

1 [Board Response - Civil Grand Jury Report - Deja Vu All Over Again: San Francisco's City  
2 Technology Needs a Culture Shock]

3 **Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings**  
4 **and recommendations contained in the 2011-2012 Civil Grand Jury report entitled "Deja**  
5 **Vu All Over Again: San Francisco's City Technology Needs a Culture Shock" and**  
6 **urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and**  
7 **recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of**  
8 **the annual budget.**

9  
10 WHEREAS, Under California Penal Code Section 933 et seq., the Board of  
11 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior  
12 Court on the findings and recommendations contained in Civil Grand Jury Reports; and

13 WHEREAS, In accordance with Penal Code Section 933.05(c), if a finding or  
14 recommendation of the Civil Grand Jury addresses budgetary or personnel matters of a  
15 county agency or a department headed by an elected officer, the agency or department head  
16 and the Board of Supervisors shall respond if requested by the Civil Grand Jury, but the  
17 response of the Board of Supervisors shall address only budgetary or personnel matters over  
18 which it has some decision making authority; and

19 WHEREAS, The 2011-2012 Civil Grand Jury Report entitled "Déjà Vu All Over Again:  
20 San Francisco's City Technology Needs a Culture Shock" is on file with the Clerk of the Board  
21 of Supervisors in File No. 120840, which is hereby declared to be a part of this resolution as if  
22 set forth fully herein; and

23 WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond  
24 to Finding Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23,

1 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 as well as Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12,  
2 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 contained in the subject Civil Grand Jury report; and

3 WHEREAS, Finding No. 1 states: “Delegating the attendance of COIT meetings by the  
4 Mayor to a representative sends a negative message to department heads and CIOs that  
5 internal citywide technology issues are not a high priority for the Mayor;” and

6 WHEREAS, Finding No. 2 states: “The Department of Technology continues to be  
7 perceived by many of its customers as providing unsatisfactory service in terms of quality,  
8 reliability, timeliness, and cost;” and

9 WHEREAS, Finding No. 3 states: “There are consequences to the Department of  
10 Technology for failing to deliver timely and high quality services, including the Mayor and  
11 Board of Supervisors continually cutting DT' s budget;” and

12 WHEREAS, Finding No. 4 states: “Another consequence to the Department of  
13 Technology for unsatisfactory service is the reluctance of departments to participate in  
14 citywide initiatives and to give up their operational independence;” and

15 WHEREAS, Finding No. 5 states: “COIT policies and citywide consolidation initiatives  
16 are not communicated to Department Heads and CIOs effectively by the Mayor and COIT;”  
17 and

18 WHEREAS, Finding No. 6 states: “COIT is not in compliance with the Administrative  
19 Code by failing to find and appoint two non-voting, non-City employee members;” and

20 WHEREAS, Finding No. 7 states: “The current citywide ICT organizational structure  
21 hinders the City CIO from fully using the established ‘authority and responsibility necessary to  
22 ... implement COIT standards, policies, and procedures for all City Departments;” and

23 WHEREAS, Finding No. 8 states: “The strategic role of the City CIO and the  
24 operational role of the Director of DT are two fundamentally different and equally full-time  
25 jobs;” and

1           WHEREAS, Finding No. 9 states: “Departmental CIOs have no formal forum to  
2 communicate with each other or coordinate common technology issues;” and

3           WHEREAS, Finding No. 10 states: “The lack of a functional reporting relationship  
4 between the City CIO and the departmental CIOs is a fundamental weakness in implementing  
5 common citywide programs;” and

6           WHEREAS, Finding No. 11 states: “Allowing common ICT functions to be addressed  
7 and performed on a department-by-department basis has led to duplication of effort and  
8 unnecessary spending;” and

9           WHEREAS, Finding No. 12 states: “The five-year ICT plan does not include: (1)  
10 ongoing operational activities, and (2) projects currently in progress with prior funding;” and

11           WHEREAS, Finding No. 13 states: “There are no consolidated citywide ICT budget and  
12 staffing plans;” and

13           WHEREAS, Finding No. 14 states: “Although COIT, DT, and a City CIO, address  
14 technology on a citywide basis, technology is not treated as a distinct citywide organizational  
15 entity;” and

16           WHEREAS, Finding No. 15 states: “There is no comprehensive annual reporting on the  
17 state of technology within City government presented to the Mayor or the Board of  
18 Supervisors;” and

19           WHEREAS, Finding No. 16 states: “There is a scarcity of consolidated citywide data in  
20 the technological arena, separate from departmental budgets;” and

21           WHEREAS, Finding No. 17 states: “COIT concentrates on the design and  
22 implementation of individual projects rather than citywide costs and savings stemming from  
23 these projects;” and

24           WHEREAS, Finding No. 18 states: “There is a need for a citywide ICT asset  
25 management system;” and

1           WHEREAS, Finding No. 19 states: “There is a need for a citywide database of ICT  
2 personnel;” and

3           WHEREAS, Finding No. 20 states: “There is no effort to gather and utilize  
4 comprehensive quantitative data to track how ICT currently functions;” and

5           WHEREAS, Finding No. 21 states: “The ICT 5-year plan is not a strategic plan and  
6 does not calculate how changes in ICT systems would impact City operations and costs;” and

7           WHEREAS, Finding No. 22 states: “City ICT managers are experiencing a growing  
8 difficulty in hiring technologists with "cutting edge" knowledge, skills, and experience;” and

9           WHEREAS, Finding No. 23 states: “Relying on Permanent Civil Service as a standard  
10 way of hiring technologists is too slow and cumbersome for the business needs of ICT units;”  
11 and

12           WHEREAS, Finding No. 24 states: “Relying on Permanent Civil Service as a standard  
13 way of hiring technologists prevents the city from attracting top talent from the private sector;”  
14 and

15           WHEREAS, Finding No. 25 states: “City technology culture is based in the belief that  
16 operating departments focus on their individual missions at the expense of citywide needs;”  
17 and

18           WHEREAS, Finding No. 26 states: “The cooperative attitude among departments and  
19 DT previously found by an earlier Civil Grand Jury has faded;” and

20           WHEREAS, Finding No. 27 states: “A department-first perspective, not the citywide  
21 perspective intended in the Administrative Code, results in a lack of coordination and  
22 communication between and among the different departments;” and

23           WHEREAS, Finding No. 28 states: “A department-first perspective, not the citywide  
24 perspective intended in the Administrative Code, results in duplication of common technology  
25 services and products;” and

1           WHEREAS, Finding No. 29 states: “Department Heads and CIOs do not view the  
2 authority granted COIT and the City CIO in the Administrative Code as governing their own  
3 plans and actions;” and

4           WHEREAS, Finding No. 30 states: “Neither COIT nor the City CIO behave as if they  
5 fully believe in their authority to enforce policy and consolidation initiatives;” and

6           WHEREAS, Finding No. 31 states: “There are no severe or immediate consequences  
7 resulting from City departments failing to abide by agreements to implement citywide  
8 initiatives or meet established timelines for completion;” and

9           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 2 states: "The Budget Analyst or the Controller  
10 perform a management audit evaluating the Department of Technology's functions to  
11 determine if the Department adequately communicates with other departments, and how to  
12 alleviate the Department's barriers to better performance;” and

13           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 4 states: "COIT appoint two non-voting, non-City  
14 employee members to sit on COIT without further delay;” and

15           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 5 states: "The City CIO develop consolidated  
16 citywide comprehensive ICT budget and staffing plans, reviewed and approved by COIT, and  
17 take the lead in its presentation to the Mayor's Budget Office and the Board of Supervisors;”  
18 and

19           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 6 states: "Subsequent to COIT approval of the  
20 ICT budget and staffing plans, COIT and the City CIO monitor adherence to these plans;” and

21           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 7 states: "The City CIO position be elevated in  
22 authority, responsibility, and accountability by creating functional "dotted-line" relationships  
23 between the City CIO and the departmental CIOs;” and

24           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 8 states: "Provide staff support to both the City  
25 CIO and COIT;” and

1           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 9 states: "Amend Administrative Code, Section  
2 22A.4 and 22A.7, to separate the position of City CIO from the Department of Technology;"  
3 and

4           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 10 states: "Amend Administrative Code,  
5 Sections 22A.4 and 22A.7, to create the separate position of Director of DT, appointed by and  
6 reporting to the City CIO;" and

7           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 11 states: "The City CIO work with the  
8 Controller to conduct a survey, including, but not limited to, performance data, client  
9 satisfaction, decision-making and evaluation criteria, inventory of services, and needs  
10 assessment, first for baseline figures and then annually to measure improvement over the  
11 baseline figures;" and

12           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 12 states: "The City CIO report annually on the  
13 state of technology in the City to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors;" and

14           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 13 states: "The City CIO and the Controller  
15 create a citywide asset management system for ICT equipment;" and

16           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 14 states: "The City CIO and DHR create a  
17 citywide skills database for personnel, to catalog such skills as programming languages, web  
18 development, database, networking, and operating systems;" and

19           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 15 states: "Revise the Charter so that all vacant  
20 and new technology positions be classified as Group II exempt positions;" and

21           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 16 states: "The City CIO be involved, with  
22 department heads, in hiring decisions for their highest level ICT personnel;" and

23           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 17 states: "The City CIO be included, with  
24 department heads, in the performance review process of senior ICT personnel in all  
25 departments;" and

1           WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 18 states: "Pending revision of the Charter, the  
2 Mayor develop methods for speeding up the hiring process for ICT personnel;" and

3           WHEREAS, in accordance with Penal Code Section 933.05(c), the Board of  
4 Supervisors must respond, within 90 days of receipt, to the Presiding Judge of the Superior  
5 Court on Finding Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22,  
6 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 as well as Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,  
7 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 contained in the subject Civil Grand Jury report; now, therefore,  
8 be it

9           RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports to the Presiding Judge of the  
10 Superior Court that it partially disagrees with Finding 1 for reasons as follows: While the  
11 participation of the Mayor's Budget Director has been helpful, departments have not received  
12 a clear sense of priority or direction without the direct participation of the Mayor, and while  
13 monthly participation by the Mayor is probably not feasible, a stronger sense of priority and  
14 direction is needed to move forward with the city's technology agenda; and, be it

15           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
16 disagrees with Finding 2 for reasons as follows: While the Department of Technology has  
17 been viewed as competent and professional for some functions and some departments, there  
18 are other departments have stated that the Department of Technology does not provide  
19 satisfactory services as often as desired; and, be it

20           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it disagrees with  
21 Finding 3 for reasons as follows: The recent cuts to the Department of Technology's budget  
22 have been the result of budget deficits, not because of the Department of Technology's lack of  
23 performance; and, be it

24           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
25 Finding 4; and, be it

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
2 disagrees with Finding 5 for reasons as follows: While COIT policies and citywide  
3 consolidated initiatives are communicated clearly, there is no follow-up, deadlines, or  
4 accountability to carrying out such policies and initiatives; and, be it

5 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
6 disagrees with Finding 6 for reasons as follows: COIT needs to prioritize selecting these two  
7 non-voting, non-City employee members; and, be it

8 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
9 disagrees with Finding 7 for reasons as follows: While the City's CIO has some powers, the  
10 decentralized organizational structure makes it difficult for the CIO to enforce COIT standards  
11 across the departments; and, be it

12 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
13 disagrees with Finding 8 for reasons as follows: While there are definite needs for an  
14 externally-focused City CIO and an internally-focused the Department of Technology Director,  
15 the Department of Technology Deputy could also assist in internal operations; and, be it

16 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
17 disagrees with Finding 9 for reasons as follows: While there is no formal forum to  
18 communicate, there are informal channels, and some CIOs meet in COIT committees and  
19 subcommittees, however, consolidation efforts would be assisted if there were more formal  
20 channels for the CIOs to interact with each other and with the city CIO, and for accountability  
21 measures to be instituted; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
23 disagrees with Finding 10 for reasons as follows: The City's inability to manage  
24 interdepartmental IT projects and to centralize functions could benefit from a functional  
25 reporting relationship between the City's CIO and departmental CIOs; and, be it



1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
2 Finding 11; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
4 Finding 12; and, be it

5 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
6 disagrees with Finding 13 for reasons as follows: While there are some efforts to plan for  
7 citywide ICT spending, there is no accountability and it's not clear who's responsible for such  
8 citywide spending decisions; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
10 Finding 14; and, be it

11 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
12 Finding 15; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
14 Finding 16; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
16 Finding 17; and, be it

17 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
18 Finding 18; and, be it

19 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
20 Finding 19; and, be it

21 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
22 disagrees with Finding 20 for reasons as follows: While there are some efforts to gather data  
23 to track how ICT currently functions, departments do not have good incentives to assist in  
24 such data-gathering efforts; and, be it

25

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
2 Finding 21; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
4 Finding 22; and, be it

5 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
6 disagrees with Finding 23 for reasons as follows: City government needs to contemplate  
7 faster and less cumbersome mechanisms beyond the current system, with feedback from  
8 labor partners; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
10 disagrees with Finding 24 for reasons as follows: City government needs to contemplate  
11 mechanisms beyond the current system to hire the best ICT staff, in consultation with labor  
12 partners; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
14 disagrees with Finding 25 for reasons as follows: While few would admit that their individual  
15 departmental needs ought to trump citywide concerns, lack of faith in the Department of  
16 Technology and bureaucratic turf has created a city technology culture that does not promote  
17 cross-departmental cooperation and the elimination of duplicative functions; and, be it

18 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
19 disagrees with Finding 26 for reasons as follows: Over the past few years, there has been  
20 some improvement in cooperation among departments, but there's still a good distance to  
21 achieve; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
23 Finding 27; and, be it

24 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
25 Finding 28; and, be it

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
2 Finding 29; and, be it

3 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially  
4 disagrees with Finding 30 for reasons as follows: While COIT would like to behave as if it has  
5 the authority to enforce policy and consolidation initiatives, since COIT itself is such a diffuse  
6 body, there is no one to hold departments or consolidation efforts accountable; and, be it

7 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with  
8 Finding 31; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 2  
10 will not be implemented for reasons as follows: The Board acknowledges that a management  
11 audit of the Department of Technology would be helpful, and this could be done either by the  
12 Budget Analyst or the Controller; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 4  
14 will be implemented within three months; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 5  
16 will be implemented within six months; and, be it

17 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 6  
18 will be implemented within six months; and, be it

19 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further  
20 analysis for Recommendation 7 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the  
21 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, COIT and the Department of  
22 Technology return to the Board with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

23 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 8  
24 has been implemented; and, be it

25

1 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further  
2 analysis for Recommendation 9 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the  
3 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the Department of Technology  
4 return to the Board with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

5 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further  
6 analysis for Recommendation 10 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the  
7 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the Department of Technology  
8 return to the Board with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

9 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further  
10 analysis for Recommendation 10 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the  
11 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the City CIO return to the Board  
12 with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

13 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation  
14 12 will be implemented within six months; and, be it

15 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation  
16 13 will be implemented within six months; and, be it

17 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further  
18 analysis for Recommendation 14 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the  
19 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the City CIO and DHR, with  
20 input from labor and department heads, return to the Board with an evaluation of potential  
21 options; and, be it

22 FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further  
23 analysis for Recommendation 15 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the  
24 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the Department of Technology  
25 return to the Board with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

1           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation  
2 16 has been implemented; and, be it

3           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further  
4 analysis for Recommendation 17 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the  
5 matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the City CIO return to the Board  
6 with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

7           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation  
8 18 will be implemented within six months; and, be it

9           FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Mayor to cause the  
10 implementation of accepted findings and the recommendation through his/her department  
11 heads and through the development of the annual budget.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25