish is an IT oversight committee. We actually went back and forth whether or not this should be in statute. The original BDR I submitted to the Governor's Office didn't have this in statute. Some states, they've done it by executive order. So, it doesn't necessarily need to be in statute. I kind of like it being in statute, because it makes it more permanent. You know, an executive order lasts as long as an administration.

So, what the oversight committee is, is it's composed of agency representatives. Its duties, as outlined in the draft, are to review major information-technology-related projects and technology architecture decisions. Currently, we have the IT Strategic Planning Committee that performs that function on some limited basis. Usually, they meet once every other year as part of the biennial budget process, and they review all the big technology projects that agencies are submitting, and they rank them by priority. So, rather than have this rather informal IT Strategic Planning Committee, we replace it with the ITOC. So, it would take over the duties of the current IT Strategic Planning Committee. It would also assess whether the state's IT programs effectively support the state's business objectives and strategies, and it would assess cybersecurity risks and management efforts to monitor and mitigate those risks. It would advise the CIO and advise the Governor.

That's really about it. It's sort of -- it's an effort, a broader effort, to enhance IT governance at the state and oversight. I've talked before about how, you know, that IT strategic planning process that we go through is very limited. It's one meeting that occurs every other year. Agencies submit what used to be their technology investment request, now called a technology investment notice, and once that is approved by the Governor and then approved

by the legislature, there really isn't any formal reporting back or oversight at a statewide level of these large IT projects. And some agencies have more resources than others. Some manage their projects well. Some struggle with their projects. EITS has struggled with some of their own projects. We had the OTIS project for parole and probation. That was before IFC, because it had gone over time and over cost, and the primary reason for that was we didn't do a very good job of project -- managing that project. We overly relied on MSA contractors and didn't put in adequate resources towards it on either side, either from the programmatic standpoint or the IT standpoint. There was no -- there was no transparency that that project was in trouble until it was well past where it was supposed to be.

Another project was DMV's SYSMOD project which has been in the papers. They spent about $17 million with a vendor, didn't do a very good job of managing that project, and they called a full stop to it. And not saying that the transparency would necessarily stop those types of -- or prevent, I should say, those types of problems on projects, but it would at least alert policy-makers and bring those issues to light sooner rather than later so they can be addressed in an effective way. So, that's pretty much it in a nutshell. Are there any questions about that?

Director Malfabon: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. The makeup of the IT Strategic Planning Committee, that's been changed now with the new kind of review process. We have a group meeting soon for the ranking of the new -- I forget the term.

Director Cates: Yes, the TINS?

Director Malfabon: Yes, the -- what was the makeup of the Strategic Planning Committee before?

Director Cates: I think it's changed over time. I believe that we had -- correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we invited all state agencies previously. Is that correct? I'm looking over -- okay, so, there wasn't a standard about who was on the Committee. We tried to make sure the big departments were represented. I think there's some departments we let have a pass this time and had a little bit smaller group, and I know historically it's varied. Last session, we tried really hard to get directors themselves to participate, but I know in prior years, it was often delegated down. I know I went several cycles just as an Administrative Services Officer and a Deputy Director.

Director Malfabon: Mr. Chairman, I have another question. So, I definitely see the benefits of having, you know, some expertise from the outside, but didn't understand why the state side is not as represented then on the oversight. You talked about some projects that needed more transparency, but could you explain the benefits of not having the -- other than the EITS, I guess, and administration representation?

Director Cates: Sure. So, for the record, Patrick Cates. The thinking behind removing the state members from ITAB is ITAB is an advisory board, and the ITOC really provides that oversight from the agency leadership, and so rather than have them serve on both boards, possibly one is state leadership. The other is outside advisory.

Chairman Diflo: Are there any other questions for Director Cates? For the record, this is Paul Diflo. Director Cates, I think you did an excellent job of summarizing that. Let me take a shot just for my clarification. The purpose of ITOC, it looks like it will provide us a

required stronger oversight when it comes to project management or investments, risk, which sounds like it's needed, and then the removal of those state agencies from the ITAB eliminates redundancy, and it also positions ITAB with a more independent flavor, if you will.

Director Cates: Exactly. I'm particularly interested in having more private sector members on ITAB to give us different ways of thinking about our business.

Chairman Diflo: Let me ask one final time before we take a vote if there are any other questions for Director Cates.

Director Malfabon: Just one question. Rudy Malfabon for the record. So, the private sector members, how will you handle any kind of conflicts of interest when they're discussing something that -- they wouldn't be involved in a specific project per say, then.

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. Good question. I guess it would depend. I mean, we have private sector members on ITAB currently, and I think it would fall under the standard, you know, open meeting rules. If somebody had a conflict of interest, they would need to disclose that.

Chairman Diflo: Okay, as we discussed at the last meeting, ITAB can provide -- we can leverage ITAB to endorse or not endorse. As Director Cates stated, this has not been approved yet. So, I would like to ask for a vote. All those in favor of endorsing the ITOC/ITAB bill request for yay.

Director Cates: You've got to do a motion, have somebody do a motion and a second.

Chairman Diflo: That's a good idea. Once again, I'm failing the Robert's Rules of Order and public meeting rules. Let me ask for a motion to endorse.

Craig Betts: Mr. Chairman, this is Craig Betts. I make a motion to endorse the BDRs proposed by Director Cates.

Chairman Diflo: And now I'd like to ask for a second. I'm going to prompt you once again, a second to vote on the motion to endorse.

Joseph Marcella: Chairman Diflo, this is Joe Marcella. I think what I'm seeing is we probably need a little bit more discussion. I think the thing that's in question here, and at least I have questions, so when you talk about ITAB and then now the split off of ITOC, ITAB is now, based on its membership, mostly, if not exclusively, advisory and maybe advocacy as well. And it doesn't have any regulatory position at all. All they can do is recommend. Is that what I understand? Based on the expertise of the panel and -- I'm sorry, of the Members and the actual moving any one item forward would be the ITOC folks. Is that what I'm understanding?

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. I think your understanding is correct. The current duties of ITAB are advisory in nature. You can make recommendations, but it's not like regulatory authority, which the ITOC would be.

Joseph Marcella: With that clarification, it's a good foundation by changing up the membership. What is the relationship now between -- and I just need to understand it. I

know you stated it, Director Cates, before -- between ITAB and the ITOC folks? How is that relationship formed? How will they advise as well as work with each other?

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. I think some of that will have to work out as we go through the process, and it depends how ITAB would like to conduct their duties. For instance, the technology investment request, the review that that goes through, I personally think it would be very helpful if ITAB reviewed those projects and made some recommendations to the ITOC. There are certainly issues which I think the ITOC could seek input from the ITAB. I really see both of these bodies as serving the CIO, and I think the CIO would be the focal point, if you will, between the two groups and deciding, you know, which direction information flows, whether it's something that ITOC initiates or ITAB to review or vice versa.

Joseph Marcella: Again, so, what I'm understanding is that ITAB is more of a strategic arm, and -- sorry -- ITOC is more of a technical component in its performance and its process, not necessarily in its authority.

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. Yeah, I guess that's a good way to think about it. Really, ITOC brings to the table that management view of the state's technology and is it meeting the state's business needs, are these prudent investments, and I guess that is, I guess, both strategic and tactical at the same time, whereas, you know, ITAB's duties are very -- I think are very strategic in nature as they currently read in statute. And keep in mind we're not -- none of this language changes the current duties of the ITAB other than to clarify that it involves the CIO instead of just the division.

Chairman Diflo: For the record, Paul Diflo. That's a good discussion, and maybe I'm interpreting this as -- similar to what Mr. Marcella was saying, that the ITAB is a board, and just like a board of directors at a company, we don't get involved in the operational pieces or the function of the company, whereas as ITOC looks to be a little bit more operational to help prevent things like the investments going awry and projects stopping and correct me if I've interpreted that incorrectly.

Director Cates: No, I think that's correct.

Joseph Marcella: Based on that understanding, then, I'll second the motion.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, Mr. Marcella.

Joseph Marcella: If we still have a motion on the table.

James Humm: Mr. Chair, for the record, James Humm, Attorney General's Office. I would ask if we could potentially defer the vote until August, reason being is our IT chief just retired on Friday, and we're going through a transitionary period. So, rather than vote yay or nay, we would request some additional time to review this internally if that would be a possibility. Thank you.

Chairman Diflo: Let me -- for the record, Paul Diflo. Let me ask Director Cates, what would that do as far as a delay with getting this approved by the Governor? Is that going to stall this effort to where it may not add value in 2018?

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. I would like to be able to tell the Governor that ITAB supports the BDR. They're making decisions right now about what BDRs he is going to support. I believe they have until -- I don't have my schedule with me, but I believe it's August 1st for the Governor's Office to submit BDRs to LCB for policy changes. Certainly, if he does accept it, it will go to the legislature, and there would be no harm in delaying a vote to show endorsement for what the Governor is including in his budget for legislative initiatives. Well, I don't know. I'm kind of rambling a little bit, but I don't think it necessarily -- if the Members aren't comfortable in supporting this at this time, I don't think it's make or break for this BDR. If you don't vote in support of it, the Governor is still going to consider it. I certainly would like to have your support if you're willing to do so today.

Chairman Diflo: Leslie, when is our next ITAB meeting? I'm pretty sure it's after August 1st; is that correct?

Leslie Olson: August 23rd.

Chairman Diflo: August 23rd. So, this will not go to the Governor. If we delay this to the next meeting, he's not going to be able to submit this.

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. He could still submit it. He just wouldn't have your recommendation to submit it. Like I say, it doesn't necessarily make or break the bill, but I sure would like to have it endorsed, whatever the Members are comfortable with.

Chairman Diflo: Let me ask a public meeting question.

Jeff Menicucci: I think it's adequately noticed. You have a motion that can be voted on, depends on what the Members want to do with that. If the decision is not to endorse at this time, it can still be brought back for the next meeting after additional time to look at it and consider it.

Chairman Diflo: Would it be appropriate, do -- it's not on the Agenda. Can I ask for a vote to delay this until the next meeting?

Jeff Menicucci: Jeff Menicucci. I believe that is included within the notice for possible action, that it may be deferred to the next meeting. We should probably ask for a motion to that effect if that's the sense of the Board.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. With that guidance, I'd like to ask for a motion to delay the endorsement until the next meeting.

Director Cates: So, there is a motion and a --

Director Malfabon: Mr. Chairman, I think the other motion has to be withdrawn first, but I would just make a comment that I would feel more comfortable if I had some time to -- I mean, I don't think that this was provided in advance, so I wanted to kind of look at it with our IT staff and say, is this something that we -- clarification on our position. I just would feel more comfortable if I could discuss it with some staff back in the office, NDOT, to see -- this is kind of -- I could explain what the goal is and then get some input. I just feel less comfortable voting on it today without that kind of discussion back at my office.

Chairman Diflo: Understood. Okay.

8

Jeff Menicucci: Jeff Menicucci. You could amend the existing motion to a deferral rather than a vote up or down.

Chairman Diflo: Okay, hearing everybody's input --

Senator Denis: Mr. Chair?

Chairman Diflo: Yes, sir?

Senator Denis: This is Senator Denis. I don't have an issue waiting. I don't know that we have to have a motion to delay it, though. If we just don't do anything, you can just automatically bring it back next time, but you do have a motion that you have to deal with before that.

Chairman Diflo: Okay, that sounds like the best idea. So, it sounds like I have to remove the initial motion; is that correct?

Jeff Menicucci: I believe the motion could be withdrawn by the person who made it or it could go for a vote.

Craig Betts: Mr. Chair, this is Craig Betts. I made the initial motion to endorse. After this conversation -- and although personally I like the idea that has been proposed of the ITOC having greater skin in the game, if it would be, over the projects and ITAB strictly being in an advisory role and not having to advise on the activity of a project. We don't have the -- we're not in the trenches as some of the members of the -- directors in the state. I would recommend withdrawing my motion at this point. I would like to withdraw my motion at this point.

Jeff Menicucci: Jeff Menicucci. Do we have the consent of the second on that?

James Humm: James Humm, Attorney General's Office, I second, second the withdrawal of the motion.

Chairman Diflo: Okay. Motion is then carried.

Jeff Menicucci: Who did the second of the original motion?

Chairman Diflo: I don't believe anybody did the second.

Joseph Marcella: That was Joe Marcella.

Chairman Diflo: Mr. Marcella, I think you're going to have to be the one to withdraw that.

Joseph Marcella: Well, I'll withdraw the second.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, sir.

Joseph Marcella: You bet.

Chairman Diflo: Motion carried. All right, that was easy. Thank you, Director Cates, for reviewing that proposal.

7. UPDATE AND STRATEGIC INITIATIVES – *(for discussion and possible action)* - Patrick Cates, Director, Department of Administration

Chairman Diflo: I believe you are still up with Agenda Item 7 with an update on the strategic initiatives.

Director Cates: Great. Thank you. Just in regard to the last Agenda item, thank you very much for considering that. I certainly understand the Members' desire to give it a little more thought before endorsing it. So, we'll go ahead and go on to -- I have an outline prepared of our budget initiatives. I went through this at a prior meeting. I think a lot of this will sound familiar to you. I think it's more refined at this point. Just so you know where we're at in the budgeting process, we are in the agency request phase of budget building.

Our budgets are due to the Governor's Office at the end of August. A lot of what we do in the Department of Administration involves internal service funds and rates to other agencies. So, we're actually trying to get a lot of this stuff put together and estimated within the next few weeks so that there's no disruption to other agencies' budgets. If we come in late with a proposal that hasn't been considered yet and they haven't put enough money aside, it can -- assuming they accept the proposal, it can have a ripple effect to all the other state agency budgets because of the way we are internally service funded.

So, I'll go ahead and go through my list. The first few items are continuation of previous initiatives from the last session. One is cybersecurity. We had a big initiative in the last session to upgrade our cybersecurity tools and add some personnel to deal with cybersecurity at an enterprise level for the state. We're really looking for the next generation of cybersecurity tools and enhanced tools for a hybrid cloud environment. The specifics of what that is going to look like is still being developed by the CIO and the CISO, but we do expect there to be an ask for enhanced cybersecurity tools for the state of Nevada.

Bigger Pipes 2, our bigger pipes initiative, was about increasing network bandwidth for SilverNet. That was -- I forget the dollar amount, $5.5 million I believe it was in the last legislative session, and that was to facilitate more cloud-based computing projects, which the state is doing more and more. I understand that the technology investment notices that EITS has been accumulating from agencies, a substantial portion of them include cloud-based computing initiatives, and if we don't have sufficient bandwidth in our network, those things aren't going to work very well and won't meet people's needs. So, EITS personnel are currently going through and evaluating what the need is for the next asked increased bandwidth. I've asked them to focus on rural connectivity, and in the Department of Corrections in particular. The Department of Corrections has some real challenges with connectivity in a lot of their locations because of their remoteness. And in fact, Michael Dietrich and I are having a meeting with the Governor's Office and folks from Corrections, I believe, later this week to discuss some of their connectivity challenges and what we pursue in terms of budget initiatives to try to solve that for them.

The next item on the list is microwave, radio, and broadband. We have a current microwave project that is underway that we are doing in cooperation with Department of Transportation. I think most of the work envisioned in that project will be complete in the current biennium, but the project timeline stretches out several years, and staff are reviewing, you know, exactly what is going to be needed during the course of the next biennium, and this just briefly really upgrades the state's microwave network, which is how we connect rural areas

when we don't have fiber. And all the fiber connections and the microwave connections all cumulatively make up SilverNet, so it's an important piece of our network for rural connectivity.

Office 365, that was approved by the legislature last session. It's the state's first enterprise-level cloud initiative. It's not the first cloud initiative, but the first enterprise-level statewide cloud initiative. The 2017 legislature approved a single statewide tenant for Office 365. What we were budgeted for in the current biennium is basically -- I call it a "coalition of the budgeted". Any agency that had the means and the budget to buy Office 365 could do so. We did get three positions out of that for EITS. Two of them will be starting in the next fiscal year. That project has been going very well. Because we had the approval from the legislature to make this a statewide initiative, we were able to negotiate very favorable pricing with Microsoft for the subscription fees for a five-year period. We would have never gotten the type of deal that we received had we not been able to deliver the entire bank of business of the state of Nevada, and I think that's a real important lesson that's part of my mantra about sharing resources. The more we can commit the entire bank of business to the state's IT spin, the better pricing that we'll get from vendors.

Project is on schedule. I don't have the exact numbers in front of me, but we have a ramp-up period to get to 18,000 licenses, and we're well on track to do that. In the next session, we need to budget for the remaining agencies to come on to the system. We're going to establish an EITS statewide assessment to cover the cost of Office 365. Currently, agencies that use our exchange server, which are most state agencies, there is a fairly small email charge that agencies are charged. So, that will go away and will be replaced by the Office 365 assessment. That will cover the licensing costs as well as the overhead staffing costs of maintaining the system.

One of the challenges in the next fiscal year is the duplicate cost of the new system and the legacy system as we transition people. Some of the legacy system will still be needed because applications that are designed around it. So, it'll take a little while to migrate. We're trying to figure out how to do that as quickly as possible so that we're not duplicating those costs, and that's my reference in my notes to the "rat through the snake cost challenge". The sooner we can get off the legacy system, the sooner we'll save money.

We are looking at deferring DOT and Corrections from this initiative in the next biennium. In the case of DOT, DOT already is on Office 365. I believe they were the first agency in the state to go there. They are covered under the current statewide contract, so there is not a fiscal imperative to bring them on to the same tenant that we're on, and I think we'll have our hands full with all the other agencies during the next biennium. It is the intent that in the following biennium, we would work through getting NDOT onto the single tenant, which is no easy lift for an agency that's already configured their operations with their own tenant. So, we're just going to defer that until the next biennium, and Corrections, I mentioned their connectivity problems, and until we solve that, Office 365 isn't going to work for them.

The next initiative, again, it's a continuation from the last legislature, our ERP project, which we branded SMART21. We also have related projects of eProcurement and grant management. All three of these were approved by the last legislature. The eProcurement project is on target. The system, they've done vendor registrations. I don't know if they've started solicitations or not, but the Purchasing division is currently using the application. They continue to configure it. I know they're working on an interface with the current

financial system, and my understanding is, is they're going to be rolling that out to state agencies later in the year. The grants management system, that went out for RFP, and it had a vendor appeal that is still in progress. So, we haven't moved on that one until that appeal process is exhausted.

The SMART21 itself, the core system, the RFP is nearly ready for release. It will be released no later than this autumn. We need to get final cost estimates for Gov Rec to be finalized. Our best guess at this point is it's about $65 million over three years to implement, and that is a guess. So, we'll see what that looks like. I'm also making a request to the Governor's Office to realign the SMART21 budget under the Department of Administration. Currently, it is a project budget under the Governor's Office of Finance. I want it in Department of Administration because I want it aligned under the state CIO. It's our biggest technology project in the state. I think it needs to be under the CIO, and the project is more mature now, and the functions of the project strongly aligned with the Department of Administration. And in fact, the executive committee for SMART21, of which I am a member as well as Jim Wells, Director of Governor's Office of Finance, and Ron Knecht, State Controller, we had a meeting. I believe it was last week, and we voted to defer the budget module for the ERP project. So, really, the functionality that is left is very much aligned with Department of Administration's. So, we're just trying to make an administrative change to how that's aligned.

Deputy Director CIO funding model and budget changes, I spoke earlier and prior meetings about realigning the CIO as a Deputy Director. We basically have some realignment to do in statute. Most of the statute refers to the EITS Administrator, really distinguishing between the functions of the CIO and the state Administrator. We do have a policy BDR submitted for that.

I'm also looking at submitting a budgetary BDR in August that would exempt the state CIO and the CISO from the statutory requirement that a state employee's salary can't exceed 95% of the Governor's salary. There are some exceptions in statute currently. Doctors are exempted from that cap, and I'm looking to get the same thing for the CIO and the CISO so that we can stay competitive in the marketplace. And the next one, enterprise IT governance and strategic planning.

We talked about the BDR for ITAB and the governing board. We want to do some realignment of EITS staff to facilitate enterprise policy development and strategic planning, IT procurement review, enterprise IT reporting for policy makers, and one of the changes that we want to make in relation to that is to change an existing unclassified position that's in the Office of the CIO to an enterprise architect. It is currently called "advisor" I think is the term. So, we want to change that a little bit. I did include at the very end of my presentation an org chart, and I'll refer to that when we get to the end. Actually, I'll just show it to you real quick since people down there don't necessarily have the hard copies, and I do apologize for that. This is really hard to see on the screen.

So, you can see the enterprise architect reclass on the org chart that I just referred to. There's also a couple of -- some positions that we're looking for and a couple other changes related to Agency IT Services, but I'll cover those as I go along here in the outline. So, basically, in terms of IT governance, we're looking at reclassing one position, an enterprise architect, and adding a couple of positions to support that enterprise architecture.

12

Cloud strategy and IT facility consolidation, what we're calling "the road to unity", this is about sharing infrastructure and creating a plan and a pathway for agencies to move to more of a consolidated model, a hybrid-cloud strategy that embraces the evolution of technology, really moves us out of the infrastructure business, and where we are still in the infrastructure business, we will share resources wherever possible. There are cost savings to be had for data center closures and consolidation.

At Switch, we've had a lot of discussion about setting forth a plan that would actually close the facility, the state data center, and move assets to Switch where appropriate. We would also be looking to move to more cloud services, and that would be over a period of time. Really look for EITS in the future to be a broker of cloud services to ensure cost effectiveness, cybersecurity, and to avoid cloud sprawl. So, it's a really different model than we're currently operating under where we have on-premise data centers at multiple agencies. There was a consolidation of data centers that occurred about eight years ago. That kind of stalled out during the recession. There was quite a bit of consolidation, but I think it's high time that we consider another round, particularly since technology has changed so much, and really, everybody is moving out of that infrastructure business and into more of a cloud service type of model.

So, the particular proposal that we're putting together, we work with Gartner. We have them on contract. We are looking at a proposal from them to do a statewide assessment to develop a cloud strategy and an overview analysis of all of our data centers to really give us that policy framework, that roadmap, if you will, that kind of guides agencies as you look at applications and as you upgrade them. You know, there's a lot of states that have issued a policy, a cloud-first policy that says as they refresh their technology, their default position is a cloud-based product. If they can't find a cloud-based product, then they might go down the ladder until you get to some custom in-house type of system, but we really need to move away from that more traditional in-house customized application development that we've done since forever.

We're trying to get the statewide assessment done in the current fiscal year -- I'm sorry, in the current biennium next fiscal year. We have been talking to multiple departments. We just had a big presentation last week to the state CIOs about the proposal and are hoping we can get agencies to pitch in to get that initial piece of work done. And so, in the next biennium, what we're looking for to put in our budgets is for Gartner to assist us with agency-specific assessment. So, they will actually go into every application that we have, an agency has, and assess its readiness to move to the cloud. Can it be moved to the cloud? Can it be moved to the Switch data center? If it's in a closet, can it be moved to the facility? Where's the place to put this? Very detailed. We're asking agencies that are willing to budget for that in the next biennium. They had given us a quote for Department of Motor Vehicles. They had expressed some interest in doing that in the next fiscal year. I'm not sure if they're still going to or not, but in the next biennium, I definitely want the EITS computer facility agencies that are located there to be -- for us to do some assessments on those machines as part of our strategy to get the data center closed long-term.

We're also looking at hybrid cloud management tools. We've talked to multiple vendors about their tools for managing that hybrid environment where you've got some of your assets in your data center and some of the assets up in the cloud, becomes pretty complicated in how you manage all that stuff without some enterprise management tools.

And if anybody has any questions, please stop me or I'll just keep rolling.

Chairman Diflo: For the record, this is Paul Diflo. Yeah, let me ask you a question on the ERP project. Does that $65 million, does that include any projected additional support head count, like a technical support or business process support head count? I ask that because I was involved in the implementation of an ERP project, and that's one area that we underestimated, that we had to go back on.

Director Cates: Excellent question. It's a very general estimate for the implementation cost themselves. I can tell you that change management is one of the components in the project office for SMART21. We know that's a big component that we need for the project to be successful. That's not specifically in the $65 million. That's just the implementation cost, but we do have existing resources for the project to address that change management piece.

Chairman Diflo: Okay, thank you, Director.

Senator Denis: Mr. Chair?

Chairman Diflo: Yes, sir?

Senator Denis: Since we're on that issue, I just was wondering on that ERP project on the SMART21, that's been going on for, like, a year now, right, as far as -- actually, we haven't heard a whole bunch about what's going on there, and you brought in Gartner to help with that; is that correct?

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. So, just kind of an overview, we actually kind of started down the road back in 2014 when there was a benchmark study done that showed the state could benefit by upgrading its ERP. We had pretty antiquated paper-intensive processes. So, I believe it was the 2015 session, there was, if I remember right, $1 million appropriated to begin the process to explore an ERP project and begin development of an RFP.

We came back and were allocated $15 million for the current biennium to take us through to RFP and to get the project started in earnest. We initially spent our first year -- we had hired an NSA contractor to work as a project manager, and in turn, hired a few business process analysts, and we spent, I'd say, the better part of a year gathering system requirements from all of the agencies, and the executive committee, I think we were concerned with the progress that we were making. We were making progress, but it was slow, and we recognized that we needed to do more. We also recognized that we really shouldn't be outsourcing the project management of our big IT projects.

I mean, having vendor resources is essential, but it is certainly not sufficient. We took a long, hard look about how we were approaching this project from a staffing standpoint, and we did bring in Gartner consulting to assist us to establish the Office of Project Management and create positions, and that all went to IFC. So, you know, the legislature has certainly reviewed and approved that. We have to go to legislature to get any of the $15 million that was allocated. So, we've had the OPM up and running and fully staffed now for, oh, maybe not quite a year I guess, but they've been doing really well. We have a great team on board. Gartner has been great to work with. They've really given us a good framework to develop this RFP. Gartner had a couple streams of work that they've done for us. One was to initially set up the Office of Project Management, which they've pretty much completed, and the

other portion was to help us develop the RFP, which they have been doing, very pleased with the output that we've received from that. As I said, we are close to ready to release the RFP so that we can get a cost for implementation.

Senator Denis: Have you -- especially in the last year, have you reconnected with some of the vendors and system integrators just on this issue or you feel that that's not necessary and just using the Gartner group?

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. So, I'm trying to think back. So, last year, we did vendor demos, and we invited all the major integrators as well as software vendors to come in and demo their systems and talk about the project. That was a year ago last January. We gathered quite a bit of information from that. I know the Office of Project Management had reengaged with those vendors informally early on. I think we're at a point now where we're close to releasing the RFP, and I don't believe they're engaging with any vendors at all at this point.

Senator Denis: I just wondered since -- I mean, since it's been so long and you had the -- they originally came in at the beginning, but now it's been a year, year-and-a-half. I just wondered if you went back out to see if there's any changes that have occurred, because, you know, in technology, stuff changes really fast, and maybe as you're getting this RFP ready, reengaging with them might give you some insights that you didn't have.

Director Cates: Yeah, that's a good point. I can tell you that most of the big vendors that are interested have been reaching out quite a bit, and I know that at conferences -- we just had the NASCIO conference here a few months ago. I've had some informal discussions with those vendors about, you know, the state of their products, but again, we're going to need to shield them a little bit from the Office of Project Management, because we are so close to releasing the RFP.

Senator Denis: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Diflo: Director Cates?

Director Cates: Let's see. Where am I at? Statewide Office of Project Management, this gets back to what we had talked about with the BDR and the ITOC. I mean, the ITOC is a group of directors. They're business leaders. They're not IT experts. So, we need some people that are a little more in the weeds from the technology standpoint. We are looking to create a statewide Office of Project Management to provide some oversight and guidance to those big technology projects in the state. We really want to base it on the structure of the SMART21 Office of Project Management. We haven't settled on exactly the right mix of positions, but it is probably three or four different positions that we would put together to form this office. It would provide oversight and best practices to all major IT projects statewide. It would ensure that there are standards, project management discipline and status reports that are met by all the projects and that issues are addressed and resolved.

This would provide transparency in reporting on IT projects for the Governor and the legislature. It's an extension of the technology investment notice process. It aligns the CIO, ITAB, and the ITOC. That's says SP for Strategic Planning Committee, but -- so, it's really the operational end of that process, if you will. This group would be preparing reports to bring to the ITAB and the ITOC, for instance. So, we are looking for a few positions,

perhaps some consulting services to assist with starting up the office. It's really -- and I just want to state this isn't about managing state's IT projects. It's about ensuring that all these IT projects have dedicated the correct resources to be successful and that they're using some common tools for reporting and that we ensure that their people have the right certifications for project management, that they're using the same standards and not missing anything. So, it's really an oversight role. They would have a portfolio of projects under them. Each one of those big projects would likely have their own project management offices that would be doing the day-to-day management. So, it's more of an oversight establishing standards, reporting type of process.

If there are no questions on that, I'll just keep going. IT procurement, there have been a series of audits that the Division of Internal Audit has performed. They've done one on procurement in general. They've done one on Enterprise IT Services. There's another report that they are working on that will be presented later this month that'll be made public, and all of these reports really talk about IT procurement, having more of a statewide strategy for IT procurement. I actually would like to, in a future ITAB meeting, go through those audit findings and discuss what we've done to implement them. I think it would be very timely, because the one I just spoke of, that'll be released later this month, but I think there's a lot of audit findings behind this initiative in particular as well as the one I just talked about with the project management office. Sorry, just lost my place here.

So, last session, we did have an initiative for state purchasing. They received approval for an in-house legal counsel to assist with RFPs primarily and provide more legal guidance to purchasing and state agencies around procurement. We want to expand that for purchasing and add a second in-house legal counsel position. The volume of work that that office does in processing contracts and RFPs is pretty significant, and I don't think we ever thought that one person would be able to be able to do justice to that. We're also looking at creating some internships in cooperation with the Sam Boyd School of Law, and as it relates to EITS, we are looking to expand IT procurement oversight, primarily to set some standards for procurement, and so we're looking to add a couple of positions to the Office of the CIO specifically for IT procurement.

Chairman Diflo: For the record, this is Paul Diflo. Yeah, I applaud your efforts on the previous projects to change the position to an enterprise architect. So, if you have an enterprise architect that can set enterprise architect principles, those can become your security standards and your operational standards, and you can avoid somebody procuring a cloud application that doesn't meet those standards, and maybe one of those principles is single sign-on, and you can avoid having multiple credentials out there. So, I think that's an absolute must, and I applaud that.

Director Cates: Thank you. The next item is agency IT services as a standalone agency. Last session, we did some reorganization within EITS. You may recall from previous meetings that the technology shops of Public Safety and Department of Administration, EITS, were combined together several sessions ago. It didn't have a very well thought out plan how it was put together, and neither shop was in particularly good shape in terms of their staffing levels and their ability to execute. So, it had been a real struggle even when I started as Director, and I'm pushing three years now. There was still quite a bit of disconnect in how people were aligned, what budget account they were in, what their functions were. You still had groups of DPS people housed in one area and admin people in another area.

There were problems with identity and culture. So, we went through a pretty systematic reorganization to align the resources in the right place and reclassify some positions.

So, we achieved that in the last biennium, and I think it has borne fruit. I think things have gotten a lot better, but when you look at the EITS org chart, it's a big org chart, and the Agency IT Services that we created is rather large and has a lot of functions in it. This is really sort of the agency-level IT resources. It covers things like desktop, help desk, local area network, application development and project management, includes those types of functions at an agency level, and frankly, probably most of the time in that office is spent supporting Department of Public Safety. They have really big IT needs.

Certainly, Department of Administration takes a lot of resources, but I think what we have all struggled with as leaders is the ability of EITS as an organization to execute those agency-level services separate and distinct from the enterprise level services. Even though we re-orged people, there's still -- I don't know how to say it. So, side conversations with Director Wright from Public Safety is part of why we put this initiative together about, you know, who is really accountable from the IT standpoint. Who is the agency level CIO, if you will, to manage these projects and deliver this agency-level service? And I think it was a real struggle for the EITS administrator to be all of that, to be enterprise level, to provide agency-level services.

So, what we're really looking to do is to make Agency IT Services on par with Enterprise IT Services and add an administrator separate and distinct from EITS, and in that org chart that I showed you, it has that outlined on the righthand side of the org charts. We would really add a new administrator so that that person really is the CIO for the agencies that they serve, the agency-level IT services. I think that will really help in terms of focus and accountability and being able to interact with agency leadership and providing those services. It should, I hope, feel more like their own IT shop rather than it being sort of diffused with the Enterprise IT Services functions and the state CIO function, frankly.

Senator Denis: Mr. Chair?

Chairman Diflo: Yes, sir? Oh, I'm sorry.

Senator Denis: I just had a question on that before he goes on. I have -- actually, when we get done, too, I have questions on the first things we talked about. I just thought we were going to go through all of them, and then I just was making notes. So, on this one on the agency-level IT, so I think you just answered this question. You've been having an issue where -- especially in public safety, where most of the help desk and those types of things are -- the services are needed. You're just trying to make it so that they can get the service that they need and they know who to go to and they don't feel like they've been swallowed up. Is that what I was hearing?

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. That is 100% correct. We're not adding more worker bees. We're just adding one leader that they can go to for all their issues.

Senator Denis: And that was -- that's always -- that was always the concern when you start combining all these different things, especially as we look at on a statewide basis to try to combine these things. The biggest concern from agencies that we always hear is that they're not going to get the service that they need when they become part of a bigger thing. So, I

think that is a good step in trying to alleviate that so that if you're trying to get other agencies to want to come on, you've got that figured out. So, I appreciate that. Thank you.

Director Cates: Thank you. Okay, next item is Centralized Video Conferencing, Collaboration Tools, and Public Meeting Content Management System. There's a few components to this. Talking about the Public Meeting Content Management System, the Department of Administration has statutory requirements to maintain a public notice website where all state and local government has to post their public meetings. Today, that website really provides no value added for agencies. It's just another place they have to go to meet their regulatory requirements. They maintain all of the material for their meetings on their own websites, and then they go and put links on Department of Administration's website. Really, what we would like to be able to do is offer a service so there's a content management system that all agencies could use to post their public meeting notices, material, and I talk in the notes about the Granicus system, which I think is a great system. And those who are familiar with the legislature system, that's what is -- that's their content management system. That's how they archive their videos, stream them, have all the materials supported.

So, we would like to have something like that for executive branch agencies. That also requires that we have an integrated video conferencing system throughout the state where systems can connect together and come through a central bridge so that they can be captured by the Granicus system. We also have a need for video conferencing systems in the state in general, not just for public meetings, but just for collaborations among agencies to keep travel costs down. And we actually have had requests from some agencies, their own IT staff asking that EITS provides some leadership role in video conferencing in terms of spec'ing systems and helping them set them up and things like that. We have been having some communications with vendors, as an example, CISCO, on integrated communication tools that combines video conferencing and phones and a lot of different ways that you can collaborate so that we can connect all these systems together.

And I would just add that we did -- was that last fiscal year? We created the -- we renovated the Old Assembly Chamber in the Capital building which had been used very infrequently, mostly was being used for storage. We renovated that into really a state-of-the-art video conferencing room, seats about 150 people. There are big, 75-inch hi def screens in the corners. We've restored the historic dais so that a seven-member board can sit there. It's been very well received. It's been very popular. That room is booked week in and week out. I think every week there is one, two, or more people meeting -- you know, public bodies meeting in that room. We've connected it down to the Governor's Office, the Grant Sawyer. We're looking to connect it to other places and enhance those video conferencing assets throughout the state.

Twenty-first century telecom solutions, our current phone system, our equipment is up for lease at the end of the current biennium, and we're working on what the next solution is. We have been having some discussions with CISCO and other vendors, and it could be an integrated approach, similar to what we were talking about for video conferencing that could provide an answer in the future. A little uncertain of timing and what's going to actually be in the next biennial budget, but we need to address our current phone system. Enterprise interfacing tool, so what we're talking about here is having a tool that's common that all agencies could use when they are doing system integration, integrating two systems. We currently, in EITS, use Software AG as our current tool. It is underutilized, and it's very

costly. It would be nice to be able to get agencies using one common tool that they could all learn once, and people skills are transferable. It's definitely applicable to the SMART21 project. We need to make sure that we're on a good standard toolset that's cost effective for everyone.

Enterprise Content Management System, our current system for the state's websites, Ektron, is at end of life. They were bought by Episerver a few years ago, and the service levels from them continues to decrease, and they're not making future investments into Ektron. So, we're considering other options to move the state forward to convert its websites, really want to make sure that we have good functionality for things like ecommerce and all the functionality that -- you know, not every agency needs some of that higher-level functionality, but we need to make sure that we have a system that's robust enough to support the most complex needs of agencies. And the next couple of things I want to talk about are not specific to EITS, but they can have a big impact on EITS.

These are other initiatives within the Department. Just a couple of them I want to talk about. Alternative workplace solutions, this is a proposal modeled on the state of Tennessee that would establish a statewide program to foster work from home, mobile workplace, and hoteling. It really is about establishing some design standards for state offices, helping agencies go through and analyze their workforce and identifying the type of employees that are suitable for work at home arrangements or mobile workplace. There's a large -- there's a large number of state employees, based upon their duties and their classifications, that could either work from home or have a mobile workplace, and when you do that, if you do that in a strategic way and do it across agencies, agency-by-agency, you really can re-think your own office configurations and how your offices are laid out.

You know, people that work from home or have a mobile workplace don't need a dedicated office in the office anymore. They can just have cubicles or common work areas that they come into on the days of the week that they're in there. So, in the state of Tennessee, they actually have an office that facilitates this with agencies. They've been doing it since about 2014, and they have seen a lot of success with this. They have reduced their square-foot need for office space for government in Nashville, which is the capital, by 50%. They have vacated one building, and they're putting it up for sale. They're in the process of vacating a second building with the intent of putting it up for sale. So, the reason they started this in the first place was to save money on real estate, and they're doing that.

What they've also found is it's wildly popular with their workforce. It's a recruitment and retention tool, and where they have implemented it, they've actually seen productivity increase. I remember them talking about a program where one office stayed in the old environment and one went to alternative workplace solutions, same program, and the people who were doing the alternative workplace solution, their productivity increased a lot.

Now, some agencies are doing this on whatever basis currently, depending on their workforce. I think we're already there. I think it's an expectation of the next generation of 21st century workforce, but I think if we do it really strategically and purposefully, that we can generate a lot of savings for the state and not have to invest as much in real estate.

Personally, I'm pretty excited by this one. I think we can make a relatively small investment and have a pretty big impact on state expenditures and productivity and workforce development. And the last one is another project that I'm pretty excited by. Oh, no, I'm

sorry, I just wanted to say that obviously, the alternative workplace solutions, IT staff are perfectly suited for these types of arrangements. So, this could have a very profound impact on EITS in particular. I forgot to mention that.

The last item, the Nevada Knowledge and Innovation Center for Better Government, or the KIC as we are calling it, we have a CIP project to renovate the Nevada State Library building. It was built in 1992. It's about 158,000 square-foot building. During the recession, public space in that building was converted over to office space. They turned, for instance, what used to be a gallery of Nevada history and art and turned it into a cube farm for EITS personnel, for application development folks.

We really want to renovate that building. We want to move the library collections into closed storage in the basement. That'll open up the first floor of the library that we can renovate into meeting rooms, collaborative workspace, private workspace, hoteling, very consistent with the alternative workspace solutions initiative. We're referring to that area as the learning commons, and we convert part of the second floor of the library to research, government documents, and library services, and it, again, would have more meeting space. Training and conference facilities, we've already made some changes in the building. We moved out payroll from the building last year. The space that they were occupying has been converted back into a training room, which is what it was made for in the first place.

We are also looking, as part of this project, to take the southern end of the building where EITS is currently located and renovating that into a conference -- into a conference room. So, we would have more training and conference facilities in this building, and we would reopen the gallery that I mentioned before and we would add those video conferencing assets that I talked about in the other initiative, and we would add some food service.

Some of the programming that would occur in that building, we would provide enhanced training opportunities for state employees. We would have both formal and informal training to develop a 21st century workforce that embraces digital government. There's a strong technology bent in this project that's very purposeful. I think as technology changes and we have more cloud-based opportunities, cloud-based applications, a lot of these systems require more people that understand business rules more so than -- you need programmers and maybe some of the traditional IT type positions. It's really important that all of our workforce is very digitally literate and understands how to work nimbly with technology.

We're also working on developing some collaborations with Nevada System of Higher Education. We want internship positions created in this facility. We're also talking about certification programs for state workers, and in our preliminary discussions with some folks at NSHE, we're talking about a pilot for fiscal certification in the next biennium. Important piece here that we want to be part of the programming in this facility, public and private partnerships, particularly with technology companies to do demonstration projects, proof of concepts, and to have the facility be a showcase for new technology. We're also going to be aggressively pursuing donations and fundraising mechanisms for different components of the construction and the programming. I'm hoping to get some scholarships for some of those interns from the private sector.

LEAN Nevada, that's a continuous process improvement, training and certification program. It expands our current Certified Public Managers training as a formalized, very intensive training that we put up and coming management through. It's a bigtime commitment. We

don't put that very many people through it. This is a way of kind of expanding that into the culture of the state, this continuous process improvement type of work. I can tell you this type of approach is expanding rapidly among states.

Last session, I proposed this as a budget concept, wasn't picked up by the Governor's Office, and it wasn't really that well thought out at that time. At that time, you had the state of Washington, Wisconsin, and Ohio. I think those were the only ones I can think of. They had active programs. There's actually a Harvard study on Washington's process improvement office and its success. Since then, it has been expanding like wildfire among states. There's now a dozen states that have active programs, another dozen states that are developing programs. It's really, I think, a key way that we can transform the workforce to get people to be problem solvers instead of paper pushers.

Project management certifications for IT project management, I don't want to preempt the audit that's coming out, but there's going to be some recommendations around standardizing project management for IT projects, because we don't have a standard discipline in the state, depends on the individuals on a project. We don't require any formal certifications or anything. We'll also be adding some library personnel and interns. I mentioned the interns, that we'll be pursuing some private funding, and then I have the org chart that speaks to some of those budget initiatives. And the last thing I had, and I don't know if anybody down south has been able to get any hard copies delivered to them, but I do have some drawings from an architect, TSK, that's been working on the library project with us for you to just look at, and I'm really happy with the design.

You can see this 3D perspective of the first floor of the library building. The big blue area on the right is currently the main floor of the library. That is currently full of stacks of books and microfiche cabinets, and, you know, there's some common areas in there, but it's pretty much -- looks like a traditional library, and you can see kind of the different meeting spaces, work stations, meeting rooms. You can see over the blue area on the far left side, that, right now, is office space for EITS, and that's all broken up into different offices. We basically opened that up and turned it into a conference room. And I won't go over all these, but you can just kind of look at it at your leisure and see the different areas. There's some descriptions on -- I think it's about the fourth page, of what the different functional areas are in the building.

This is another blowup of the library and then some conceptual drawings of what the interior space would look like. You know, this is the learning commons. You can see everybody in there, different areas where they can sit and collaborate and work privately, work in groups. You can see in the lobby actually having a -- if anybody is familiar with the building, if you walk through that lobby today, it's pretty dead. People transit through there from one place to another, and it's a beautiful space. It's very underutilized. So, you can see an information booth in there. That black box on the wall with the state seal, that's intended to be a large LED screen where you could do wayfinding for people, you know, do some state programming on that. You can see this is also in the lobby area there's some stairs that are being proposed to put on one side that would take you directly up to the top floor, which is where most of the library distribution and stuff would be. You probably can't see it with the small size, but there's the food service right there. We're calling that the Governor's Grill, to have some food service like they have the Caucus Deli in the legislative room -- or I'm sorry, in this room in the legislature -- legislative building. That's the word I'm looking for, sorry.

This next shot, this is of currently is EITS space. You can get a visual of what that would look like, a raised platform, some multimedia assets, and I think that was seating for about 150 people. And again, this isn't specific to EITS. The main partners in this building would be -- that's some outside seating -- would be HR, because they provision a lot of the training. It would be the library, because it's a library, and we would convert it in a 21st century library, libraries where a lot of research would occur, a lot of collaboration would occur, and a lot of informal learning.

Purchasing, basically, every division within the Department of Administration, pretty much every division, has some statutory training requirements that they have to provide to state agencies so they'll provision them here. I think Purchasing and EITS in particular would partner together on a lot of those public-private partnerships and bringing in these technology companies to work on some demonstration projects, host some vendor fairs. You know, we get IT vendors that come in and go around agency-by-agency, you know, plying their wares, which is fine, but if we could provide them a forum where everybody could come together and collaborate together, we think that would be more effective. So, that is all I have.

Chairman Diflo: For the record, Paul Diflo. Well, thank you, Director Cates. That was a very comprehensive review of the initiatives, some of them very exciting. My guess is you have generated -- will generate some questions from the Board, maybe some discussion. So, with that, we will open it up for any questions or discussion on what Director Cates reviewed.

Senator Denis: Chair?

Chairman Diflo: Senator?

Senator Denis: Thank you. Let's see if I can find my notes. I'm going to go way back for just a second. These are real quick I hope. On the microwave projects, when do you anticipate that you -- you mentioned that they would be done, but some of that also is dependent on whether -- and other stuff, right, but when do you anticipate that that project will be done?

Director Cates: I don't know the exact date. I can get back to you on that. I believe that the work is supposed to be -- most of the installation work is supposed to be completed in the current biennium, but there's some maintenance and some other things that will continue in the out years. I think the maintenance agreement goes for -- I can't remember if it was nine years or something. I'm sorry, we're not coming up with the dates. I'll have to get back to you on that, but I think the bulk of the work is supposed to be completed in the current biennium, but I can get back to you with a more specific timeline.

Senator Denis: Thanks, and then the same thing with the Office 365. You said that's -- last session, you approved a certain amount, and then you were going to come back and do the rest of it. When do you anticipate that the first part -- because I think in here, you said something about -- or I was reading somewhere that you were having some issues, but that everything is all in place now, that you can complete that.

Director Cates: We are on track to complete those agencies that were budgeted to be on Office 365. We should have that completed this biennium. We just gave a report to some LCB staff I think a week ago on the project on the status of that. We're on schedule. We're

hitting our targets according to our contract. You know, we've had a few hiccups along the way. I think we probably could have used maybe more people than we asked for. We certainly probably could have used more contract dollars than we've asked for, but I think all the agencies are participating, have collaborated really well with us, and we're getting it done. You know, I'll be happy to forward to you the report that we gave to LCB. We'll forward it to all the members.

Senator Denis: Thank you. And then on the other -- on page two, the cloud strategy IT facility consolidation, when are you looking to have the -- complete that?

Director Cates: Well, the first phase is the statewide assessment and policy framework. We're not certain yet, but we're hoping to get that done next fiscal year, so fiscal 2019. Right now, we're talking to agencies about the proposal and see if we can cobble together the funding with multiple agencies participating. I anticipate we'll have to go to IFC. At least some of us will have to go to IFC to move money around and make that happen. So, I think at this point, we're talking about, at the earliest, an August IFC before that work could start. And if I remember, the timeline for that, it was about a 12-week engagement, and then the other piece is, you know, the assessment of the EITS facility and those agencies. That would be built into the next biennial budget.

Senator Denis: Okay, cool, and then I had -- my last question, I think, was on the phone system, the current lease. How long have we had the current lease?

Director Cates: I'm getting blank looks from my supporters in the back.

Senator Denis: Been a while?

Director Cates: It has been a while. I mean, it went through a few sessions of just getting agencies on board, and I know that in the 2017 or -- I'm getting my sessions confused. The 2015 or 2017, we kind of brought the final list of agencies on board onto the system. It's been quite a while.

Senator Denis: Yeah, and I -- you know, for some of us, sometimes we see that, and we think, didn't we just do this? You know, but, you know, it's important to make sure that we keep up, and I don't know how the actual phones are holding up, but it's good to see that. So, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Director Cates: Thank you.

Joseph Marcella: Mr. Chair?

Chairman Diflo: Yes, sir.

Joseph Marcella: Joe Marcella. To Director Cates, I had a couple of questions. First of all, on the ERP, is that an enterprise, ERP? I mean, everything is labeled ERP when it comes to infrastructure software, but is that for the entire enterprise, in other words, the entire state, or is it -- folks will have to sign up for that individually?

Director Cates: So, it's for the entire state. Even today --

Joseph Marcella: So, everybody's on the same -- I'm sorry. Everyone is on the same payroll and purchasing system and HR, and so forth?

23

Director Cates: Correct.

Joseph Marcella: Is that what ERP -- okay.

Director Cates: Yes, that's correct. Even the system we have today, the Advantage system, Advantage Financial and HR, those are statewide systems. The whole state uses those systems. I think DOT has a different instance of the Advantage system, because they have some customization, but still the same platform, and that's what we intend for this. And the executive committee has set a goal of having a cloud-based system that all state agencies will use, and we have participation from all state agencies that have subject matter experts committed to the project.

Joseph Marcella: Where did you coin the name SMART21? Is that 2021 or is that 21st century or am I making two assumptions that's wrong -- that are wrong.

Director Cates: It refers to the 21st century if I remember. It was a -- it was a -- we had a split vote on the executive committee on the choice of names for the project, and we settled on this, and I believe it refers to 21st century. And I can't for the life of me remember what SMART means, but it's an acronym for something related to technology.

Joseph Marcella: And part of that was sort of being comical as it's going to be finished within the 21st century or 2021. The other comment and observation I'd like to make, if you will, is that, one, what you've just described is, one, not only aggressive, but it's a lot of moving parts. There are a lot of things being done, all of which are related either directly or have dependencies on each other, communication software, and so forth. Is there an overarching strategic plan that pulls all of this together so that we can see the timeline and the relationship of not only the communications and the security when that gets layered in and the infrastructure and 365 and how that goes out to the individual agencies, and then the last thing, obviously, I think ERP is foundational. It's not necessarily strategic at all. It's your payroll. It's the delivery of purchasing, and there's a standardization for that. What I'm seeing is, is that some of this is coordinated. Some of it is leveraging the horizontal so that -- and preserving the vertical, but a lot of it seems to be catch up; am I correct?

Director Cates: For the record, Patrick Cates. Yeah, I think a lot of it is catch up. You know, the State hasn't updated its IT strategic plan in a number of years. What I can point to in terms of strategic plan is between my own ears and that of the CIO, and we are certainly leveraging different needs with each other and different capabilities with each other, but I really do believe that a lot of this is catch up, because during the recession, we lost a lot of resources. We did not make a lot of investments in technology other than, you know, a few who might still have had funding, and to really drive enterprise-level IT, we have to make some investments and play catch up to get some basic tools in place, such as the ERP system, which is a 20-year-old system.

Joseph Marcella: What you're literally doing, then, and again, this is what my observation is, is that you're setting a foundation that's functional so that each individual agency who participate as well as the centralized IT could start to step off and start to create new services, innovative services, and support the communities, both the -- obviously, the cities, the counties, and the constituents. Is that what I'm understanding?

Director Cates: Yeah, that's spot-on. That's correct. I talk a lot about digital government transformation. That's kind of a buzzword, but really, we are on the cusp of, you know, an inflection point of changing technology, and we have an opportunity to shed some of our legacy technology and modes of doing business and embrace these newer tools that'll allow us to be more nimble and not have to invest in legacy infrastructure. And this is all setting the foundation to help us do that, help us move forward into the 21st century for a digital government.

Joseph Marcella: And the last question is, is do you have a more favorable -- is the technology -- has it stepped up in the budget process where, in fact, folks realize that they actually have to spend money to service the communities? In other words, do you have better favor in the budget process than you've had in past years? It's an unfair question, but I'm going to ask it.

Director Cates: I'm trying to figure out a diplomatic answer. I think it was really hard for the state to invest in anything but keeping their head above the water during the recession. So, there wasn't a lot of appetite to make a lot of technology investments. I think people are seeing the need for this type of investment more and more. You know, the last session, we had some ambitious IT initiatives, and the Governor supported them, and we were successful getting through the legislature. We got everything we asked for from a technology standpoint. So, I found that very encouraging. I think people do recognize the need for this.

Joseph Marcella: Appreciate your comments. Thank you.

Chairman Diflo: For the record, Paul Diflo. Any other questions or discussion regarding the strategic review? Seeing none, I will thank you, Director Cates, for your very comprehensive review.

Director Cates: Thank you.

8. PROJECT STATUS DASHBOARD – Michael Dietrich, State CIO

Chairman Diflo: And I will ask the state CIO, Michael Dietrich, to come up and present the project status dashboard.

Michael Dietrich: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. For the record, Michael Dietrich. So, the Project Status Dashboard, which you should all have a handout of the prototype, if you will, this kind of came from a couple of directions. One was in a previous Agenda item, which was to cover our strategic initiatives, IT initiatives, which Patrick just did a wonderful job of doing. Also, part of that discussion was the status of projects that are in flight, things that we're currently working on, and something that also I was looking for as the new state CIO, because I'm used to, in the private sector, being across many initiatives and having the need of an executive dashboard so that I can see exactly where we're at with projects.

And the idea is to keep it very lightweight, because we're covering a lot of ground here, and the traditional method of building a dashboard like this is what is going well, what are we blocked by or what could have gone better, and some overall health indicator of the project. Is it red, yellow, or green? The stoplight analogy is commonly used in these types of artifacts.

So, in speaking with Chairman Diflo before the meeting, it seemed like a great idea to kind of present where we were at with this prototype of the dashboard and get feedback. Primarily, is this something that would be a useful tool for the ITAB to see this, and before I -- actually, before we get into that, this prototype includes a select list of projects. First of all, you can see the first page. There's a heading, Agency IT Services. The AITS PMO currently manages 59 projects, and obviously, there are not 59 projects in this deck.

So, there was some selection criteria for the prototype as to what we would include, and those were projects that were funded, approve-funded by the legislature that were on the initiative's list that was just presented or kind of a little bit fuzzier definition, which is ones that have risen to a level of visibility that we need to include them if they don't meet those first two criteria, but it's very likely that they will meet the first two criteria -- that they will be on here because they've met the first two criteria.

So, the discussion is, is this something that is valuable, you know, not just to me as the CIO, but to the ITAB in general, and if so, what should we include? How many of these should we include in this level of detail? We can also go into any of these that you would like to discuss the detail of the project, but I would like to highlight, for example, if you turn to the very last page, just one example kind of walking through the format of one of the projects, again, to not -- the intent is not to go down through every one of them, but for example, the microwave replacement project, current project status is yellow.

And first of all, we start out with the name of the project, the purpose and the scope of the project, so why it is that we're doing this, and this should always be comprehensive enough so that folks who aren't intimately familiar with what the project is can at least get the overall intent for the state to be embarking on this initiative. And then the next section is the challenges, and in this case, we have three specific challenges. First of all, there's a work program in progress to divert funding for the project.

There's also a contract delay in the tower lease for the Sawtooth Mountain Tower and also some USFS approval for construction of a tower at Pinegrove Peak. So, these three things are causing some slippage to the project, therefore, the project status is yellow. This is -- it's not a significant slippage. Now, of course, a lot of this depends upon the approval of the work program that is currently being submitted. The outcome of that could certainly change the project status.

Another highlighted project, one that we just spoke about, is -- let's see. I'm sorry, these pages aren't numbered. I apologize. It's on the back of the second page. This is the DPS restructured OTIS modernization. It was spoken about that this was a project that had suffered from some lack of PMO oversight and therefore some slippage.

So, this is one that is in a red status, primarily due to the fact that the schedule of the project has slipped approximately 45 days. We didn't see any impact to the project budget itself, but there is still a lot of work to accomplish, and that needs to be accomplished in a very short period of time.

So, we're saying that there is some risk to delivery of the project at that -- on that timeline, and also, this is -- there's some ongoing discussion about what "done" looks like, quote-unquote, of the project, and this is specifically dealing with the data export function, which is

outside of the project scope, but that is something that is being negotiated with the customer; therefore, we're pending acceptance of the revised schedule.

So, there's a couple of highlights of how this system would work. So, opening this up to comments, questions?

Joseph Marcella: Mr. Chair, I do have a recommendation –

Chairman Diflo: Mr. Marcella.

Joseph Marcella: -- for Mr. Dietrich. When it comes to -- I'm sorry, I have to get back into it, challenges, do you see any benefit in adding what the dependencies are and what the impact might be, and it could be based on those dependencies. For instance, it would be good for us to know if a project is failing or falling behind or actually doing well, how that has a relationship to anything else that has a dependency or it impacts based on all of the other projects that you have so that we can make some judgments as to, from a business perspective, how to help you move those things forward.

Michael Dietrich: For the record, Michael Dietrich. That is an excellent suggestion. I do agree with that and as I am a big proponent of the "why" we do things and understanding the business impact of a delay or slippage in a project would certainly be an important thing to include in this -- in the dashboard.

Joseph Marcella: I think this is an excellent document; otherwise, it's a good 50,000-foot overview of what's going on within your organization, so thank you.

Michael Dietrich: Thank you.

Chairman Diflo: For the record, Paul Diflo. Any other feedback for Michael? Mr. Betts?

Craig Betts: I'd like to make a comment. Mr. Dietrich, I like the document as well. It's a good snapshot of these projects and the status. I had a comment very similar to Mr. Marcella regarding the red, yellow, green stoplight. It looks like that's a combination perhaps of a few things, such as maybe budget functionality, timeline. Any one of those could turn a color yellow or red, so some clarity around which component is driving that color if it's not green, but also, I had a question about the delivery date. Is that a -- was that the original project scoped date or is that the proposed revised date?

Michael Dietrich: For the record, Michael Dietrich. Thank you for the question. I would have to get back to you on clarification of these dates from the PMO team, but certainly, it would be good to state that there was an original date if -- let's say the date was revised, an original date and then revisions if appropriate. Thank you.

Craig Betts: Thank you.

Senator Denis: Mr. Chair?

Chairman Diflo: Senator?

Senator Denis: Yeah, I think this is great. You know, when you can look at something and see where it's at, and especially if you got folks that are asking you about it, you can look at it real quickly, and I would agree on the date thing. I think if you have your original date and

then if there's an adjustment to that date, because a lot of times, you'll get those kind of questions. Weren't you supposed to have it done by November? And you can explain why, you know, it's going to take now until January or something, right? So, I agree. This looks good, thanks.

Chairman Diflo: Director Cates?

Director Cates: Thank you. So, I'm just wondering in terms of what would be presented to this body. I know that for the IT Strategic Planning Committee, there is a dollar threshold. Excuse me. I feel like I'm going to sneeze. Okay, it went away -- that there is a dollar threshold in what they consider, and I guess -- it seems like we would want some information on here as to what the budget is, and maybe there's some level. So that we don't end up with a list of very minor projects, we might want to set some monetary thresholds. I think it's $500,000 for the IT Strategic Planning Committee to even look at an IT project. I don't know what the right number should be, but it seems like that financial piece ought to be part of what goes into this.

Michael Dietrich: Thank you, Director Cates, for the feedback, and I certainly appreciate that and would love to hear the Committee's recommendation on the criteria for inclusion, because I absolutely agree. We certainly wouldn't look at all 59 projects, especially since some of them are on hold and in indefinite hold status for budgetary reasons or they simply weren't approved, and I think that the monetary value of the project is a good threshold to use.

Chairman Diflo: For the record, Paul Diflo. Yeah, in my opinion, I would agree with that. Anything that would go to the steering committee is probably appropriate to come to ITAB, and if that's the criteria, I would think that would make a lot of sense. Any other thoughts on what Director Cates has proposed?

Joseph Marcella: Joe Marcella. I'm curious if this material could be dynamic in a way that it's online, could be on the ITAB website or under some sort of a secure sign-on and that sort of thing so that prior to a meeting, there might be issues that we've been following as well as from a legislative perspective and from a community point of view. If a question is asked, we actually have the information to answer them with, particularly with the governments in the south and in the north, because they do have a dependency on some of the things that state does, so a snapshot. If it's a dashboard, can it be put online so that we can watch what's going on?

Michael Dietrich: Michael Dietrich for the record. Thank you, Mr. Marcella, for the comment. I really appreciate that, and it is my hope that -- especially given the internal nature of the tool, that we can put this online and it can be dynamic so that it's something that can be easily referenced. I would certainly take the Committee's lead as to what we would want to publish in a public forum under the charter of this Committee, but certainly, if we have the mechanism to place it online for internal purposes, then the online document could be shared as appropriate.

Joseph Marcella: Thank you. I think being private would be beneficial.

Chairman Diflo: Agree. Any other input for Mr. Dietrich? Seeing none, thank you, appreciate that, Michael. I assume you can gather the information that's been captured, the feedback, and we can get an update for the next meeting.

Michael Dietrich: Yes, I've taken copious notes.

Chairman Diflo: All right.

Michael Dietrich: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Committee, for your time, appreciate it.

9.   ADA ACCESSIBILITY STATE WEBSITES – Linda DeSantis, Agency IT Services

Chairman Diflo: That will take us to Agenda Item 9. If you recall from the February meeting, it came up in public comment that we needed a status on ADA accessibility state websites. So, I would like to invite Linda DeSantis from Agency IT Services to give us a status on that.

Linda DeSantis: Good afternoon. My name is Linda DeSantis. I am the manager of the web group, and it's under Agency IT Services Department of Administration. First thing I want to say is that I've tried to summarize this as much as possible, but we've been working on it for quite a while. So, we do have a website. The name is here, ada.nv.gov. We've got a lot of information there. So, I please encourage anybody, if you need more information, to go there and kind of look around. Hopefully, there's a lot more detail that I'm going to provide.

I just want to begin by saying we started the efforts for -- EITS actually started the efforts in August of 2015, and we basically just started reading about it, got a couple of comments email-wise or phone calls, and we actually started to learn about it and look into it. We wrote a white paper. We actually did create this website, again, back in 2015. We did secure a free download of a wave tool, does one-page analysis at a time, and we used that for several years, actually, until about 2017.

Basically, at that point, what we were trying to do was understand what the issue actually was, and then of course, how could we try to remedy it and remediate it. And at that point, we did have the pleasure of working with Brett Silver, who was -- he was blind from birth, used assistive technology, and we were able to prepare a bunch of templates, and here's a video, here's a YouTube, here's a proclamation. Could you tell us -- evaluate it and tell us what you were getting if it was compliant to try to help us, again, understand, and at that point is when we actually did understand that with proclamations, for example, if a person using a -- was blind and the image, the proclamation, the executive orders were graphics or images, all they could see was the title of it and nothing more. So, it was pretty much a useless document out there for anybody that did have a problem or was using assistive technology.

So, that kind of started us, and then as we progressed a little bit more, the Department of Education actually was cited by the Office of Civil Rights, and because they're on our content management system -- and I probably should have started by saying we do have a state content management system, and I'll go a little bit further into it, but the Department of Education had three sites that are on that. So, of course, we were part of it, because the system was not ADA compliant.

29

So, we met with them. We wound up purchasing a remediation tool, did a little bit more than one page at a time. It was called Site Improve. So, we wound up getting a license where, like, five or six state sites could be under it so that it would help them -- it actually -- the tool scans the system constantly. It evaluates the content and documents and everything against the WCAG, you know, Section 508 standards, and it comes up with a report telling us -- it comes up with recommendations. It doesn't fix it, but it will say, this is what you've got to do. Here's some of the recommendations for how to fix it. So, we, again, had to have some understanding time as to how to use the tool.

We then trained Department of Education's webmaster, one of the few agencies that solely has just a webmaster that does nothing but webmaster work on many of their sites, and we actually had to get certified ourselves to prove to OCR that we understood it well enough to train, and at that point, as soon as we trained her, she actually got 100 or so of the webmasters that actually touch Department of Education, and she trained them also. So, they've been working on it for about a year-and-a-half now. They're absolutely doing great. They've used the tool. They're reporting to the -- they have a contract with OCR, and they do report their status, and we work with them, of course, on it, but it was, again, a step forward.

Again -- let me see. I'm sorry, I think I have to change the page. On May 17th -- May of 2017, the National Federation of the Blind sent a letter to the Governor's Office, and at that point, it was -- what we actually did is we started to put together a working committee, and that's where the committee expanded a lot. We wound up working with Thomas Kearns from the Office of Disability Services at TMCC and Assisted Technology Consumers, and we meet with them, and on the site, there's a list of all the meetings that we did. I put a report out pretty much every month on all of the progress or all of the issues or whatever has come out again on the website. But what I really wanted to state there is that we were very convinced that once we got the tool and we could -- and the tool would say that a page or a template was ADA compliant for a document, we felt that that was good, that we had been successful.

By working with Thomas and the assistive technology group, we've realized that it doesn't mean that, that the tool can only make certain decisions and give certain recommendations, and it is compliant, but navigation considerations and things that the tool wouldn't tell us is something that we're learning by working with the assistive technology group where we have a dropdown, for instance, on a navigation bar. Well, they don't see that, and the way -- and when we did check it, the way that -- I'm sorry, the card reader or the JAWS or whatever the reader is that they're using, most of the time, it'll just skip over it or if I just say meetings and there's 20 different items under that, all they see is meetings.

So, it's helped us understand not only do we have to use the tool, but we have to redesign things in the correct way, and we also need to have the human person there testing and helping us. So, that was just something we thought we were doing well, but we could certainly do better, and so I just wanted to mention that. We have -- the EITS team has been trained on ADA remediation. When I say trained, the basic training. We are constantly learning every day. We are getting software. We use linda.com. We just got some software -- or requested some software where we can actually have our staff get certified so that they -- and they're just a better outreach that we can have of information and education. I wanted to mention about our content management system. I probably should have put it in the front. Currently, our CMS has about 500 users, and they rotate, believe me, if a person moves

around in the state, but those 500 users, we have 142 websites that we're monitoring and that live in our content management system. And we have 23,711 pages on those 142 websites that we are addressing and trying to make compliant. Then the nice thing about that is that because it is a content management system, we have smart forms or templates. So, there might only be 20 or 25 different layouts or formats to the page.

So, once we were able to get those ADA compliant, we now have to -- like, we've had them tested. We've had AT consumers. We've also had Site Improve as part of the OCR. When they cited DOE, one of the things they had was manual auditing, and that was actually evaluated. So, our templates we know are ADA compliant according to them and according to, you know, someone that's worked with them as an -- with assistive technology devices, but now what we're trying to do is move them into the websites. And out of the 142, we probably just directly support, as in doing the updates ourself, probably 20, the Governor's Office and several other -- a lot of the boards. But the users themselves actually -- Department of Education, Department of Health and Human Resources, they all have their own staff. So, what we're doing is as we're approaching each new department, we contact them. We get the new templates in. We actually have a training class that we put together in NVeLearn, our learning environment, and they can take the class, and it's pretty detailed, and we just say, these are the rules of ADA. If you're dealing with a staff template, this is what you have to do in order to remediate it. So, we've got that out there. We've had, I think, 29 people so far have used -- have looked at it, and what we're doing is as we see that people have taken that class, we're reaching out to them and saying, okay, are you ready now to start, you know, remediating your website and your content? What else?

To date, we only have -- well, we have seven websites remediated. Thirty-one are currently being remediated, so we've reached out to 31 more agencies, and we're working on that. The issue that we're running into that's more daunting is really the documents and the multimedia, and we have 81,284 documents out of those 142 websites and 13,000-plus multimedia.

So, what we've done is we actually have -- out of those 31 that are current -- websites that are currently being remediated, they're probably almost remediated when it comes to the content. What's stopping them from being fully remediated is the documents.

So, what we've been able to do is we actually have -- there's groups in the Department that are either online or they're part of the help desk or they're part of the operational area, and they've got a little free time until a call comes in or whatever, and that's who we've been working with. We've trained six people so far. So, on their free time, when they don't -- when they're waiting for a phone call, they actually have been trained to remediate pdfs. So, they'll sit there and they'll go through and they'll remediate them and put them on the site, and then we just upload them into the document, into the actual website, and then we test it again.

So, hopefully, we will go from seven to a lot more, a lot quicker, because it's almost like having six part-time employees that are helping us, and basically, we're also teaching them how to make documents compliant to begin with, start out and create those documents and create compliant ones so we don't have to go back and try to remediate them after the fact when you can create them ahead of time.

What I don't have here is we have a tremendous amount of training online, a lot of written documentation. We've also started putting webinars out there for people who want to learn a

different word, learn a different way. So, that we're consistently doing. We have this one document guide that seems to be very popular that we've trained the people with that you actually -- here's all of the procedures. Like, how can I remediate a Word document in ten easy steps? And we give them a bad Word document that they can, you know, download and actually go through the process and remediate it as they're doing it, and we're working right now on doing -- it's been so successful, we're doing the same thing on how can you remediate audio files, how can you remediate, you know, YouTube videos and anything we can think of. We're trying to give them that walking through, and basically, we're trying to make it so tested and consistent, that we can tell our users now, just come here, follow these instructions, and it will help us with the outreach, because as you can imagine, it's quite a bit of outreach. And that's just dealing with our own CMS, our own content management system.

We've also -- like I mentioned earlier, we've only got the Site Improve tool for six sites. I think we've got three of Department of Education. We've got the Governor's site out there. We've remediated all of those proclamations all the way back to 2016, I believe, all of the executive orders, all the press releases. So, we're feeling pretty good about moving that forward. We've also realized, and this is something else, we've also realized that we're doing it kind of manually, because it was part of our learning, and now we feel like we're kind of understanding it enough. So, now for every -- I mentioned there's 25 templates -- or different types of templates.

So, say if you go to everybody's homepage, there might be 20 fixes we have to make for the header and the footer that are pretty consistent across the entire 142 sites. So, what we are currently working on is writing a program that we can release and update all of those 142 at one point. So, it won't make the entire site compliant, because there's still other templates that are being used, but it will allow the users of the site to be able to come in and fix the navigation and fix the other things that are consistent across every page in the site. So, we're hoping that will also help us make bigger strides faster instead of one person kind of going through, saying, okay, today, we're going to work on health. Let's do this. Let me see. What else?

Future plans, we are -- I believe on Friday, we have our first kickoff meeting for SeamlessDocs. One of the things that we absolutely love about it is that it will take a pdf. It can make it into a form that's interactive. By doing that, you're actually putting all of those elements that you need to have a compliant form along with it being ADA compliant -- I'm sorry, along with being interactive. It also – I'm reading this. It also allows online signatures, and we've also -- we were able to acquire a service center, which we're really kind of excited about. Years ago, we used to have all the forms online. I think it was called Silver Source, and we can actually almost mirror that now where we can eventually start taking a lot of those documents out of the website, linking to this service center where the documents are.

So, we're actually excited about doing that. It will help tremendously. It will -- the one thing about the SeamlessDocs that we're trying to check out is if it's a regular pdf, it's pretty -- with no interactivity whatsoever, it's not going to be compliant -- if it's not compliant when you bring it into SeamlessDocs, it won't be after, but that's our plan of we'll take those, make sure they're compliant when we bring them in. And like I said, people will be able to go right to

that SeamlessDocs service center portal to get any website. It's got taxonomy. It's got all of the data that it needs and the structure that it needs.

In 2020-2021 budget, we've asked to have Siteimprove for all the sites within the CMS. Like I said, we have 142. We're only covering about five, which means that as we're testing and remediating, we're back to doing the one page at a time, which is time-consuming, and it's part of why it's so slow for our process. Also, we've asked to increase the FTE by two. We support the CMS. We support the Nevada eLearn system. We're doing support for anything web-related at all, and our staff, we have two people that are actually covering our phones, what we call state web. It would be nice to have another person there.

Certainly, we possibly could cover -- because now we're covering not only questions about the systems that we support, but we're covering questions about ADA. So, we've got to make sure that everybody is covered and that we've got enough people to respond and give them a customer service experience. And then of course, what we want to do is we want to continue to do the outreach to all the CMS users, and right now, we do it by email. We send out reports, and we have reports posted on the website all the time. We've got e-blasts that we send out to all of the CMS users, especially if something goes down. So, we're just trying to expand all of those -- all of those tools that we have.

The needed governance, and I will say it's on my document that I've attached, but I did not put it onto this document. The needed governance is based on information Thomas and I -- Thomas Kearns and I work a lot together along with assistive technology. We try to meet about every month, every month-and-a-half, and these are some of the initiatives that we all felt would help us with this endeavor, the first one being state authority to move accessibility forward to non-CMS users.

I work with the legislature. I've talked with one of their people last week, showed them the website we've got we're trying to share. I mean, I'd like to see the CMS website, the ada.nv.gov be expanded to cover all of the state websites, you know. We do have -- we have a link on there. It's like a little logo that we put on several years ago, and that links to a complaint form, and that complaint form, not only is it -- we just deal with website issues, but other issues are physical disabilities. So, we work a lot with HR and equal opportunity -- the equal opportunity area.

So, when we have everybody on our website, if they link to it, there's a form, and that's going to be one of the forms that we actually put into SeamlessDocs just so that we can have better outreach, but everybody can create -- you know, they put their complaints in, and then we evaluate it, and we disperse it to it's either a physical disability or it's a state site. And the problem we're running into is in a lot of the complaints that are coming in that way aren't necessarily on sites that are in our CMS.

So, you know, we do outreach. We send it to them. We haven't had too terribly many, but what we're asking other agencies to do is put that link on their website even if they're not in our CMS so we can have one centralized area to collect these complaints and try to at least be able to get back to the user and tell them, you know, what's going on and what are they doing or at least make them aware of it. Centralized accessibility authority, that's another one of the things we need governance on, statewide accessibility inventory of all websites within Nevada. I've certainly got that capability on our CMS, but I don't have a clue when it comes to Secretary of State or NDOT or DMV. They could be doing a lot. I'm just not aware of it,

and maybe I don't need to be, but I think somebody needs to be, because the complaints are coming in, you know, and that's the other thing, that every state agency would have a way for a user or consumer to ask for help.

That was the one issue I'm talking about that maybe we could just have them link to us, mandatory training for anybody in the state that provides content to state websites, and when it comes to mandatory training, Thomas was very specific. I tried to keep it kind of brief, but it is detailed a little bit more in the document behind the Word doc, but basically, to let them know the law and to let them know what it does cause issues, how it causes issues, what they should be doing about it, where I think a lot of people just don't realize it. And it's never been something that was -- we just started looking at in 2015. We probably should have looked at it a lot sooner, but it's -- I think we're moving ahead, probably not moving ahead fast enough.

Create and maintain all state agency accessibility purchase processes, and that's certainly something that I learned more from Thomas than anything about when you buy a product, it's got to be able to be ADA compliant with VPATs and other things that needed to be done. I'm not very good at that, where Thomas would have a lot more information than I would, but basically, you know, we've been talking about doing that, and that was one of the things, when we looked at SeamlessDocs, it was one of our concerns. And one of the things when we do our pilot, which is probably in the next week or so, is to make sure that it does in fact produce ADA-compliant information. If not, at least we can figure out, just like with the CMS, what additional thing do we need to do so that when we do release it to a website, that it is compliant, and then verify reporting of ADA assets and state web and electronic information, possibly legislation.

There was a letter that came, I believe -- and I didn't put the date. I'm sorry, it was just about -- I think it was the end of May, and the NFB, the National Federation for the Blind, has asked for another meeting at the Governor's Office. It was originally scheduled for June 1st. It's been moved to July -- second or third week in July. The date I don't have yet, but basically, that's kind of what they're asking for also. They've pretty much said, yeah, you're moving forward when it comes to the content management system for the state, but what about the rest of it? And that was addressing kind of what Thomas had said with his public notice speaking last month -- last session, I'm sorry. And that's pretty much what I have. Does anybody have any questions?

Chairman Diflo: For the record, Paul Diflo. Thank you for the status, Linda. I think you eluded to this where you provided training to people, so you could stop digging the hole as new web sites are created.

Linda DeSantis: Yes.

Chairman Diflo: And that's just for the hundred and –

Linda DeSantis: I can address that if -- what we have is we do have it for the 142, but what we are working on doing is we've kind of took a copy of it, and we are currently working on taking out the uniqueness of the CMS and just making it a little bit more general so that anybody doing anything in a website will be able to get those answers. So, we are working on a second version of our training.

Chairman Diflo: And what I'm wondering, and maybe this is a question for Michael or Director Cates, but if it has become part of the standard for creating websites so that it is documented in the standard, if it is a qualifying ADA website, you have to have these -- you have to use this tool to remediate it. That way -- and it has to be done statewide.

Linda DeSantis: Yes, we agree.

Chairman Diflo: But it has to be documented in a standard and maybe even as part of the enterprise architect. Maybe that's one of the principles that we have.

Linda DeSantis: That's a great idea. We were hoping that we could get our training class, and again, we're just kind of seeing what people think of it and if we've done a good job or not. What we were hoping is that it would be something like security training that is currently being done, you know, you can't work for the state. You've got to keep it up every year to just make it mandatory that way, but I think we've got to adjust our training and make sure that it's working and it's working correctly. We're not experts at it, so, you know, we're just doing what we think we can.

Chairman Diflo: And then two other questions. Of the 142 that are in your control, is there a projected completion date? I heard you say we're going to work on some automation. We've got some additional resources that are manually doing things, but you've got seven out of 142 complete so that -- implies that we've got a ways to go, and I wonder if there's a projected timeline.

Linda DeSantis: One of the things that will certainly help us, because we can't give to the users right now, because we can't give them a tool to help them remediate other than a free do one page at a time. The minute we get a tool like Siteimprove for all of the websites, then they can run their reports, and they absolutely can make progress on doing it. Right now, we're trying to help them do it for them, and when we're training them, they'll say, okay, I've got my homepage, and they've got to do that homepage, get a complete remediate and go to page number two or go to page number three. Well, with this report and Siteimprove tool, it's going to give them a report every time they run it of all of the issues that are done for every single page that are created for every page with recommendation. So, it will make the process faster, but it will still take -- it still takes time, and I think once we can get their attention, once they've got the tool, we get the templates into their website, then it's actually more of an issue that I can see with getting their documents compliant, which is why we're putting so much emphasis on the documents, because we've kind of handled -- here's what the template is. Just move your data in and fix these three areas to make that template compliant. So, I don't have a timeline, but it certainly won't be until after we get a tool like that for everybody.

Chairman Diflo: I see. And then my final suggestion, and this is probably for the Board and Michael. Even though this probably doesn't meet the $500,000 criteria, I wonder if this is a project we want to have on that dashboard because of the visibility of it. Any other questions, observations, discussions regarding this topic? Director Cates?

Director Cates: Thank you. Linda, thank you for the presentation. I just want to make sure that I heard you correctly about SeamlessDocs, that that is actually assisting you in getting forms to be ADA compliant. Did I understand that correctly?

Linda DeSantis: Absolutely. It'll take an interactive pdf, and when you -- you can actually just put it into SeamlessDocs. It's very easy, but then you've got to kind of define the field, and by doing that field definition for each one of the interactive fields, you're actually tagging it properly to make it ADA, yes, and they actually say that they are ADA compliant. They don't have a VPAT, so we've been working with them on that, but with the exception of just bringing a non-compliant pdf into SeamlessDocs, it will still be non-compliant, but those we can handle, you know, before we bring them in, but it's all the applications. It's any of the forms, and there's a tremendous amount of them will become ADA compliant when it's out, and we're going to verify also that during the test, during the pilot.

Director Cates: That's outstanding. Just for the benefit of the rest of the group, SeamlessDocs was the result of another budget initiative that we had last session for electronic workflow, and we were budgeted for licensing for a certain number of licenses with the intent that it would facilitate electronic workflow for the state, in particular, for agencies that have forms that the public needs to fill out so that those can be put online and in an electronic workflow type of process. I forget the bill number from a few sessions back that directed agencies to put all their forms online.

So, that was part of the purpose of that. I know they're also looking at SeamlessDocs for HR. So, HR has an application that's been -- they've been automating forms, literally, for years. It takes quite a while to get one or two forms done, and they're looking at SeamlessDocs as a tool for that as well. So, we're a little slow getting it up and running to go through the procurement process, but I was very impressed with what I saw when they demoed to us quite a while ago, and I'm happy to see it's meeting our needs in ways I didn't even anticipate. So, it's great.

Linda DeSantis: And if I can add something, we wound up -- or Suzie Block wound up sending out a request to all of the DOA people -- DOA departments -- I'm sorry -- to send us their ideas of what they want for a pilot. We've wound up getting -- I think 13 different of the divisions or agencies have sent us their pilots. One of them is Deferred Comp. That's going to be one of the ones we're doing.

So, what we've done is we've been meeting with each one of them, kind of going over their documents, seeing -- because we've got to do a few things. We want to -- we want the pilot to not only -- we want it to test the workflow and the capabilities of everything that the SeamlessDocs tool has, along with teaching us and giving us an opportunity to be able to create several different examples and also make sure it's ADA compliant. So, we've got about four pilots that we're selecting, but we've also got about -- well, another eight or nine from the Department of Administration that they've given us.

So, we're going to jump from that once that's done, start doing the other pilots, and start publicizing it. So, it'll be on our website, and I'm not sure which one it'll be on, might be ADA for this particular thing. Right now, it's on an internet site called Agency IT Services, but it -- we're really going through with the PMs, evaluating the documents, evaluating what they can do, and we think that once we can have those examples out there, other agencies and other departments, when they go out, we can say, oh, that's what you want? Look, this is similar, and we've already done it, and yes, it can be done, et cetera. So, I just wanted to add that.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, Linda.

Linda DeSantis: You're welcome.

10. BOARD DISCUSSION OF FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS *(for discussion only).*

Chairman Diflo: Any other comments from the Board? I see none.

11. PUBLIC COMMENTS *(for discussion only)*

Chairman Diflo: We will go to Agenda Item No. 11 and the second, ask for any public comments. Are there any public comments here in Reno? And we do have some.

Thomas Kearns: My name is Thomas Kearns for the record. I just wanted to introduce the letter that Linda had eluded to from the National Federation of the Blind. It's a very important letter and a process that many -- two of the three of the Board Members already have received, but I think all of the Board Members should read that. And one more thing, if you could make accessibility part of this Board's mission. It is so vital. That's all I have to add.

Chairman Diflo: Thank you, Mr. Kearns. Has anybody joined down in the South? Any public comments in the South?

Speaker: We have no one.

Chairman Diflo: Okay, seeing none

12. ADJOURNMENT *(for possible action)*

Chairman Diflo: Then I will ask for a motion to adjourn.

Director Malfabon: So moved.

Director Cates: Second.

Speaker: You don't need a second.

Chairman Diflo: All right, meeting is adjourned. We'll see everybody on August 23rd.

- http://www.notice.nv.gov

The appearance of the phrase "for possible action" immediately following an agenda item denotes items on which the Board may take action.

We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled. If special arrangements for the meeting are required, please notify Leslie Olson in advance at (775) 684-5849 or you may email your request to lolson@admin.nv.gov .