

***** NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING *****

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

LOCATIONS:

Legislative Counsel Bureau	Grant Sawyer Building
401 South Carson Street	555 E. Washington Avenue
Room 2134	Suite 4401
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 website is <http://admin.nv.gov>. Click on the link "Livestream Meetings: Old Assembly Chambers, Nevada Capitol Building" – Listen or View.

DATE AND TIME: August 12, 2019, 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.

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Director Deonne Contine
Senator Moises Denis
Director Richard Whitley
Sherri McGee
Craig Betts
Joseph Marcella
Krupa Srinivas

1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

CONTINE: Good afternoon from Carson City. This is the time and place for the Information Technology Advisory Board meeting. I'm Deonne Contine. I'm the new Director of the Nevada Department of Administration, and we don't have a Chairperson at this moment, so I'm going to open the meeting and hopefully once we get to the Agenda item to elect the Chair, then the Chair could take over running the meeting.

So, it's 1:00 p.m. We're at the Legislative Council Bureau at 41 South Carson Street in Room 2134, in Carson City, and we're video-conferenced to Grant Sawyer at 555 East Washington, Room 4401 in Las Vegas. The first Agenda item is call to order and roll call.

Kristen Marshall: Senator Denis?

DENIS: Here.

Kristen Marshall: Assemblyman Hambrick?

Kristen Marshall: Director Contine?

CONTINE: Here.

Kristen Marshall: Director Whitley?

WHITLEY: Here.

Kristen Marshall: Ms. McGee?

MCGEE: Here. Here. Here.

Kristen Marshall: Mr. Betts?

BETTS: Here.

Kristen Marshall: Mr. Marcella?

MARCELLA: Here.

Kristen Marshall: Ms. Srinivas?

SRINIVAS: Here.

Kristen Marshall: Director, we have quorum.

CONTINE: Great. Thank you. So, we'll move on to

1. 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.

Agenda Item No. 2, Public Comments. Is there any public comment in Las Vegas?

CONTINE: Nobody is coming forward.

CONTINE: Thank you. Is there any public comment in Carson City? Okay. No one is coming forward here either.

No. 3, Approval of the Minutes (for possible action)-Chair, ITAB. Discussion and

decision to approve minutes of the meeting on November 14, 2018.

CONTINE: I won't vote on this matter because I wasn't on this Board for that meeting, but is there any comments or changes or questions about the minutes?

MCGEE: For the record, Sherry McGee. I just have one comment about the minutes, and that is when we ask for follow-up, if we could please get some of that follow-up. It just helps me make better decisions and recommendations when we have some of those follow-ups. That's all I ask on this as we move forward. And with that, if I can motion to accept the minutes.

CONTINE: Is there a second?

BETTS: This is Craig Betts. I second.

CONTINE: Okay. I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion? Okay. All those in favor, please signify by saying, aye. [ayes around] Any opposed, nay. Okay. The motion carries unanimously. Okay.

4. ELECTION OF ITAB CHAIR AND CO-CHAIR (for possible action) (NRS 242.122)

On to Agenda Item

The Item No. 4 is the Election of ITAB Chair and Co-chair. So, we'll take the Chair first. Is there anybody that would like to make a nomination for someone to serve as Chair? Including nominating yourself if you so desire. Is anybody in Las Vegas interested?

We have a few people up here that are going to be off the Board, and/or retiring, and we have a couple of vacant positions right now. So, there's no one essentially in the north to serve as Chair. Is there any interest, Senator Denis, anybody down there?

DENIS: We don't have anybody rushing forward.

CONTINE: So, I did talk to the Board Council before we sat down, because we have some people that need to be appointed and some other people that may either be reappointed or somebody else may be appointed in their position, we could put it off until the next meeting, but it will still be at the next meeting that we'll need somebody. Is there anybody that has any thoughts? Or is there anybody that wants to step forward?

DENIS: This is Senator Denis out in Las Vegas. That actually sounds like a good idea to maybe wait until next time. We're still not going to have the appointments by then, are we?

CONTINE: I know Director Swallow is in the room here, but she hasn't gotten the paperwork yet from the Governor's Office. So, I think she'll be on in time

for our next meeting. And then we also have another private sector person who may come on before that meeting, and hopefully, Ms. McGee will be reappointed. She's up in September, so—that's kind of where we are in terms of the people on the committee—or on the Board. So, there's some unknowns at this point.

DENIS: Well, it seems to me that since we don't have anybody clearly stepping forward, maybe people just want to—maybe some people need to know what it entails, and by putting it off until next time, maybe we can get somebody that will be willing to step up and do it.

CONTINE: Okay. Mr. Menicucci, is that fine to do?

MENICUCCI: That would be fine. It should probably have a motion to that effect, and we will need some temporary Chair for the purposes of continuing this meeting.

DENIS: Senator Denis. I'm willing to make that motion that we move forward with the temporary Chair and put off doing the actual election of Chair and Vice Chair until our next meeting. Can we appoint you as the temporary Chair?

CONTINE: Oh, sure.

DENIS: Okay. That would be my motion then.

CONTINE: Okay. So, there is a motion to continue Agenda Item No. 4 to the next meeting, and to appoint Deonne Contine, myself, to chair this meeting only. Is there a second?

WHITLEY: This is Richard Whitley. I second.

CONTINE: Okay. I have a motion and a second. Is there any other discussion? Okay. All those in favor please signify by saying, aye. [ayes around] Any opposed, nay. Okay. Motion carries unanimously.

5. COMMENTS BY THE CHAIR (*for discussion only*) – Chair, ITAB.

Next item is Item No. 5, Comments by the Chair. I have a time to make comments under Item No. 7, so I don't have any other comments.

6. INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME NEW MEMBERSHIP (*for discussion only*)-Chair, ITAB.

So, Item No. 6, Introductions and Welcome New Members. Am I the only new member? Okay. So, that's—there aren't any new members other than myself.

7. DEPARTMENT AND POST-SESSION UPDATES (*for discussion only*) – Department of Administration Director, Deonne E. Contine.

So, I'm moving on to Item No. 7. Just to give a little bit of an update from the legislative session, and I think Michael Dietrich is going to talk about AB33, which was a bill to change the composition of this body, that didn't pass the legislature. But one important item with respect to this Board is that, Michael Dietrich's position as the CIO, he filled that position through the Deputy Director of the Department of Administration. So, in this legislative session, the State CIO was created as a separate position in the pay bill.

So, now the State officially has a State CIO as a position, and that will free up the Deputy Director position in the Department of Administration for the Deputy. So, that was one outcome of the session that actually happened when I came—at my request when I came in February and realized that we did not have a Deputy and that the CIO was stuck in this weird place and structure. So, that's all I really have to talk about with respect to the Department, and so I will—if there's no questions about that or any discussion about that, I'll move on to Item No. 8, which is the CIO Strategy Update, Key EITS Initiatives, and this is for discussion and the STATE CIO, Michael Dietrich.

8. CIO STRATEGY UPDATE, KEY EITS INITIATIVES (*for discussion only*) – State Chief Information Officer (CIO), Michael Dietrich.

DIETRICH: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, Director Contine, members of the Board. I am Michael Dietrich, the State Chief Information Officer. I'd like to take some time to give you an overview of some key initiatives, and also the status, if you will, of the State IT Strategy document. You should have—actually, before I get started, I just wanted to thank everyone for joining us, and thank you, Director Contine, for helping guide the meeting and pull everything together. Really appreciate it.

We had a little bit of a lull through session, and—as I'll speak about in one of the agenda items a little bit later. In the meeting, we have some very clear objectives that we'd like to see achieved through this Board. So, I very much appreciate everyone's attendance. With that, we'll go ahead and jump in.

So, you have two documents, either electronically or in your document packet. One of them is familiar to some. It's a two-sided document with my photo on the front. That's the State IT Strategy, which is currently in version 1.1. I think the last time this body met, we were in draft version 1.0, and there have been quite a few changes to this document. The second document, which I'll reference as well, is just the back page of the strategy, and you can identify this because it has some orange highlights over some of the key actionaries that I would like to speak about.

So, the evolution of the strategy, we had—in the actions and outcomes section of the document in version 1.0. There were several things that were asterisked, and those indicated initiatives that were contingent upon funding in the legislative session.

And so now that we've exited session, we have a very clear beat on what it is we can accomplish. And so, some of those things were either taken off and will be shelved and addressed in the next session, or they've been modified because they were critical things that we wanted to achieve, and we had to reduce the scope so that we could still make some progress on them despite not being able to fund the entire initiative. So, I'll just go through those. Again, it's on the back of the one-page document and they're highlighted in orange.

First of all, under information security, we are implementing a GRC, or Governance Risk and Compliance framework, and we are currently in the process of procuring a tool that is the physical framework itself that we will use to collect the GRC data. And this is something that was both requested in statute and—Bob, remind me of the bill?

DEHNHARDT: SB302

DIETRICH: Thank you. SB302, which specified some additional requirements and control around the security of information, and the collection of the data that's supported our protection of that information. And it's this GRC framework, which our State Chief Information Security Officer, Mr. Bob. Dehnhardt, will go into detail about. And I'll pause for questions after any one of these if anyone would like any—ask questions or request clarification.

So, the second is under architecture and solutions. We have this process by which technology investments formally were requested, it was called, the TIR. Some of you might have heard the term, TIR, spelled T-I-R, which was Technology Investment Request. That has been modified. That was modified, I'm going to say a couple years ago, to become the Technology Investment Notification. But regardless of what it's called, it's a process by which Enterprise IT services is notified of a technology investment, and I always ask why? Why do we do these things? Why are we requesting people fill out a body of paperwork and provide a substantial amount of information about a technology project when in some cases Enterprise IT might not even have direct involvement in that project, because as we know, there are IT shops in the agencies that handle a lot of these things. But it is a critical piece of information for us, and there's a couple of things that we want to achieve out of this that we perhaps didn't achieve to the level that we should have in the past.

We want to make sure that if there are any dependencies or anything that EITS needs to provide, we're able to provide it and we know well enough in advance to change capabilities or modify the way that we provide a service to an organization to support this. It doesn't mean that we always can, and that's another thing that we want to know. If there's something that's outside of our scope or outside of our capabilities, we don't want there to be the assumption that we can provide that support or these services. So, that's a very important part of the technology

investment notification.

It also gives us the opportunity to have the conversation with agencies about opportunities for sharing. So, if we're seeing TINs and this is—especially apparent in this era of cloud-computing. We will see TINs come in with similar cloud-computing asks for example, and we want to be sure that if there is an opportunity for sharing a single solution, reducing sprawl, or even realizing economy is a scale through volume purchasing, that we're able to do that. Questions, comments?

Tied to that is the establishment of an enterprise architecture team. And in the last meeting, you were introduced to Mr. David Axtell who is our Chief Enterprise Architect and is helping with his effort. We recently hired Mr. Tim Galluzi, who I believe is in the audience, who will be on David's team as well helping with that effort and reviewing—the primary function of this group is to review the TINS, as well as to overlay new asks and our aspirations for the technology in Nevada over the existing capabilities. To make sure that we're staying on the right track and we're doing things that are feasible and within our capabilities, but also thinking toward the future as much as we possibly can. Okay.

Moving on to the third and, quite possibly one of the most important initiatives that we're working on, under Eco System Platforms and Support, you'll see a large highlight which encompasses a lot of components of what we are doing to support the blind community, and to provide American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) assistance in general. This is a very large effort, and we will be going into detail in an upcoming agenda item in the meeting. But I do want to highlight that from the infrastructure perspective, it is a—there will be a new Content Management System, or CMS, and this is where all our web—the framework where all our web information is presented. And I've got a lot of questions during session about, what is a CMS, and so, I took some time to refine the definition of it. It's really, if you think about it—if you've got a lot of artwork and you want to display it, you could just tack it on the wall and lean it up against the wall in a big pile, and, yes, everyone could see your artwork. But with a content management system, that's the curating of the gallery of that artwork.

So, that puts it into a nice frame. It puts it—makes sure that all the descriptions are consistent, all the data that frames this demonstration of artwork is consistent. And that's really what the content management system does. Also, a critical component of it is the compliance with web content accessibility guidelines for accessibility as one example.

It is important to point out that the CMS, while most CMSs support accessibility, they don't do it for you. You still must make sure the content you're posting is accessible. The web team, some representatives from the web team will talk a lot more in detail about this.

Moving right along to Communications and Engagement. One area of it is very near and dear to me, and this—the number one that's highlighted revolves around collaboration with agencies as they develop their IT plans. And this is in statute, that the Enterprise IT will collaborate with agencies on these plans, and we plan to really amplify this to start to understand across the state, what is happening. Now, as I kind of caveated when we were talking about architecture and solutions, we can't deploy, we can't build everything. There are agency IT shops that handle a lot of this, but it is my belief and the belief of the Office of the CIO, that we should at least be sharing information and sharing awareness so that we are able to capitalize whenever possible on shared solutions and collaborations.

We're hoping to have good, meaningful discussions with agencies about what they're going to be doing with IT, even if they have their own substantial IT shops that will be providing quite a bit of internal services. How can EITS help? How do we interface with those agencies?

This is more of a tactical item, but No. 4, which is Increasing Support Transparency, this is kind of flipping it the other way around. Enterprise IT Services has been established for quite some time and providing a standard suite of services to our agency customers. What happens when you have somebody that's been established for a while and it's been running well, is more and more isolation can take place, and we're kind of seeing that with our support processes where we were—while a good job was being done, our support surveys continue to receive very high marks from our customers, there was developing a bit of lack of transparency of seeing exactly where something was at, because, again, a process was running. It had run similarly for quite some time, so we kind of lost the need to share the components within that process.

We've launched this trial of a support transparency system, which allows requestors to look inside of a ticket—really the physical piece of this, if you will, is a ticket within the help desk system. Before someone would put in a ticket and that ticket would take some amount of time, depending on the ask, to be resolved. The ask is, is that a customer be able to look inside the ticket and see—especially if it's something complex. One example that we also use is onboarding a new employee, which has, I believe, about a dozen tasks within it. And some of those tasks can be time consuming, especially if you're waiting on a new computer, for example, from a vendor. The customers are okay with this. People were—I'm finding, and my staff are finding that everyone is okay with the amount of time it takes to deliver something, and everybody understands lead times and trouble with vendors, etcetera. But the ask is, we want to see the progress.

So, we have prototyped this page, this dashboard, which lets you look into a ticket and see the status of your request. The reason I am kind of spending a little bit time on an item that's only one sentence is because, well, we stalled that project.

We stalled the launch of support transparency, and the reason is, as we started to peel back the layers of the onion about what we were going to expose to our customer, we also realized that there were some improvements that we could make to business process in general. How support requests flow through Enterprise IT, how we logged who was working on what and when, which if we didn't do, would just result in more confusion if you expose the contents of a ticket to a requester. So, we've put this business process improvement initiative ahead of support transparency, and we have some folks from the program management team and others within the organization working on identifying these areas where we can improve the flow of support requests, especially if a request touches multiple group with needs. Like it goes from help desk to network engineering, back to platform, back to help desk. To be able to alleviate confusion and allow someone to see a satisfying view of where the request is—especially if it's something that—the example I just gave, it could take six months to, say, connect a new office. So, it's just exposing every step of the way and letting folks know what is going on and what to expect next. Questions about that? Okay.

And last, but certainly not least, are a couple of things that are very tied to this. Under Governance, No. 2, is a portfolio review process, and we will hear more about this as well, but this will allow us to have visibility across what is happening inside of Enterprise IT. And especially—if we see the fruits of our labor, if you will, with collaborating with agencies, this allows us to see the portfolio within, and how it connects without—or, outside of the organization as well. And then No. 3 is the Business Process Improvement that I just spoke of, which was one of those things—as I mentioned, as we refined version 1.1 of the spreadsheet, that was a kind of a late addition as we saw that the support transparency project required this fundamental or foundation business process improvement.

I'll close by saying a few of these things were modifications of an ask, so there's several things on here that were simply removed, such as the unity environment, which was a common shared computing platform that all agencies would be able to reside in, be tenants in, if they so desired. That was removed along with a couple of other initiatives. But things like the Enterprise Architecture team, we had a budgetary ask to staff that team up, and that was not successful. However, we believed very strongly that this team needed to be improved, and we had to have some standards that were established, which resulted in a, again, a great hire onto that team. And we're starting to put together some business processes such as the portfolio review, which will allow that team to do its job more effectively even though, again, we weren't able to staff up to the level that we desired.

MCGEE: I have a comment.

DIETRICH: Absolutely. Please. I'll open it up for any questions.

MCGEE: Sherry McGee for the record. So, with the collaboration and communication and the Enterprise Architecture, from just being out there in the agencies and that, the TIRs were great, you know, because agencies know what they want. But sometimes there's agencies out there that don't necessarily know what they can have for a solution or what's even out there. I'm hoping that the communication and collaboration isn't just a one-to-one agency and that it's more global so that everybody can learn from each other, and that some items that maybe an agency isn't working toward immediately, but in the future might be thinking about things that they want to do, that there is an actual architecture out there that they can go look at and make plans accordingly so that they're aligning with the state. So, anyway, great job on the strategic plan and what you're accomplishing. I just look forward to more of that collaboration and communication. Thank you.

DIETRICH: Thank you, Ms. McGee for the comment. I really appreciate that and getting the right level of communication and collaboration without being overwhelming is always the trick, and we'll be reaching out to folks like yourself to understand how you want to receive the output of what the architecture team is doing. And we'll also be sitting down wherever possible with both the business leadership and the IT leadership, and the state entities to get an understanding of how we can help and what those nuances of communication are. I will say we can't help folks unless they're willing to share as well, so I'm really—I'm hoping that we'll have that spirit of collaboration which starts with trust. I mean, people really need to trust that we're not trying to change their business; we're just trying to help and be more collaborative. So, thank you for the comment. Other comments? All right. Thank you very much for your time.

MCGEE: Thank you.

9. EITS PROJECT PORTFOLIO (*for possible action*) – EITS Chief Enterprise Architect, David Axtell and EITS PMO, Eric Pennington. Portfolio review process and implementation plans. IT project status. ITAB discussion and support.

CONTINE: Thank you. Okay. So, moving on to Agenda Item No. 9. EITS Project Portfolio. And I believe Mr. Axtell and Mr. Pennington—and this is a portfolio review, process and implementation plans, IT project status and ITAB discussion and support.

AXTELL: Thank you, Madam Chair. For the record, my name is David Axtell. I'm the Chief Enterprise Architect for the State. Good afternoon members of the Board as well. I'd like to address the overview of the portfolio management that Michael previously discussed.

This is a new practice that we've begun implementing to allow a wider lens to

manage and promote the Enterprise services that EITS provides to the state agencies. The practices of portfolio management, it's the practice of managing all organizational resources, both operations and projects. The purpose of this is to manage them together as a group to achieve strategic objectives. So, therefore, they have been separate.

So, our steady state program capability has not been married with what our individual projects are doing, from a management standpoint. And this is going to change. Creating a broader view of the EITS resource landscape will result in a more comprehensive and efficient tactical management ability. Again, tactics leading us to a strategic plan that you have in front of you, and that—giving us some, we believe, better success in that.

Some of the benefits, just a few of the benefits of this practice is, the ability to leverage a more inclusive view on the resources. When work in progress limits our hit, those from program staffing, sometimes they will be exceeded by new legislative or customer demands. And we'll be able to see that, anticipating challenges to new services, as well as delivering what we're currently doing in a nominal operational standpoint. This will also provide opportunity to more directly associate project accomplishments with the program activities and improvements, and I think that's key because a lot of times individuals on the—working on the programs themselves, kind of lose sight on what their successful outcomes are and who they are helping.

So, this will tie individuals within the EITS organization, I believe, closer to the customers that we serve. Additionally, we'll be able to share the EITS portfolio, much as Michael shared the strategy, with all of the agencies and it will be an ability to allow us to partner better for Enterprise Services and the BDRs when we place each successive run of the ledge for additional improvements in technology. We'll be able to communicate it better because it will tie our strategic outcomes to the tactics that we're following and, therefore, the result should be a little more obvious for everybody to see, not just within EITS but across the rest of the state.

Lastly, being able to link these projects will provide us with a very tangible way to manage tactics and identify when projects may no longer be needed because of a different technology that's come out, or, perhaps has to be changed slightly or adjusted for a new solution that happens between biennium's or just in the fullness of time. And so, I think that the ability to see our capacity and our velocity in programs and in projects together, will give us a much better view on EITS total capability.

The description, I'd like to give a brief description of the portfolio and— at the high-level is comprised of both projects and programs. The lexicon of the official project management book would be "operations" but in the state, those are synonymous,

so I will use “programs” moving forward. Projects basically have a lot of visibility. They have had, and they will undoubtedly continue to have, because they’re the ones that we go for unique solutions or a one-time shot. So, there’s a lot of scrutiny on those. Somewhat less visibility into day-to-day operations unless something falls, and of course we don’t expect that to ever happen, but the visibility is certainly much more on the temporal projects.

As an outcome of projects, they can add—there’s several outcomes they can produce, one is new capability. And so, we enter into a project to provide something, say, new cutsheet printing, the unified communications or security monitoring, these are all individual capabilities that we may not have had in the past. Looking forward to what the state wants to grow into, and that was a needs register that I reported very briefly on in my last ITAB result. It has not changed much at all since then. Those needs are part of the new capability.

Additionally, it could increase the program capacity. And so, this could mean things as simple as more V-hosts, more servers for state agencies—increased bandwidth where necessary. Or handle more service requests if we are performing more of those service capabilities, we obviously are—need to expect that we are going to be handling more calls, more emails and more tickets for services.

So, this is the capacity aspect of a project that results in a new program capacity, but the project gets us there. And lastly, projects improve program efficiency. And so, that could be things such as improving workflows, automating processes. There’s lots of opportunity for process automation and simplifying customer interaction. Nobody really wants to be on the phone for ages when they’re looking for help, and so, a mechanism that allows things to simplify that interaction are things that will produce efficiencies.

All these project outcomes are temporal, and the projects by definition end and they produce a result that folds into a program capability capacity or efficiency increase. And so, the projects which we’ve been reporting on and have a very good handle on, and their PMO team, really have very little change in the portfolio specter and practice as we move forward. Programs on the other hand are a little different. They’re ongoing production of goods of services and they’re the ones who deliver the value on a day-to-day basis to all our customers. All our customers have programs of their own that they deliver on, and we basically provide infrastructure on which they leverage to succeed in their operation.

So, the projects in general aren’t directly involved in the success of a customer, but they are mandatory in order to improve the capacity or capability or efficiency of the programs that we provide, which are infrastructure. Most of the programs that we currently provide, most of you are familiar at some high-level because they’re part of the service catalog that EITS has. They include database management,

software maintenance, enhancements, IT support, mainframe services, network, VPN access, telecommunications, and things right down to the physical card access, security card access stuff. Security is also another big blanket that, from an enterprise standpoint, needs to be operated across the state to give us that first pass.

So, the combination of both projects and programs, the new EITS portfolio, will be the vehicle that we will be—used to engage the right tactics to deliver the outcomes that will align with not only our own strategy, but also provide us with infrastructure for the success of other agencies.

Lastly, currently we have been gathering data for the programs within EITS, clarifying much of the data, and associating them with analogies that are very easy to understand, day-to-day things. Most people can understand if a network goes down, you don't get email. If a telephone won't ring, the back office doesn't work, you don't have a phone call. But there are many things in database management in the server support that people may not directly associate with their own business outcomes within the agency. And so, we will be using more agency examples of the solutions and outcomes that individual agencies use for the infrastructure, just to give people an easier way of knowing why these are important and how they relate to each agency in the state.

I'm expecting that by our next meeting we will have a template of this and a first draft for data. The project stuff has been up and running and has been going smoothly. That will be folded into this template, but the new one will include all the program information. And so, I'm hoping that we will be able to provide this in the next meeting. And then after that, with some review time, achieve some feedback from the Board in order to identify where we need to correct or revise as appropriate, and as we move forward.

This will be an ongoing effort, and we're just starting. We're trying to take baby steps. So, the data we're collecting in the portfolio will not be comprehensive down to minutes worked or megabytes, or gigabytes of data passed, but it will start at a higher level and we will be cycling through and providing more detail as this matures.

AXTELL: Thank you. David Axtell for the record. I'd like to introduce Eric and have him then go through the current project status to connect last meeting with this current state. Thank you.

PENNINGTON: Madam Chair, members of the board, Eric Pennington for the record. As you remember, we covered some pretty high-profile projects in the last meeting, and we're going to close the loop on those. Happy to say we've had some success in closing some projects, and we've had some not so successful

projects. So, I'm going to go through the list. These were projects that were specifically requested either by the Board or exceeded the price tag of a half-a-million dollars and were large efforts.

The first on the list with the State of Nevada, ADA remediation, I'm going to defer that to Susie Block and Linda DeSantis. I will say the project itself was—I believe it was creating that crosswalk of activities to address the findings of the NFB. I think that's been completed, but they'll be able to give you a complete report on that.

Next was a project that had been going on for some years. It's called the Computerized Criminal History Modernization Project, and we had completed about three-quarters of that and released it last May. I want to say last May. It was May of 2018, and that project's been ongoing and we're just on the cusp of finishing that. Right now, we're evaluating, but the schedule slipped a little bit, but we're looking at—optimistically, we're looking at mid-September to the end of September to complete that project. One of the projects that we weren't successful with was the OTIS Project. That was the Offender Tracking Information System for parole and probation. We moth-balled that project at the end of October, if you recall. We did make a recommendation in December to pursue an RFI and look at cost products. We did release a successful RFI and we had, I believe, it was ten respondents on that, and more than a handful were very viable options.

Since then, the parole and probation has gone to the legislative session and secured funding and they are working on an RFP and that—we're hoping that'll get released soon. Our involvement in that is minimal at this time.

For the state open system groups, we had two major initiatives going. One is the Office 365 State Tenant, and that is ongoing and I'm happy to say we've onboarded 16 executive branch departments, boards and agencies, and we have probably a dozen more in flight. And so, I think it's going well, and I believe, Ms. McGee, we're working on the Attorney General's Office now, if they're going to let me—have any feedback on that, I'm happy to take that.

The other was a VX Rail Project, and that was installation of a VH Rail system in the switch facility. That project has been closed, and that's due to absence of funding for the power supply at Switch. So, I'm not sure when that's going to open, but at this point we're—that project has been closed.

For the networking group, we have the "Bigger Pipes" Core Infrastructure. That was completed sometime ago. I believe that was completed in December of 2018. And we have the Microwave Replacement Project and final acceptance was completed in June of 2019. Both of those are in operational state.

At this time, are there any questions about the prior projects we reported on?

We do have some new projects that we're ramping up. The first is the content management system replacement. We're managing the writing of that RFP, and we'll probably be managing implementation of that. Within the facility, the EITS facility, we have a complete phone system refresh and it's managed well by the vendor, but we're monitoring that and we're going to make sure we're staying within budget and we're keeping an eye on the schedule. Another one out of the facility is Duplex Printings. We're buying some Duplex printers for the mainframe systems.

On the application development-side we've got two major legislative mandates, it came out for DPS, that affect the Protection Orders Program, and this is stakeholders throughout the state, the county courts systems for submitting protection orders, new types of protection orders. We're just kicking that project off.

And then also for DPS, it doesn't seem like something major, but we're working on a Windows 7 to Window 10 upgrade for roughly 1,100 computers that are out there right now. Obviously, anything that comes from the planning group, we'll be ready to roll up our sleeves and take care of those too.

CONTINE: Is that it?

PENNINGTON: Yes. That's what I have.

CONTINE: Okay.

PENNINGTON: Any questions?

MCGEE: I have a question.

CONTINE: Go ahead, Ms. McGee.

MCGEE: For the record, Sherry McGee. So, the RFP for the Web CMS, is there a timeline on that?

PENNINGTON: For the record, Eric Pennington. Yes. There is. We are having a kickoff meeting later this month. We plan to have a draft RFP written by the end of November, and I believe the release date would be—if I recall correctly, December 27, with the deadline of having a contract in place by June 30th of 2020.

MCGEE: Thank you. And I have a second question to ask. I thought we were going to get just like a high-level dashboard of all the projects, because last time I remember when you started talking about the projects that you were involved in, worried about your capacity. And so, if we could just get an overall, you know, list of the projects, I think that would be good. I think we would like that.

PENNINGTON: For the record, Eric Pennington. That is something that we're working on. That's something we're working on with the planning group, so we

do—we are going to have a whole different format for reporting that. We will have a full list and a dashboard, the conditions. We've put together in the last few months a risk scoring analysis. We can look at those key areas of risk and complexity on the projects, so you have an understanding what we're working on.

MCGEE: Okay. Thank you.

CONTINE: Any other questions? Any questions from Southern Nevada? So, this item is marked for possible action. Do you have a request for action from the Board at this time?

AXTELL: David Axtell for the record. No. At this point we do not have any action.

CONTINE: All right. You guys are done.

SPEAKER: All right. Thank you.

CONTINE: All right. Thank you.

10. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA)/NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND UPDATE (*for possible action*) – CIO, Michael Dietrich and Agency IT Services Chief, Suzie Block. ADA website accessibility progress, FY20/21 plan, legislative approvals and status update. ITAB discussion and support.

So, the next item is Item No. 10, Americans with Disabilities Act, National Federation for the Blind Update. Michael Dietrich and Suzie Block, and this has to do with the ADA website accessibility, progress and the plan for the next few years. And some legislative approval updates. Go ahead.

DIETRICH: Thank you, Director Contine. Michael Dietrich, State CIO for the record. I have with me Suzie Block. And we did not believe when we scheduled the meeting that Linda DeSantis, who is one of the key folks on—that are leading this effort, would be available today. Linda is here today, so with the Board's permission, I'd like to invite Linda up to present as well.

CONTINE: Sure.

BLOCK: I'll go ahead and start. I'm Suzie Block, I'm the Agency IT Services Chief. Director Contine and Board members, thank you for taking the time today for us to give you some updates of what we're doing around ADA. I'm going to talk a little bit about the budget requests that we've submitted this last legislative session, give you an overview of what we want to do with the funding and the program, and some of the deliverables and outcomes that we're looking forward to. And then Linda is going to give you an update since the last ITAB meeting of some of the major milestones around outreach, how we're using the Siteimprove tool. And that's really what's making this whole program work, so I'll just go ahead quickly and give you an update.

Executive Branch leadership agreed that ADA is a top priority, and in order to help support that important initiative, submitted a budget enhancement this last session to create a team to assist agencies with their website compliance, and expand our ADA program capabilities. This week, we will be presenting our ADA program to the Interim Finance Committee. The actual work program going in for fiscal year '20 is approximately \$279,000. And then in fiscal year '21, it'll be an additional \$323,000.

In the budget enhancement address is concerns with the State of Nevada websites that were outlined in a compliance agreement drafted by the National Federation of the Blind, the Decision Unit submitted during last session included software, positions and the funding of consultants and testing resources.

The additional positions required to fulfill these needs are a Program Officer III, and three public service interns. The Program Officer III will fulfill the request to hire a web accessibility coordinator to represent the executive branch and websites that fall within agencies, boards and commissions of the executive branch. This resource will also lead web accessibility coordination for the executive branch agencies, boards and commissions, and will establish a cross-functional web accessibility committee. The three public service interns will allow us to train state agencies on how to properly remediate web documents and assist state agencies with more difficult document remediation activities.

Currently on Linda's team, we have two and a half resources that are doing document remediation and training agency personnel. And if you can imagine, that's a huge effort in addition to the other duties that they're required to fulfill, keeping the content management system up and running.

The National Federation of the Blind requested we retain an independent web accessibility consultant who has expertise concerning accessibility web development, the terms of the compliance agreement, and WK2.1AA to represent the executive branch agencies, boards and commissions. The web accessibility consultant will also provide an initial evaluation regarding the State of Nevada's website compliance.

So, they wanted somebody impartial to be able to evaluate where we are today. Additionally, we will leverage the consultant to assist with guidance on our state web accessibility policies. So, we've got policies in place, but we're also going to leverage these consulting funds to be able to vet them to make sure they're aligned. So, we're getting a resource that has experience in this area. And then the budget enhancement includes funding to cover testing activities that will help ensure our websites meet the necessarily guidelines of accessibility. And the funding of this program will help us to expand our outreach and support.

And I personally as a chief, I'm so proud to have this lady next to me. She has done an amazing job on just the outreach itself. I'm going to turn it over to her in a second, but I'm here today to ask for the Board's support of this important initiative, and how can you support us? It's basically raising awareness and having conversations with other agencies, directives of why this is important, so that we're all kind of unified and we all recognize that we want our websites to be able to meet the needs of the community. So, with that, I'll turn it over to Linda.

DESANTIS: Good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity to speak. The last time that we did report to this ITAB Committee was back in November of 2018. And at that time, we only had the tools to report about the websites that are in the State's CMS. Today, I'm excited to report that we've purchased an Enterprise website monitoring tool, and that's Siteimprove. That's being offered to every department, division and board that has a website in the State of Nevada.

I can tell you we currently have 132 websites in the State's CMS, and we've been able to identify 45 additional websites that are outside of the State's CMS. Websites like the Legislature, DMV, NDOT, Secretary of the State, Conservation and Natural Resources. And the tool has allowed us to scan their websites as long as there's not a password-protection on it, and it's kind of giving us a ballpark of how many webpages we're looking at, how many PDF documents that we actually have. We're getting a better idea of what the size of the issue of the state is. I can give you some summaries.

Total number of PDFs is probably the most difficult to remediate and to deal with. We have 105,940, which is about 30,000, maybe 25,00 more than the 77,000 we'd identified previously. Of those 105,000, to date we've remediated 15,641 documents. I know that sounds like it's not very much compared to the 105,000, but—I'm sorry. But those documents, that's just the number of PDFs. That's not the number of pages that are in those PDFs. Fillable documents, documents that are hundreds of pages long, and they're basically the ones that they're going after first are the ones that are used the most. So, they're the department guides, the department reports, that have tables and all kinds of extra information that take a long time to remediate.

So, 15,641 is huge as far as I'm concerned, and so are they. They're difficult to do. They take time, but when they're able to be remediated—after a couple of them, I don't want to say it gets easier, but it does get a little bit, where you at least know the procedures and the tricks in order to make it happen better. So, what's left so far that we have is 90,299.

Total websites completely have been—is 177 websites, 21 of them are completely remediated, which is, again, huge. There's 156 left, but the great thing about it too is that there's an additional 24 websites where—there's two parts of it. One of

them is to remediate the webpages so people can read your content. The other part of it is to remediate the documents. I keep on talking about PDFs because they're the most difficult, but there's also included in these numbers, YouTube videos, audio, Excel documents. I mean, it goes on and on. Just about anything you can put in the website has to be remediated.

So, there's 24 additional websites and as we're going and people are getting more trained, 24 of these websites already have their content done. I'm expecting another 20 or 30 very shortly, but now all that's left is the remediation of the documents. So again, there's—I think there's a nicer picture than looking at that 109—105,000 and getting a little nervous.

Most of the remediation training has also started in June and July. We've had the same documents and the same information on the website for probably the last two and a half years, but what we found is that we need to have classrooms, or we need to have an instructor go through that information, and that's what we've been doing. We started out with classrooms that handled like twenty people, now we're doing YouTube live streaming, and the last class that we trained had 105 people in it. That's really kind of nice because with that training, the user can sit at their desk. They can download practice documents that we have created. They can walk through the remediation along with the instructor. They can actually—we break after two or three sections because it gets kind of complicated. We set up a conference line that they can call in, ask and talk about problems that they have. So, it's been hugely successful.

So, I'm just excited about it. And I don't want to jump, but I'll go into the number later. The other thing is, with the fact that we're doing so much training in June and July, I'm really expecting that now that the people know how to remediate, that these numbers are also going to increase, and more and more documents are going to be remediated because the users know how to do so.

We're also talking about these numbers and the first thing that we're asking people to do with their website is look at them and clean up the garbage. There are so many documents out there that are five, six years old, that people have kind of inherited because other people who had the content responsibilities are gone. And so, that kind of thing has made a great improvement.

When the Department of Education was cited a couple years ago, they had over 5,000 documents and the first thing they did was looked in there and removed about 1,100 documents that were unnecessary. By doing that, that's 1,100 documents that they don't have to remediate, and don't need to be on the website. The website should be kept current, it should be kept compliant. So, that's another one of the things, which, again, I feel are going to change these numbers quite a bit.

The other thing though is that, for all the cleanup and stuff that they're doing, there's new data being added every day, and that's another one of the areas—and I'm looking at you and smiling—where the emphasis is on making all documents compliant before you put them on the website. Director Whitley, I'm looking at him and smiling because he's taken the initiative to have everybody in the Department of Health and Human Resources after August 16th, nothing goes on this site that's new that isn't compliant. And we're hoping that other departments follow. Okay.

The other thing that we talked about—and the reason why I had these numbers to begin with is that, we've purchased a Siteimprove monitoring tool. Basically, why is it so important?

The Siteimprove tool was first used by us with the Department of Education when they were cited by the Office of Civil Rights. That was about four years ago. At that time, we had to work with the Office of Civil Rights, tell them what tools we were planning. They approved them, and that was the tool that we had selected at the time. It wound up—as far as the Department of Education has told me, they wouldn't have been able to accomplish the compliance without that tool. And the reason for it is that it's a 24/7 tool. It constantly monitors and tracks the content, the data that's in that website. And even with those of us who have experience with it, we can have a compliant site and you add one document to it, or you add one picture that you don't tag, and your site is no longer compliant.

So, we'll see that fluctuation all the time. Well, now with the tool, the users know what changed and can go out and can fix it. So, to me, it's just a great tool. Siteimprove, also one of the major issues is, once you remediate a document, or remediate a website in fact, you can be ADA compliant and the tool can tell you it is, but it doesn't mean that that website, or those documents, are usable. That someone that is using an assistive technology device can utilize that. So we were mandated to have our website, or that particular website, monitored by an auditor, and that was Siteimprove that did that and that was helpful to us because when they did that remediation, they had audit sitting next to them, somebody that was an assistive technology device, and they were able to go through all of it. And that's one of the major reasons why we were able to get all the smart forms and templates that everybody uses to enter their data in our content management system, we were able to make that compliant.

So, another one of the great features. The Siteimprove tool actually scans, monitors, evaluates users' content against WCHE or the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines or Standards. And what it does is, it takes that data, compares it against the standards and it gives you information about, this is what you—or recommends that you do in order to make that content or that document compliant. Tremendously helpful again, because we know that it's monitoring against something that is standard and has great value. So, that's another one of the

pluses with the tool.

It also gives you an inventory of all the content in that website. So, you can click on inventory and it'll tell you, you got 700 webpages, and 900 PDFs and 12 audio files, etcetera, Excel, all the way down the line. And I think the neatest and the most valuable is, when you're inside that tool and you're working with the PDF, you can sort that list of PDFs and it will tell you, this PDF has been accessed 500 times. This one, 499. And it goes in reverse order and will go all the way through for the most used to the least used.

Again, it's one of the tools that we tell users about, that they can go out and delete off all the ones that they don't use, if they can. Or, at least when they're remediating, start remediating with the most used and continue that way. So, those are just some of the benefits of the Siteimprove tool.

The other thing is, to acquire a site-approved license, we've asked all our users to sign a service level agreement. And the major reason for doing that is that we wanted all the users to use our ADA assistance program. The ADA assistance program is a program that's been written in-house and it's basically built for any assistive technology user. And when we first started working in ADA a couple of years ago, one of the areas that was mentioned quite often was that, there was no place for somebody to ask for help or say, I've got a complaint with this. That's what this particular website, or this application—it's truly an application, is about.

So, on the top of every page in the entire—every website, every page within our content management system has a link to that assistive technology—that assistive ADA assistance program. When a user goes there, they can report on, there's an issue with physical accommodations. There's an issue with web accessibility, where they—where they need a document with the 100-and—whatever the tremendous 105,000 PDFs that are there. If everybody was totally remediating constantly, there's no guarantee that a particular document would be remediated by the time someone needed one.

So, this gives the assisted technology individual a chance to request that a document be remediated as soon as possible. And the other thing is, a lot of times, maybe there's a question that they have, or something that they need in order to—they need somebody to call them back and talk to them about an issue. So, all these things are handled in the assisted—the ADA Assisting Program. And what it does is, the minute that that person fills out that form, it will generate a helpdesk ticket in the system. It also looks up and says, oh, this is come from the AGs Office, and who is it that we should be sending this request to? It has that in our database. It turns around, it sends an email to the owner of that website to fix or be aware of one of the complaints. It also tracks it to make sure that it stays as a live ticket, or an open ticket, until it's hit its resolution and it gets closed. And then we

have a dashboard, we also have tracking information, and that's why we've really asked for everybody—right now, we cover the websites that's in our CMS, but anybody else that's outside our CMS, we're hoping that they will use that particular application so we can monitor and make sure that everything is being done. Okay.

And the other thing I just want to cover is the outreach and the training. Again, we've been able to implement the YouTube live streaming. We just had a class today and it's just working out great. We're getting nothing but compliments. People are very happy, and I think it's just because they have a chance to go through and remediate as you go. It's one thing to be in a class, and it makes sense when the teacher is showing you how to do it. Then you get back to your office a couple of days later and you look at it and it's like, oh my God. What in the world? How do I start? So, that's kind of been eliminated by doing that.

To date, we've trained 660 users, and that's been in the last maybe two and a half, three months. And we've had nine departments that have participated, 16 divisions, 3 elected officials, they have been taking our classes and everything, 2 boards, and it just keeps on getting better. We've also had wonderful success with training users in departments that aren't in our CMS, and I think that's terrific. The Department of Conservation and Natural Resources has required that all their content users go to the classes and begin to remediate. So that, I think that's impressive.

Nevada courts is the same way. They're in our CMS, but they don't use our templates or anything. They're constantly—in fact, they've got Siteimprove, they're doing a lot of document remediation. So, it's really kind of cool. The Nevada Department of Tourism, their site is built by a 3rd party vendor, and that vendor now has Siteimprove. They are maintaining, remediating, and it's just been terrific. Silver State Health Insurance is another one. State Public Charter Schools is even another one. And that's just a few.

Every day, we're finding more and more people that want the tool, that want the help, and they're doing the work. The training classes are currently scheduled through September. We're at least having one class a week. We're finding those classes are between 75 and 125 people a class. So, we're going to continue to do it. In some cases where an initiative like August the 16th happened, we threw a couple classes in because we knew that it would help us and help everybody.

And then, basically, I just wanted to give a couple of kudos and shout outs to people. Director Whitley, everybody on your team, DWSS, which is Welfare, has just been incredible. They have a project leader, they're meeting weekly, they're partnering with us. Their progress has been amazing. They have six subject matter experts, and they keep getting better. They're helping to train everybody. It's just been great. And now, we're—again, we've added those classes because

DPHS and DHCFP, all the other divisions are jumping on board with the fact that they all have to be—able to know how to get a document out there by August 16th that's ADA compliant. It's been a huge initiative.

The Department of the Administration, they're actively remediating. They're also helping us get all the divisions the site improved tools that they need in order to do it, and they're taking a lot of the training classes. Business and Industry, the same thing, they're—I mean, it's just been very, very rewarding in the last couple of weeks, to see everybody kicking in and saying, we need these tools, we need this help, we want the training.

Again, the Department of Conservation, the Public Information Officers—and I'm going to say this, has probably been very, very helpful on the outreach. We're able to put a class out there. We're able to call them on the phone. They'll reach out to all the public information officers, tell them about the classes. They're helping us get Siteimprove licenses distributed. So, it's just been, to me, just great couple of months with the progress that I feel that we've made. If there's any questions?

CONTINE: Great. Thank you. Are there any questions? Go ahead.

MCGEE: For the record, Sherry McGee. I feel like I'm taking over the meeting, but anyway, I just want to say thank you for all your work that you've done. And from personal experience with your team, the responsiveness has just been amazing and the project's probably where it is today because of you. So, thank you very much.

DESANTIS: Thank you.

WHITLEY: Richard Whitley for the record. I just want to echo that. I mean, I think your customer service is really—you gave kudos to our department, but it's refreshing and it's not just a solution in search of a problem. The time you spent to make the solution relevant, and—that's what got the team onboard and to—whatever that is that you do, to see more of that would be greatly appreciated. But I—kudos to you.

DESANTIS: Thank you.

CONTINE: This is Deonne. I'd like to say also, this is one of the main—I came to the—to be the Director in late February and this is probably one of the things that I've worked the most on, collaborating and trying to figure out how we can get what we need to keep helping.

I think, you know, one of the challenges that I'm sure Michael's team has—that we've discussed internally is getting the agencies to kind of have that—have a resource at the agency and buy-in to this as being important. And so, I think to the extent that we have the resources, that EITS has the resources, and has done an

amazing job, I think everybody deserves a lot of credit because nobody has done anything with any additional people or money up until this point.

So, everything that's been done on this project has been done under existing budget, with existing staff. And that's just amazing that, both in the agencies and within the EITS and the Office of the CIO and the Department of Administration, that everybody has kind of stepped up. And I don't know—Michael, are you going to speak to what we're going to be asking for? Is that—you're next? Okay. And so, I'll just stop talking then. And—and—except I'll ask, is there anybody in Southern Nevada that has any questions or comments at this point? All right. Go ahead, Michael.

DIETRICH: Thank you, Director Contine. So, Suzie highlighted an overview of the ask that we will be taking to IFC this Thursday, and I wanted to kind of put a little bit of clarity around that and address a big issue.

So, you mentioned five positions, I believe, in your summary, of which we will be requesting four of those five positions in the IFC on Thursday, which is the Program Officer III and the three Public Service Interns. That's a very small number of people, and if you—you know, we've kind of broken this down. It's a very simple equation. Well, it's not that simple because documents are so complicated, but if you use an average for a document, say it's 20 pages and it's of a medium, moderate to high complexity, we came up with—I think it's four people—or three people doing the actual remediation work, would take about 17 years.

DESANTIS: Yeah.

DIETRICH: To finish the stack of documents. And I think there were some eyerolls in session when we mentioned those numbers. And we get it. It's also difficult to hire. You can invert that. You can hire 15 to 20 interns and get it done in a couple years, but it's—you know, how do you house them? How do you manage them?

So, it's a difficult challenge no matter how you slice it. However, if you look at the problem as we have 105,000 documents in the executive branch to remediate, you're looking at the wrong problem. The problem we're trying to solve for is making sure that the blind community can find the documents that they need, and their screen reader technology can access them and read them. If you look at it that way, then you can make more effective use of a group of resources even though it's still not perfect or as fast as we'd like it to be, or truly in our hearts desire it to be, I think is not overexaggerating. But we can make it most efficient by this method that we're calling, just in time remediation, and that is—Linda eluded to that, which is a combination of all these mechanisms.

It's the accessibility program of having the icon to get help on the website. That's

the entry portal that allows someone to request that a document that is not currently remediated, be remediated. It's also getting all the folks at that agencies trained so that they are participants in the accessibility program, so if a document comes in through any agency, then we can make sure that the request—or a document—a request comes in for an agency, we can make sure that the request is routed to that agency, and we know the points of contact within the agency who can best perform the work, most quickly perform the work. And then if it all routes through the central program, Linda and her team, it allows a backstop of, well, let's say that talent at the agency is stumped by that remediation problem. It happens. Sometimes you'll have a weird document that is difficult to remediate, well, we've got the subject matter expertise to help out in the core team.

That's why we want to make Siteimprove consistent. It also allows—you know, in the short time I've been with the state, I've seen 15, 20 people change positions in my direct sphere of influence, and people move around. It allows a person moving from one agency to another to take that institutional knowledge with them because we use a common tool set. So, that's why we are asking for the support of the ITAB and others that we present this to, to really make this the standard method across the executive branch so that we have a common place where all of this effort is centralized, and also common methods to route the request and make the just in time remediation program as quick and efficient as possible. Getting to—really if we're solving for the root problem, which is ensuring that someone in the blind community is able to access the documents that they need, we want to make sure that when we do have one that's not remediated and the request comes in to make it accessible by screen reader technology, that we do that as quickly as possible. And right now, Linda, what is our just in time remediation average?

DESANTIS: Linda DeSantis for the record. Right now, it's probably been three days, possibly four. In the beginning—we've had about 95 requests for document remediation since January 7th when it was first piloted. In the beginning, it was probably 20 days, 25 days, because of two reasons. It was a new program, people weren't sure what to do with it. The second thing is, they weren't trained. So, 90 percent of the work was remediated by us. Now, I've just looked at it. In the last month and a half, the lead times have gone down, like I said, maybe five days, if—if. And most of the remediation is not being done by us anymore, it's being done by the departments.

DIETRICH: Thanks, Linda. So, Michael Dietrich. This is what we want to get to, and we want to continue to add talent from the agencies that will speed up the remediation process, in addition to the new positions who will also help with that, but mostly kind of train the trainer. They will help us get more people on board, and knowledge about how this works to reduce those remediation times. Our target, which we are confident we can hit if we get all the agencies on board, is

sub 24 hours for standard Just in Time Remediation.

Now, in some cases, that may not be quick enough. Somebody—it may be sometime in the afternoon and someone needs to get a form filled in by that afternoon, or 5:00, end of day. We will have processes that we can evoke in emergencies like that, where we work directly with someone in order to read the document to them, walk them through it. This is required if we want to make this “Just in Time Remediation” program work, but we expect that to be the exception, not the rule. It’s still better even though it’s a process, it takes time, it’s still better than the serial remediation of all the documents, because if you look at 105,000 in the stack, statistically, it could be 17 years before we get to one of those documents. But this program allows us to get to it as quickly as we can, and the goal is to get to it as quickly as needs require.

CONTINE: Okay. Thank you. Are there any questions or comments? I think we’re done with this one, huh? This one was also for possible action, but you’re good. You guys are good, you just—

DIETRICH: Yeah. The action we’re asking for was just an endorsement from the Board that this is the best approach, and if there are any other suggestions or observations about how we are trying to accomplish the needs with the resources that we are approved to ask for—if there are any suggestions to make the process better.

WHITLEY: This is Richard Whitley with Health and Human Services. I mean, I’ll make a motion that—to endorse the approach you’re taking. It does—I don’t know we would make improvements any other way. So, that’s my motion.

CONTINE: Can I get a second?

BETTS: This is Craig Betts. I second. I think it’s an appropriate way to go about it.

CONTINE: Under discussion I’ll just say that this has been an evolution. When we went in the session to get funds for this, the session—or the legislature put the money in a reserve category and asked for the—for EITS to come to the IFC in August—or, to come to IFC, but we’re going in a couple days, to kind of discuss the plan. And since that time, the team has been working on this Just in Time concept and flushing it out some more. And it really does balance—with the amount of resources that we have, it balances addressing the most important documents first, in light of the fact that we don’t have \$12 million to hire a consultant to remediate our entire system.

So, I think the team has done a great job in coming up with this plan, and I’m—and of course I support it. So, I don’t know if there’s any other comments? Any other

discussion? Okay. So, we have a motion and a second. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. [ayes around] Any opposed? Okay. The motion carries unanimously. Thank you, guys.

DESANTIS: Thank you.

DIETRICH: Thank you.

11. INFORMATION SECURITY UPDATE AND STATUS OF SECURITY GRANTS
(for discussion only)-State of Nevada Chief Information Security Officer, Robert Dehnhardt.

CONTINUE: Next is Item No. 11, Information Security Update and Status of Security Grants, and Bob Dehnhardt for EITS.

DEHNHARDT: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the board. For the record, my name is Bob Dehnhardt and I'm the Chief Information Security Officer for the State. I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I'd like to highlight a few projects that we have in flight right now, and then go into some details on some upcoming efforts that we have.

First of all, the legislative session approved an expansion and update for our Nevada Card Access System, or NCAS. This is the system that controls access to buildings using the little swipe cards that we use. They approved replacing 80 card readers and upgrading our license for the software to an Enterprise license. This is really important.

We need to upgrade these readers so that we can use more modern technology with smart cards or encrypted cards to better improve our physical security. And, we've had, over the last couple years, some rather phenomenal growth in the use of this system. We're over 80 different buildings on the system right now, and we're on pace to be pushing 100 by this time next year. So, with that number of buildings depending on this system, having the resilience of multiple servers out there controlling the system is critical. So, that has been approved. We're already in the process of working with the vender to get it scheduled, and we have plans for that to be completed by the end of this quarter.

Another item that Michael alluded to is the GRC program, Governance, Risk and Compliance. We've been working on this for a while. We're in the final phases of procuring the solution for it. I hope to have that completed by the end of this month, which is kind of pushing it a little bit, but it needs to happen. This is key to moving the state forward in managing its security program. With this, we'll be able to put all of our governance in one place, all of our standards, our polices, our regulations from other entities, mainly the federal government, all in one place and map them to each other so that if—say the IRS, the FBI and Social Security all have a control around

one security function, like password length and complexity, and an agency happens to fall under all three, sometimes they contradict each other. Sometimes IRS wants 10 characters minimum, FBI wants 12. Things of that nature, and mapping all of that can be a real load.

When I was the Information Security Officer at Welfare, it seemed like it sometimes half of my job was maintaining a spreadsheet that kept all those mappings in place. This tool will do that fairly easily to help information security officers manage the programs within their own agencies and make things a lot easier for them to set the standards that they need to set. It also will help with compliance audits. The auditors come in and they check against these controls and they tend to ask the same questions. This tool can keep the responses and any artifacts that we have to generate for these audits, in one place. So, they come in and, ideally, we can pull a report, do a quick Delta on it to update things that need to be updated and hand it to the auditors, lessening the load for the compliance audits greatly.

And finally, the third thing that we'll do is provide for risk management of information security within the state, which is something of a blind spot right now, I have to tell you. We don't really have a good handle on the risk load that each individual agency is carrying, and what the state as a whole is carrying. We have a pretty good idea. Our ISOs are paying attention to this, but we don't have anything concrete that we can point to, that we can really track. And by putting this governance and these compliance documents in this tool along with inputs from other security programs that we have going on, we'll be able to track all this much more closely. We'll have a better understanding of the risk that the state is facing, and what kind, where it resides. And by using that, we'll be able to make more informed decisions about security technologies and changes going forward. Any questions on any of that? Yes, ma'am?

MCGEE: Sherry McGee for the record. So, will you be going out and auditing the agencies with that tool? Or how do you see that rolling out?

DEHNHARDT: Bob Dehnhardt for the record. We're going to be rolling it out to the information security officers in each agency for them to populate and use internally. There is an expansion module that we're not buying upfront, but I do have plans down the road, that will allow self-assessments and self-audits. And then we will use the tool with any third-party auditors from the federal government or from industry that come in and need to audit the agencies.

MCGEE: Thank you.

SRINIVAS: Krupa Srinivas for the record.

DEHNHARDT: Oh. Yes, ma'am?

SRINIVAS: Sorry. Another quick question for you, sir. Krupa Srinivas for the record. Do we have a policy of regular security and vulnerability assessments across the agencies?

DEHNHARDT: There is. Bob Dehnhardt for the record. There is a requirement in NRS 242 that calls for vulnerability management and scanning for all agencies. Right now, it's something of a hit or miss. We have some agencies that are fully engaged with the Enterprise level scanning that we've got available. There are some agencies that haven't taken that on yet, mainly because of concerns with their production environment. A scan on an improperly configured scan, or a scan that's on an improperly configured environment, can take down production really fast and we don't want to do that. At the same time, we do want to secure the environment, so we work with agencies to get them to a point where they can do the scanning as regularly as possible, but we're not at a 100 percent yet.

SRINIVAS: Thank you.

DEHNHARDT: So, Bob Dehnhardt for the record. So, that tool ties in with something else that came out of the legislature this past session, and that's SB302, which made—what on the surface is a fairly simple change to NRS 603A, requiring all State agencies that are data collectors to comply with the CIS 20 Controls, or with the critical control cybersecurity framework. And I did provide you with an overview of the CIS controls in your packet.

This seems like a simple thing to do because everyone refers to the CIS controls as the "CIS 20". If there's only 20 of them, that shouldn't take long at all. It's a problem of what CIS has 20 of and what they call controls. They're more goals than controls, but we'll use their terminology. They also have a 171 sub controls, and that's where the rubber meets the road. That's where all the heavy lifting is involved. Now, when you look at NRS 603A, my view, and the view of the State Information Security Committee is that, virtually every agency is, in some form or another, a data collector.

So, we all fall under 603A to one degree or another. We discussed it and decided that our path—the best path forward for the state would be to adopt the CIS controls as a baseline control framework for the state, for all executive branch agencies. We felt that this was the most effective way of working with the requirements in SB302. And we also felt that it was the best thing for the state as far as raising the bar and protecting the state.

So, we've put together a project plan and we will be including this in the project portfolio to make sure that has an appropriate level of visibility and tracking. Phase one is already underway. It started July 1st, and Phase one includes going through our state security program policy and updating it to ensure that all the 20 CIS main controls are reflected in policy statements. Some of them are already there, some of

them aren't. So, we're going to go through, we're going to map all of that. This is the first time since 2012, since that policy has been updated. So, it's due. It's time.

I already was looking at doing that anyway; this just gave us a purpose and a starting point. Along with that, you'll notice in the handout that each of the sub controls has a green, orange or blue dot by it. CIS in this most recent version of their controls, came up with implementation groups, guidance from them on how to implement all these controls rather than just do a big bang and try and do it all at once.

So, implementation group one is the green dots, and those controls generally relate to policy standard process and procedure. They're things that you can look at doing without a lot of funding, without a lot of resources, and you can still make improvements to your environment. What we're going to do is take the 33 sub controls in implementation group one and map those to our state-wide security standards and make sure that, in some way or another, we are enforcing or enabling those controls within our environment. And that would take us through the first implementation group. That's slated to be—or, that's targeted to be completed by December 2020. SB302's provisions go into effect January 2021.

So, by the time those provisions go into effect, we should be through with implementation group one of the controls. Phase two of this project will run concurrent with phase one, and it's looking at implementation group two, which are the orange dots. There are 99 unique controls in that group, and they tend to focus more on technology. We have a lot of technology in the state already in place, and so we should be able to do—we should be able to just cross off a lot of those, but sometimes our technology isn't doing it the way that CIS recommends, so it may not be up to the standard, and we are missing some. We do have some gaps.

So, the implementation group two controls will be used to inform and develop our budget requests for the next biennium. We'll use these as the drivers to make our budget requests. We'll be looking at doing as many of them as possible and practical at the enterprise level. Since we are applying these standards and controls across all agencies, it just makes sense to take the burden of implementation and support off the individual agencies and do it at an Enterprise level more possible. And we also get a benefit of economies of scale by shopping all executive branch than each agency going out on their own.

Now, security isn't necessarily a one size fits all, so there may be cases in here where it would be more appropriate for each agency to take on their own interpretation and implementation of a control, and that's fine. We'll do that where it makes sense, but I really want to do as much as possible at the Enterprise level simply because it's a more effective use of resources and funding.

And then in with that, we'll also be looking at implementation group three. These are

more advanced security controls, and they don't necessarily apply to a baseline. So, we'll implement the ones that everyone on the security committee agrees, should apply to the entire state, but we'll back off from the ones that are maybe too onerous for some agencies that aren't really dealing with sensitive information, while we'll support and enable agencies that do have those requirements to go forward. This phase two is intended to be completed at the end of the FY 22/23 biennium. Any questions?

CONTINE: I don't see any up here. Any in Southern Nevada? All right. I think that's it then. Thank you.

DEHNHARDT: Thank you.

12. ITAB 2019/2020 MEETING SCHEDULE AND MEETING OBJECTIVES *(for possible action)*- CIO, Michael Dietrich.

All right. Next is Item No. 12, the ITAB 2019/2020 Meeting Schedule. Michael Dietrich, go ahead.

DIETRICH: Thank you, Director Contine. Michael Dietrich for the record. So, this is the discussion of primarily the outcomes of this meeting, kind of what we want, what we as Enterprise IT and the Office of the CIO would like to accomplish from this meeting, and a discussion of the meeting cadence. I'll start with cadence first. And, the 2020 cadence is pretty easy. We have in statute that the ITAB will convene four times per year, once per quarter.

So, we will tract to that schedule in the next year, however, we missed a meeting at the beginning of this year, so this was a—this is our first meeting for 2019, and it is our desire to have at least a couple meetings before the end of the year. So, I wanted to just put that out there to the Board. If we—I think that having three meetings before the end of the year is probably a bit too aggressive, but if we do every other month from now to the end of the year, it puts us at October and December. I just wanted to see if there was any comment about that cadence, or if we believed we could schedule three meetings before the end of the year.

MCGEE: For the record, Sherry McGee. So, you're saying that in statute it's calendar year? Not fiscal year?

DIETRICH: Michael Dietrich. That is correct, calendar year.

CONTINE: We can make, what? Four happen? Every other month. So, you're looking at October and December, early in the month?

DIETRICH: Yes. That is correct.

CONTINE: For both? Sounds good to me. I don't know. Would anybody

else in Southern Nevada, do you have any comments on this scheduling?

SRINIVAS: Every other month sounds good.

CONTINE: Thank you.

DIETRICH: Michael Dietrich. Thank you very much. We will go ahead and schedule a meeting in early October and a meeting in early December, and then we will get back on track with our quarterly cadence in 2020, and hopefully we will make some progress in identifying appointees for open seats and reappointing any members as necessary.

So, on to the objectives. And as Director Contine alluded to, we had Assembly Bill 33 which was related to two things. One was a bit of more definition around the CIO role and the reporting structure within the Office of the CIO. If anyone was following that, one of the primary things was the Office of Information Security and the Chief Information Security Officer reporting to the CIO rather than within Enterprise IT, as a kind of separation of—or, rather, a reduction of conflict of interests. You should never have your security oversight reporting within the structure of the organization that you're overseeing. And we are handling that with a reporting structure of the Chief of Information Security Officer reporting to the CIO.

The other piece of it was a definition of—a better definition of the IT Advisory Board, and some of the things that we hope to accomplish. One where we compose the membership, bringing in more industry, private sector knowledge and expertise, and the reason for that, even though that didn't happen, we do have some great industry expertise on the board now and we're hoping to fill the open seat with more of that. But kind of the reason behind that, again, I like to ask why. Why do we have an IT Advisory Board? You know, everybody's time is valuable. Again, we very much appreciate folks joining us for this meeting, but we really want to get something out of it. And it's—we as State IT, we cannot operate in a vacuum.

Often—it's all too common that state agencies do things in a similar way as time goes on, without looking to areas of improvement. And I always want to make sure that we do that, and I've been out of the private sector for about a year and a half now and I'm already seeing, as I keep in touch with colleagues in the industry, that things are changing. There are things that are very new to me, and things that I wasn't aware of, and I always want to make sure that we exercise every opportunity that we have to stay as current as possible. That's one thing that we would love to get from this body.

And also, it's just—in the advisory capacity, just kind of looking at what it is that we have going on within Enterprise IT and across the state, and suggesting best practices helping guide us in good directions, as well as advocating—because we can't have membership from all of the agencies but helping us to advocate the benefits of some of the things that we're trying to do.

So, that is really my desire of what the IT Advisory Board means to Enterprise IT and the Office of the CIO. That said, you, members of the Board, have to receive information in order to help us with that, and that's really what—to me, what the meat of this discussion is about, is, are we bringing the correct things to this forum? Are we sharing the right things with you? I heard loud and clear that we really need to get that project dashboard in a way that it is consumable by everyone on the board so you can really see what is going on within State IT. I think the portfolio is going to help with that as well, which is why we are really putting a lot of effort into those things up front. Are there other things we can do—other ways we can deliver information so that the Board feels like you can give us that feedback that we need to improve state IT? And with that, I will take questions—

MARCELLA: Michael, I'm going to—for the record, Joe Marcella. Michael, I'm going to ask you a question in light of providing some kind of background of support and information. Did you get in this budget cycle, the priorities that you were looking for? Or was everything a compromise?

DIETRICH: Michael Dietrich for the record. Thank you, Mr. Marcella for the question. We did—we went after quite a few things, and some of them I would say were truly aspirational. So, while—for instance, not getting the funding, the budget authority to build the shared computing platform, that was something that I believed and still believe we need as a state. It is just, to me, ineffective and a waste of resources for the state to be operating multiple expensive data centers in various geographic locations across the state rather than consolidating those into one area which is what the industry is doing. You know, I've heard terms as powerful as, the datacenter is dead. The individual datacenter is dead. It's a dinosaur concept.

So, I would say that was certainly disappointing that we weren't funded for that, and I believe that we need to continue to build the business case in order to be successful with that initiative. So, that was not—that was beyond a compromise. That was just simply a loss. Other areas I would say that did get funded, there is always a desire to have funding to be able to purchase resources and establish levels of service at a higher level. However, we also are very good at accomplishing with what we are able to, what resources we are given. Would I want more? Absolutely. And I don't know if that directly answers your question, but hopefully that's a bit more information.

MARCELLA: Well, it does. The point I was trying—Joe Marcella for the record, Joe Marcella. One of the—the reason I asked the question is that, for some of the priorities that are particular to IT, that are obvious that they should be done and not usually or consistently obvious to those folks providing the funding. What kind of support could this body give you in the budget process? And then how could we acquire the kind of information that we can give you that support? And then what kind of teeth would our advisory, or our opinion or support, written or otherwise, provide you in that budget process? In other words, can we help there?

DIETRICH: So, Michael Dietrich for the record. I truly appreciate the additional clarification and commentary. If I—you know, and I'm kind of stepping out—or possibly stepping out of the boundaries of what we could ask for on the Board, but I'll just go ahead and put it out there.

I love the comment about, how can you help with the budget process, and I think knowledge—and I think acknowledgement, that, in any forum, whether it be a board room of a company whose core competency is not technology, or the state, there is the difficulty of speaking the language of technology—or, rather, speaking the language of business, not the language of technology, and presenting technology asks in a way that everyone can understand the true benefit to the company or to the state.

And even when you kind of abstract technology out of it, you're still speaking to a group of decision makers of very diverse backgrounds and diverse skillsets of knowledge and expertise. So, even some of the very high-level concepts are not clearly communicated. So, I think that having any forum where we can speak the language of technology as it relates to the needs of the business, and then have that translated and subsequently advocated to the decision makers in such a way that it is understood and effective, would be helpful.

I did hear that in the last session there was a technology advisory board and I wasn't—or, I'm sorry. A tech caucus, rather. I wasn't certain what the desired outcomes of that group was, but I heard tech and I thought, it would be great to have a voice in something like that speaking to what was going on in technology within the state. If there is any way that we can, as this Board, this body, get plugged into a forum like that, that would assist us to communicate technology—have the technology conversation with the decision makers, it would be, I think, a wonderful opportunity. But, obviously, finding those opportunities can be challenging.

CONTINE: This is Deonne Contine for the record. I would just add, some of that—especially with respect to the AB33 that didn't go through—and I know that—and Michael testified when the bill was presented that many of those initiatives had been brought to this Board and discussed extensively. And I know some of it—I mean, I don't really think there was a lot of controversy, but I think that bill really was—I think—at the end of the day, I think most people will agree that it was—that it's good policy. The changes—that creating the structure where the CISO reports to the CIO and not to EITS, and some of the other things—changes to the boards, it was just—I feel like that was due to a change in administration in all honesty.

And so, there just wasn't enough time to educate a new Governor and a new team that work for that Governor, about the importance of that. And so, and I think that's what Michael's getting to as well. It's like, we, internally, he and I, need to figure out, how do we communicate that and how do we help people see the importance of that?

Even if it's just a policy and not a budget. So, that's something we can continue to work on, but also bringing those issues to this Board and having the Board discuss it and support it, I think will help in that regard.

DENIS: This is Senator Denis. And I will say, there's—on some of these issues, I don't—when I saw the bill, it never got to us on the Senate side, and so I don't know what the decision was to introduce it on the assembly side first, how that ended up happening. And nobody really reached out to me, which I probably could have been helpful because I serve both on finance, and I also happen to be a member of the tech caucus. But I could have probably been some help there. We just—I saw some of that, and once we get into session, everything just gets kind of hectic to be able to do that, but I probably could have been more helpful, but I didn't realize what was going on. I was told it was too late and it was on the assembly side, and it's real hard for me to do anything once it gets over there.

So, I think as we move forward if I can be helpful there, I could of—you know, I was hoping it would get through from the assembly side over to us so I could have that discussion with some folks. But since I didn't really know what was going on there, I didn't help out as much as I could of.

CONTINE: I appreciate that—this is Dion—because I think that bill was heard, I don't know, five days after I started. So, I was right there with you.

DIETRICH: So, Michael Dietrich for the record. Is there any other suggestions, going back to how we can deliver information to the board and encourage the discussion and the feedback from the Board that would—again, my goal is to ensure that we are making good decisions and through the collaboration with this body, and the hoped-for collaboration with the law makers, the decision makers, gain support for those decisions. I mean, that really is the thing that makes things happen around here, right?

MCGEE: Sherry McGee for the record. So, that whole communications piece, because I know there's a lot of—it's a very small community, right? Our legislature is the public, and then the folks that work throughout the agencies as well. So, I think that communication piece, making sure that what we're talking about here is communicated out so that other people hear that same message and hear the things that you're doing, the good things that you're doing and the things you're trying to achieve. That will come back around through some of those back channels as well. So, I'm a real advocate for that communication and I think that will help a lot.

DIETRICH: Michael Dietrich. Thank you, Ms. McGee, for the comment. And we will certainly work on better communication, both from this group and out to agencies, and receiving the communication as well. And I will just go ahead and conclude with, we'll continue to improve the project dashboard and the portfolio and

expect more of that to—information at the next meeting, and we can refine from there and hopefully that will be a good vehicle for some of these discussions. Thank you.

13. BOARD DISCUSSION (for discussion only)- Chair, ITAB and CIO, Michael Dietrich. Board may discuss issues raised by agenda items or identify concerns within statutory mandate to be addressed at future meetings. Thank you to Paul Diflo for his time and commitment to ITAB.

CONTINE: Okay. Item No. 13, Board Discussion. So, Michael Dietrich, the Board may discuss issues raised by the agenda items or identify concerns within its statutory mandate to be addressed. And then, I don't know if you want to say something about Mr. Diflo?

DIETRICH: Yes.

CONTINE: Go ahead.

DIETRICH: Michael Dietrich. First of all, I'd like to thank Mr. Paul Diflo, and I think he had another commitment and had to leave the meeting. He was attending as a member of the public after resigning his Board seat and resigning his Chair. And he just did a great job since I've been here, with conducting the meetings and keeping us going in the right direction. So, thank you to Paul Diflo for his service as Chair.

And I also wanted to thank all the folks from Enterprise IT for their presentations and all the effort around portfolio project management, ADA, security. All very critical initiatives, and I think it's wonderful that these folks are putting together this communication for the board and all the work that is being done within Enterprise IT.

14. 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.

CONTINE: Okay. Thank you. Does anybody have anything for future agenda? All right. Okay. Well, then moving on to Item No. 14, is there any public comment in Las Vegas?

DENIS: No one is coming forward.

CONTINE: Okay. Thanks. Is there any public comment in Carson City?

UCHEL: Yes, there is.

CONTINE: Go ahead.

UCHEL: Good afternoon. My name is Dora Uchel and my last name is spelled U-C-H-E-L. For the record, I am the National Federation of the Blind, Northern Nevada, Reno Chapter, Vice President. I am totally blind. I want to say thank you to Linda—I'm sorry, I lost her last name, but kudos for her for doing all the ADA compliance. And this guy next to me, Thomas Kerns. I want to say thank you to all of you guys here and not cancelling the meeting today. It is really important to have ADA compliance.

It's been difficult. I have a twelve-year-old and sometimes I would need her to help me fill out applications for the DWSS website because it's not accessible. I'm hoping on the Friday, it will be because we use a mobile phone, we don't have laptop or computer, so hopefully when we do this moving forward, that we all keep in mind that this day in age, everybody has mobile phone to use for—as a computer. I have a backpack, but it's heavy to carry a laptop with everything else, so mobile phone is the way to go. And I appreciate your time and thank you.

CONTINUE: Thank you. Go ahead, sir.

KERNS: For the record, my name is Thomas Kerns. I'm an MFB member, also board member of the state. I first want to say that this has been a twelve-year voyage for me. I started knocking on the accessibility door for the state and very few people would even answer the door, and then when they would answer the door, they say, yeah, yeah, get back with me. Or they'd say, oh, no, no, see ya. Does that, so then I would reach out to Sam and then inevitably Sam wasn't there anymore and somebody else took over the job.

And so, what I was really doing was helping individuals like Dora get accessibility on statewide websites, and we would just—you know, fight after fight after fight, and usually we'd never get anywhere or worse, get the reaction of, the other individual in the—on the other side would say, well, can't you fill that out? Or, can't Dora's children fill that out? Or.

And so, basically, it was denying the individual access to statewide services and goods. And the truth of the matter is, depending on which website you go to, we have somewhere between 100 to 110,000 visually impaired and blind people in Nevada, and many of them do not have access to state goods and services. And it's very important that this process keeps going.

This ITAB and the EITS are truly a light on top of a hill, and you're not keeping it unshown. As you heard Linda talking about this, from Michael's directive, to Suzie's encouragement and leadership, and Linda's "Jersey-girl" attitude, she is not liable to stop and she has pushed it, the EITS has pushed it and encouraged it.

I know that you are only a small portion of the websites in the state, but by your encouragement, by the EITS encouragement, it is spreading. For instance, Director

Whitley approached me three ITABs ago and ever since, I know for a fact he has been trying to make progress and is making great strides to doing that, and with the help of EITS and this commission, you're doing it. But it's a huge task.

Every time I hear Linda talking about it, I almost see as a little boy, the Ed Sullivan show and that guy spinning plates, and he's got ten plates in front of him, and then a dog shows up and he's doing dog tricks and spinning plates, and what really isn't known, there's a hundred more plates off stage. And the EITS is still spinning those plates. They need help.

We as a group, the National Federation of the Blind want to be your team members in this. We want to encourage you. We want to help you. We will give you all the advice and time that you need to move this forward. So, please use us. Please think about us. And a few things that we can think about as a group, there are things that has to be done. There is no website accessibility statewide standard. They keep pointing at—oh, this standard, or, that standard, but the truth of the matter is, is they're accessibility standards such as the WCAG (Web Content Accessibility Guidelines) that have clearly pointed at those standards.

Michael alluded to them, Linda alluded to them, and they put those in place. But the truth of the matter is, the state doesn't have a standard that they say, we're following this. And that needs to be done.

And along with that accessibility standard, we also need a purchasing process standard. And that purchasing process standard must, must ask for a VPAT 2.0 and above request. A VPAT stands for Voluntary Private Accessibility Template, 2.0 points to 508, which is of course a federal standard. But they've ran through these processes. And so, for instance, a vendor cannot buy anything—I mean, sell anything to the federal government without this VPAT standard, and what it comes down is a report on their product and how accessible it is.

So, I encourage written standards for website accessibility, written standards for purchasing processes because without that, let's say we all stick to VPAT—I mean, to standards, if we're buying inaccessible content and inaccessible products, we're just undermining our work and it's just going to all fall back to the problems we have today. But once again, I really, really want to thank you for being this beacon for the state and it's accessibility. Thank you very much.

CONTINUE: Thank you. Is there any other public comment in Carson City? Okay.
15. ADJOURNMENT (for possible action)

CONTINUE: Going to Item No. 15 then, Adjournment. Do we need a motion? Okay.
We're adjourned then. Thank you, everybody. [end of meeting]

Notice of this meeting was posted before 9:00 a.m. three working days prior to the meeting pursuant to NRS 241.020, in the following locations:

- Capitol Building, 101 N. Carson St., Carson City, NV 89701
- Legislative Building, 401 N. Carson St., Carson City, NV 89701
- Blasdel Building, 209 E. Musser St., Carson City, NV 89701
- Carson City Court Clerk Office, 885 E. Musser, Carson City, NV 89701
- Washoe County Courthouse, Second Judicial District Court, 75 Court Street, Reno, NV 89501
- Nevada State Library and Archives, 100 Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89701
- Grant Sawyer Building, 555 E. Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, NV 89101
- And the following web locations:

- o [http://it.nv.gov/Governance/dtls/ITAB/Information Technology Advisory Board \(ITAB\)/](http://it.nv.gov/Governance/dtls/ITAB/Information_Technology_Advisory_Board_(ITAB)/)
- o <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.

The Information Technology Advisory Board may: take agenda items out of order; combine two or more agenda items for consideration; remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time.

Supporting materials for this meeting will be available to the public at the meeting locations at the time of the meeting. Members of the public may request supporting materials from Leslie Olson at (775) 684-5849 or email a request to lolson@admin.nv.gov.

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.