



Committee on Information Technology

Office of the City Administrator

San Francisco City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Suite 352

Minutes

COIT Privacy and Surveillance Advisory Board Meeting
City and County of San Francisco

Thursday, June 29, 2023

3:00 PM – 5:00 PM

Webex Online Event

Members

Mike Makstman – Chair, Chief Information Security Officer, Department of Technology

Guy Clarke – IT Governance Director, San Francisco International Airport

Mikela Clemmons – Technical Director, Digital Services

Mark de la Rosa – Director of Audits, City Service Auditor, Controller's Office

Jillian Johnson – Chair, Director, Committee on Information Technology

Michelle Littlefield – Chief Data Officer, Data SF and Digital Services

Molly Peterson – Contract Reform Manager, Office of the City Administrator

1. Call to Order by Chair

Mike Makstman called the meeting to order at 3:04 PM, provided instruction on how to give public comment, and conducted the roll call.

2. Roll call

Mike Makstman – Chair, Chief Information Security Officer, Department of Technology

Guy Clarke – IT Governance Director, San Francisco International Airport

Mikela Clemmons – Technical Director, Digital Services (Arrived at 3:07 PM)

Mark de la Rosa – Director of Audits, City Service Auditor, Controller's Office

Jillian Johnson – Chair, Director, Committee on Information Technology

Molly Peterson – Contract Reform Manager, Office of the City Administrator

COIT Staff

Julia Chrusciel

Danny Thomas Vang

3. General Public Comment

There was no public comment.

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes from June 8, 2023 (Action Item)

There was no public comment.

Jillian Johnson made a motion to approve, Molly Peterson seconded.

The minutes were approved by Michael Makstman, Guy Clarke, Mikela Clemmons, Mark de la Rosa, Jillian Johnson, and Molly Peterson.

5. Department Updates & Announcements

Jillian Johnson announced that there will be no PSAB Meetings in July, and that the social media monitoring policy was passed by COIT.

There was no public comment.

6. Surveillance Technology Policy Review: Data Forensics (Action Item)

Asja Steeves and Mark Powell presented on behalf of the Police Department on their Data Forensics Tool. There were two proposals directed toward the subcommittee:

- Craft language so that a tool can still be utilized without having to reengage the approval process, whenever there is a product update or additional features that fall within the scope of the authorized use cases
- Incorporate "grant funds" in conjunction to "operating funds"

Questions posed by members of the subcommittee include:

- Is the retention policy different based on the type of crime?
- Is it possible to only retain evidence, not the entire phone?
- Could the lab staff take credential information (such as those for Google Drive), or is there an additional warrant needed?
- How long is the seal for evidence not tied to a warrant?
- Can notes and reports be used as evidence?
- What is the legal difference between Notes/reports and evidence?
- Are there modules or features that the department knows that they would like to access at the moment?
- How does the charge of this subcommittee and the purpose of the policy compare with other checks, such as the cyber risk assessment and contract processes?

The following suggestions were made by members:

- Update language to focus on the type of technology, instead of the specific company contracted with, so that the policy better allows for flexibility in vendor choice
- Provide more specificity to the retention policy (such as the minimum and maximum of years), and what governs specific types of crimes (such as a policy or code)
- Perhaps provide examples of what types of incidents would lead to "indefinite" retention, and what would fall under the appeals process
- Include a point of contact for public members who would like to acquire additional details, especially for policies that are not published on a public domain
- Add any specific additional modules/functionality the Department may want to use in the future, even if not currently in use, so that the department does not need to amend the policy at a later date

There was no public comment.

Jillian Johnson made a motion to move this item forward with the following amended language: (1) removal of the specific company name across the document and (2) more distinction on the retention policy. Molly Peterson seconded.

The motion was approved by Michael Makstman, Guy Clarke, Mikela Clemmons, Mark de la Rosa, Jillian Johnson, and Molly Peterson.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:57 PM.