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City Hall, Room 305 and Webex Online Event

Members

Katie Petrucione – Chair, Deputy City Administrator/CFO, City Administrator’s Office

Cyd Harrell – Chief Digital Services Officer, City Administrator’s Office

Damon Daniels — Analyst, Mayor's Office

Jason Blandon – Acting Chief Information Officer, Public Library

Ray Ricardo — Acting Chief Information Officer, Airport

Todd Rydstrom – Deputy Controller, Controller’s Office

Tajel Shah – Chief Assistant Treasurer, Treasurer-Tax Collector

Mike Cotter – Director of Finance and Administration, Department of Human Resources

Jillian Johnson – Director, Committee on Information Technology

1. **Call to Order by Chair**

Katie Petrucione called the meeting to order at 9:06 AM. Jillian Johnson provided instruction on how to give public comment and conducted the roll call.

1. **Roll Call**

Katie Petrucione – Chair, Deputy City Administrator/CFO, City Administrator’s Office

Cyd Harrell – Chief Digital Services Officer, City Administrator’s Office

Damon Daniels — Analyst, Mayor's Office

Ray Ricardo — Acting Chief Information Officer, Airport

Todd Rydstrom – Deputy Controller, Controller’s Office

Mike Cotter – Director of Finance and Administration, Department of Human Resources

Tajel Shah – Chief Assistant Treasurer, Treasurer-Tax Collector

Jillian Johnson – Director, Committee on Information Technology

COIT Staff

Neil Dandavati

Julia Chrusciel

Danny Thomas Vang

1. **General Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

1. **Approval of Meeting Minutes from March 31, 2023**

There was no public comment.

Tajel Shah made a motion to approve, Jillian Johnson seconded.

The motion was approved unanimously by Jillian Johnson, Cyd Harrell, Damon Daniels, Ray Ricardo, Todd Rydstrom, Mike Cotter, and Tajel Shah.

1. **Department Updates & Announcements**

COIT staff did not have any announcements.

There was no public comment.

1. **FY 2023-24 & FY2024-25 Budget Project Presentations: COIT Allocation Requests**

Tajel Shah and William Joe presented on behalf of the Assessor-Recorder (ASR) on the proposed Property Tax and Tax Systems Replacement project.

Mike Cotter and Damon Daniels asked the following clarification questions:

* Question: How the Treasurer and Tax Collector’s (TTX) Empty Homes Tax project integrate with this project?
	+ Response: The Empty Homes Tax is based on parcels (blocks and lots). The Assessor Recorder’s (ASR) system is the system of record for the City’s parcels. It includes all characteristics needed to determine a tax assessment. ASR feeds TTX all blocks and lots. TTX then adds information from the Department of Building Inspection, the planning department, and Department of Public Health, to determine who has to file the Empty Homes Tax.
* Question: Curious about 12 M remaining project balance. Are there plans for this?
	+ Response: Yes, we are planning to spend these funds, except for a small contingency for unforeseen costs.

Cyd Harrell presented on behalf of City Administrator, Digital Services (DS) on the proposed project “Support for Digital Security & Translation, and Digital Accessibility & Inclusion Police.

Todd Rydstrom and Tajel Shah asked the following clarification questions:

* Question: Sheriff has a DS related project. Any work being done with them? Just want to make sure that other departments know about the great work you’re doing.
	+ Response: Don’t know of it yet but we do work with other departments on a work order basis.
* Question: There have been many issues with translating tax forms into different languages. (In particular, it is costly, requires a vendor, and there can be liability issues). TTX does many videos in multiple languages. If TTX were to create a walk- through video tutorial for the Empty Homes Tax form (in multiple languages and potentially containing the actual form questions in it) on the City’s website platform, would this be okay from an accessibility standpoint? Would this be a potential way to save costs, by not actually doing translation within the application itself?
	+ Response: Leaving aside the legal ramifications, which we can’t speak to, this should work, as long as you share the URL for the video tutorial on the form.

David Huebner and Nate Frank presented on behalf of Department of Human Resources (DHR) on the proposed projects “Onboarding & Electronic Personnel Records” and “Employee Access to their City (Intranet / SF | My Portal)”.

Cyd Harrell, Tajel Shah, Ray Ricardo, Damon Daniels, and Katie Petrucione asked the following clarification questions:

* Question: Cyd Harrell: Is this likely to fix the preferred name problem in the system?
	+ Response: That solution is actually in progress between CON and DT.
* Question: For individual portal…will the Health Service System (HSS) and Retirement system also shift?
	+ Response: That is the vision at least for HSS, perhaps as Phase 2 or 3. For Retirement maybe not since alumni still need access. It would be great if performance management can be integrated so information from this process can flow back into the personnel record.
* Comment: Appreciate DHR starting with onboarding and thinking about integrating historic data later. This matches the strategy for document management.
* Comment: As a general statement- as City we need to be careful with tools like Service Now. There is a risk of getting overweighted in terms placing City functions within one application, since it can become hard to separate ourselves (“vendor lock-in”). Service Now is one of those tools. So as COIT, we need to look at how much weight we’re putting in any one vendor, and also whether we might analyze which vendors are appropriate for different categories of service needs.
	+ Response: Good point. We like Service Now not because we can put everything in it, but more so because it lets you integrate with other services like Smart Recruiter, Salesforce, etc. This keeps it modular, facilitates a unified experience for the end user, and prevents vendor lock-in to a degree.
* Question: Since all agencies have their own onboarding practices, how does this project relate to those various practices/needs? As a specific example, for permanent exempt (PEX) or permanent civil service (PCS) candidates, particular forms must be completed. Will DHR provide the digital experience for these forms?
	+ Response: The Gould report noted the need for an equitable/unified employee experience, while also maintaining accessibility. Our research team is looking into what aspects of experience are ubiquitous and which are unique/perhaps driven by regulatory needs, so that we give our team the flexibility to account for unique department needs, while creating a unified, baseline experience for all City employees. Regarding specific forms needed in onboarding, like PCS, the answer is yes, DHR would provide the digital experience. That is why we see onboarding as so intertwined with the electronic personnel record. At the time of onboarding, all of the key forms (e.g. PCS) should be provided digitally, and then the data should flow into the electronic personnel record and other key systems like payroll, taking the burden off of various departments to re-enter the data. Thinking of this as a continuum of improvement: the first step is just creating a fillable PDF. The next step is turning the PDF into structured data. Relatedly, another capability we can build in is to take data filled into a form and generate PDFs when needed.
* Question: For the intranet project, why the decrease in salaries from year 1 to year 2?
	+ Response: Two positions are associated with the project and will fall off after the project is complete; the other three positions will potentially be there for longer as the project takes time to become part of regular operations.
* Question: How does all of this interact and interface with the PeopleSoft system of record? Would this system contain the personnel record, rather than have that in PeopleSoft, and has DHR evaluated the pros and cons of that?
	+ Response: Initially, the new platform will be a hub linking to PeopleSoft; later on, there will be more options. We could have widgets in Service Now that take information in and then transmit the data to PeopleSoft. For payroll, PeopleSoft would continue to be the system of record. The employee record would be housed in this system, rather than PeopleSoft, and DHR has evaluated the pros/cons of this.
* Question: In general, COIT funds can be used to fund project positions, but not ongoing operational needs; What’s the transition plan from COIT funding to operational funding?
	+ Response: This is an important question and one that we should likely consider collectively within COIT; based on past experience, we have used work orders to make the transition to operational funding. However, cost redistribution should perhaps be considered as an alternative since the use of work orders can create inequities, where departments with less funding are less able to access the needed resource. In general, we could use further discussion on who would pay for infrastructure like this.
	+ Also, based on experiences with past projects, some project roles turned into necessary roles. The project demonstrated that HR’s business practices have changed sufficiently that the roles had become necessary permanent roles.
* Comment: It’s also important, when thinking about how costs are distributed, to consider the Total Cost of Ownership (TCO). This would include the implementation cost and also the expected future maintenance costs, factoring in the expected life of the system. This is important to know upfront, and perhaps consider in the context of ROI.,
	+ Response: Yes, TCO is something that COIT can focus on; there are many activities generating costs across the City (think document management) and in different “swim lanes”; we must add all the swim lanes up to get TCO.

Mike Cotter presented on behalf of DHR on the proposed project “Disaster Service Worker (DSW) Management System”.

Katie Petrucione, Cyd Harrell, Todd Rydstrom, Tajel Shah, and Damon Daniels asked the following clarification questions:

* Question: Has a particular system/tool been identified?
	+ Response: Yes, there are a couple of options, with one being more attractive. This option in the interim can take in information, but also has API capability--- integration (e.g. PeopleSoft, Service Now) and feeds from databases; A long term goal is to reduce manual data-feeds/uploads.
* Question: Would DHR be the primary user of this system? Has DHR talked with DEM about this?
	+ Response: Initially, it solves for deploying/tracking resources. Whether DHR is the owner would be great follow-on conversation. There are quite a few benefits that would impact departments beyond DHR. Yes, DHR has spoken with DEM and DT.
* Question: Curious if you can describe employee experience DHR would want to offer with this? Would the platform support text communication in an emergency? Also, is this more of a research and definition request at this point?
	+ Response: In terms of employee experience, one intangible benefit is that it lets employees share their talents/skills, which could help address the existence of some inequity in DSW selection currently. Yes, the system would support text communication in an emergency, and push notifications can be configured. Yes, this is a research and definition request, and there is a need for conversations to see if would replace existing applications.
* Question: Could this solution be used with volunteers? CON values this because it helps with tracking hours for local match purposes.
	+ Response: Yes, the solution can be used with volunteers.
* Question: Given that our approximately 35k employees are spread out over 10 counties, contacting them depends on quality/up to date records. How would this system help with that?
	+ Response: This tool can feed back data into PeopleSoft, helping this effort.
* Question: Thinking of the collection of employee data, is there value thinking of this more broadly in understanding our employees? What was the thinking around that?
	+ Response: Absolutely, from employee experience viewpoint, that is what the intranet project aspires to do. Eventually, DSW could be consumer of the employee persona work. For example, using data gathered on employees, the DSW system could be used to identify employees who would be a great fit for a given position. It is all about putting in place a structure that could then later take advantage of that employee persona data that is being built.
* Question: Would the system collect just self-reported information?
	+ Response: Some of the data contained would be self-reported, but we could also pull data from a learning management system, such as what courses you’ve taken, and your prior experiences.
1. **FY 2023-24 & FY2024-25 Budget Recommendations (Action Item)**

Jillian Johnson presented on behalf of COIT staff.

High Level Discussion of Recommendations

* Question: Just confirming that the two lower scenarios for funding are 28.5 M and 29 M?
	+ Response: Yes, that is correct.
* Question: Does the list of projects recommended for funding include all projects that have presented to this committee?
	+ Response: The list excludes the Police HRMS, Permits, and Recruitment projects. The Recruitment project received funding last year, and it appears that Smart Recruiter should be able to address their needs. Police also has a project balance, and some other funds may be available. For HRMS, it appears that last year’s funds also have not been expended. For Permits, some great questions were posed by the committee, so we may allow more time for the project to be developed.
* Question: The “previous allocation” isn’t what’s actually been given right?
	+ Response: That is correct. That is just the recommendation.
* Question: Is the Police NIBRS project included?
	+ Response: It is included in the high scenario.
* Question: Do we have an idea of all departments that didn’t present to COIT asking for money, but have desire to carry forward funds that won’t be spent this year?
	+ Response (from fellow committee member): Each program should check in with its budget analyst to discuss plans around carry forward.
* Question: If this committee approves requests, does COIT keep a reserve where they approve a portion of the amount, and then departments can come back to draw on the fully approved amount, and the funds get released?
	+ Response (from fellow committee member): Indicates that this is not currently the case and would likely not be an option.
* Comment: It could be helpful to look at who was funded in FY 22-23 for these asks. That could facilitate addressing the carry forward question. It might also help look at capacity. If a department was previously funded and fully spent its funds, then great. If they didn’t fully spend their funds and are looking for new projects to be funded, they may not have capacity to implement new projects.
* Comment: On the Project approval spreadsheet, it would be good to know if the recommendation is “approve with no funding”. Thinking of department capacity, we could also look at the departments’ other projects and consider whether they’ve been completed.

Approval of PUC Project

* Comment: I don’t understand the enterprise license PUC has separately procured with onboarding functionality….thought we had a citywide Service Now license?
	+ Response: They used DT’s enterprise agreement.

Discussion of Police and Sheriff NIBRS Projects

* Jillian Johnson notes that the Mayor’s office did fund the Police NIBRS project with about 5M, and very little had been expended based on a recent check.
* Comment: Perhaps the Sheriff should go forward with its NIBRS project, so that they can gain technical learning that could then benefit the Police NIBRS project?
	+ Response: Jillian Johnson notes that the Sheriff had a less complex NIBRS project in general.
* Comment: Aren’t both the Police and Sheriff both feeding data into JUSTIS; shouldn’t they have the same platforms, though not necessarily the same instance? I’m not sure if the data for the two departments can be in the same instance.
	+ Response: Jillian Johnson notes that we can recommend coordination and perhaps a shared system when approving.

Committee Approval of Recommendations

* Ray Ricardo: Supports the recommendations put forward.
* Tajel Shah: Echoes Ray Ricardo and expresses support for the recommendations. Would pull out Sheriff’s and CON’s document management project from the approval list.
* Katie Petrucione: For Rec & Park’s project request, they are not asking for funds; curious about their request to migrate legacy PFS HR system.
* Jillian Johnson summarizes some committee guidance, which will apply to both current and future approved projects:
	+ Human Resources related projects should coordinate with DHR.
	+ Banking related projects should coordinate with TTX.
	+ Document management projects should coordinate with the CIO/CAO.
* Ray Ricardo: Makes motion to approve the COIT Director’s recommendation of projects to fund.
	+ Tajel Shah: Seconds Ray Ricardo’s motion.
	+ Roll call vote: The motion was approved unanimously by Katie Petrucione, Cyd Harrell, Damon Daniels, Ray Ricardo, Todd Rydstrom, Tajel Shah, Mike Cotter, and Jillian Johnson.

There was no public comment.

1. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 11:41 AM.