

## **Civil Grand Jury Report - Déjà Vu All Over Again: San Francisco's City Technology Needs a Culture Shock"**

### **DPH Response**

**F2.** The Department of Technology continues to be perceived by many of its customers as providing unsatisfactory service in terms of quality, reliability, timeliness, and cost.

DPH Response: Disagree. DPH can only respond to this finding based on its own relationship with DT, not those of other departments. Overall, DPH considers the services provided by DT to be adequate in quality, reliability, timeliness and cost. While there are issues that arise from time to time between DPH and DT, as is unavoidable, they are generally resolved. DPH is dependent on DT for many of the services it relies on, and for which DPH would have insufficient financial and personnel resources to provide on its own without having DT available as a resource.

**F4.** Another consequence to the Department of Technology for unsatisfactory service is the reluctance of departments to participate in citywide initiatives and to give up their operational independence.

DPH Response: Disagree. DPH can only respond to this finding based on its own relationship with DT, not those of other departments. DPH is proactively participating in citywide DT initiatives including data center consolidation, email, and others. DPH views these initiatives as an opportunity to access new resources and technology it would otherwise be unable to afford to purchase and operate independently.

**F5.** COIT policies and citywide consolidation initiatives are not communicated to Department Heads and CIOs effectively by the Mayor and COIT.

Response: Disagree. DPH holds a seat on COIT as a voting member, and is fully aware of the policies it helps to establish through that body. To the extent that other departments are unaware of COIT policies, DPH would support additional communication of COIT policies.

**F9.** Departmental CIOs have no formal forum to communicate with each other or coordinate common technology issues.

DPH Response: Disagree. COIT, along with its numerous subcommittees, task forces, and working groups, is designed specifically as a forum for the type of communication. There are surely areas where improved communication would be beneficial, and DPH

would be more than willing to actively participate in any opportunities for improved communication.

**F10.** The lack of a functional reporting relationship between the City CIO and the departmental CIOs is a fundamental weakness in implementing common citywide programs.

DPH Response: Partially agree. Execution of citywide IT initiatives clearly requires coordination between departmental CIOs and the City CIO. However, DPH believes it has made an effort to collaborate on citywide IT initiatives under the existing reporting structure and legislative requirements, and will continue to do so with or without an additional formalized organizational relationship with the CIO. However, depending on how a functional reporting relationship would be structured and implemented, it could potentially help continue to strengthen this collaboration.

**F11.** Allowing common ICT functions to be addressed and performed on a department-by-department basis has led to duplication of effort and unnecessary spending.

DPH Response: Agree. This finding has been identified and discussed repeatedly at COIT meetings for the past several years, and has led to a number of consolidation initiatives, including those listed in the Civil Grand Jury report.

**F13.** There are no consolidated citywide ICT budget and staffing plans.

DPH Response: Disagree. The City has a 5-Year ICT Plan. In addition, as part of the annual budget process, COIT and its committees compile and review extensive data on departmental IT spending. This process takes place in numerous public meetings. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors each year deliberate and approve a citywide budget and annual salary ordinance that includes IT spending for all departments. The Mayor and Board of Supervisors bi-annually consider the consolidated citywide 5-year ICT Plan.

**R2.** The Budget Analyst or the Controller perform a management audit evaluating the Department of Technology's functions to determine if the Department adequately communicates with other departments, and how to alleviate the Department's barriers to better performance.

DPH Response: Disagree. This recommendation is not applicable to DPH. DPH has selected “disagree” since DPH is required to respond to this recommendation and none of the allowable responses are appropriate. DPH is not in a position to recommend how to allocate the time and resources of the Budget Analyst or Controller’s Office. These offices surely have competing demands on their time and resources, which much be judged from a citywide perspective rather than that of DPH.

**R5.** The City CIO develop consolidated citywide comprehensive ICT budget and staffing plans, reviewed and approved by COIT, and take the lead in its presentation to the Mayor’s Budget Office and the Board of Supervisors.

DPH Response: Agree. This recommendation is already implemented, at least partially, through development of the 5 Year ICT plan, the annual budget process under COIT and its committees, and the City’s budget process.

**R6.** Subsequent to COIT approval of the ICT budget and staffing plans, COIT and the City CIO monitor adherence to these plans.

DPH Response: Agree. This recommendation is already implemented through COIT’s year-round monitoring of individual and consolidated citywide projects. DPH is committed to participating in an enhanced monitoring process if directed by COIT and the CIO.

**R7.** The City CIO position be elevated in authority, responsibility, and accountability by creating functional “dotted-line” relationships between the City CIO and the departmental CIOs.

DPH Response: Partially agree. Execution of citywide IT initiatives clearly requires coordination between departmental CIOs and the City CIO. However, DPH believes it has made an effort to collaborate on citywide IT initiatives under the existing conditions, and will continue to do so with or without an additional formalized organizational relationship with the CIO. However, depending on how a functional reporting relationship would be structured and implemented, it could potentially help continue to strengthen this collaboration.

**R8.** Provide staff support to both the City CIO and COIT.

DPH Response: Agree. More staff support would likely be positive, if funding is available. However, the Civil Grand Jury's report does not identify a funding source for these positions. Therefore, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, rather than DPH, must evaluate this recommendation against competing citywide funding priorities.

**F14.** Although COIT, DT, and a City CIO, address technology on a citywide basis, technology is not treated as a distinct citywide organizational entity.

DPH Response: Partially agree. Technology is treated as a citywide entity in some respects. Certain functions are coordinated through COIT and the CIO, such as citywide consolidation initiatives, CIO reviews of purchasing, and centralized review and approval of departmental budget proposals. Certain functions are centralized within the Department of Technology, rather than dispersed in individual department budgets, and funded through work orders. Other functions are department-specific in nature, such as clinical systems at DPH's hospitals and health clinics.

**F15.** There is no comprehensive annual reporting on the state of technology within City government presented to the Mayor or the Board of Supervisors.

DPH Response: Partially agree. DPH continuously works with the Mayor's Office, COIT, the CIO, and the Board of Supervisors Budget and Legislative Analyst's office to supply information on budgetary, staffing, and programmatic aspects of its technology operations and projects. DPH has participated in development and presentation of the City's ICT plan, as well as numerous other presentations to the Board of Supervisors on information technology. DT presents and discusses in detail its technology needs with the Mayor's Office during development of the annual budget and other times as needed. DPH also provides written documents and presentations to the Health Commission multiple times per year, which are available to the public. Since the Civil Grand Jury is surely aware of each of the activities listed above, DPH assumes that the Civil Grand Jury does not consider these activities to be "comprehensive annual reporting on the state of technology within City Government" and therefore partially agrees with this finding. DPH will participate in any additional reporting requested by the Mayor's Office or Board of Supervisors.

**F16.** There is a scarcity of consolidated citywide data in the technological arena, separate from departmental budgets.

DPH Response: Partially agree. DPH notes that its Departmental budgetary data is a very rich source of data on its technology operations. This data is consolidated citywide during the annual budget process. During the past several years, DPH has participated

in efforts to improve the collection and standardization of technology data, including responding to surveys, re-categorizing expenditures in the City's financial systems for improved tracking, and efforts to improve citywide technology data collection led through the COIT Planning and Budgeting Subcommittee. However, DPH is not aware of a consolidated source of data that includes all of the items listed as examples in the Civil Grand Jury report, and therefore partially agrees with the finding.

**F17.** COIT concentrates on the design and implementation of individual projects rather than citywide costs and savings stemming from these projects.

DPH Response: Partially agree. In many cases, COIT has focused extensively on the citywide costs and savings stemming from IT projects. For example, many of the citywide consolidation efforts currently underway were initiated by the Mayor's Office, Board of Supervisors and COIT because analysis showed reduced costs and/or improved outcomes per dollar spent could be realized. The Civil Grand Jury report both endorses these initiatives and acknowledges that citywide benefits are a driving motivation. Without COIT focusing on citywide costs and savings these initiatives would not be happening. However, in many cases COIT is continually striving to expand upon and improve its analysis of citywide costs and savings from technology projects. Since there is always more that can be done in this regard, DPH partially agrees with this finding.

**F18.** There is a need for a citywide ICT asset management system.

DPH Response: Agree. An asset management system could be helpful. However, the Civil Grand Jury does not propose a funding source for such a system. Therefore, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, rather than DPH, must evaluate this recommendation against competing citywide funding priorities. Provided that the cost to acquire, operate and maintain the system would not be excessive and that funding is identified DPH would welcome such a system.

**F19.** There is a need for a citywide database of ICT personnel.

DPH Response: Agree. A personnel database could be helpful provided that the cost to acquire, operate and maintain the system would not be excessive and that funding is identified. However, the Civil Grand Jury does not propose a funding source for such a system. Therefore, the Mayor and Board of Supervisors, rather than DPH, must evaluate this recommendation against competing citywide funding priorities.

**F20.** There is no effort to gather and utilize comprehensive quantitative data to track how ICT currently functions.

DPH Response: Partially agree. DPH continuously works with the Mayor's Office, COIT, the CIO, and the Board of Supervisors Budget and Legislative Analyst's office to supply information on budgetary, staffing, and programmatic aspects of its technology operations and projects. DPH has participated in development and presentation of the City's ICT plan, as well as numerous other presentations to the Board of Supervisors on information technology. DT presents and discusses in detail its technology needs with the Mayor's Office during development of the annual budget and other times as needed. DPH also provides written documents and presentations to the Health Commission multiple times per year, which are available to the public. Since the Civil Grand Jury is surely aware of each of the activities listed above, DPH assumes that the Civil Grand Jury does not consider these activities to be "comprehensive annual reporting on the state of technology within City Government" and therefore partially agrees with this finding.

**F21.** The ICT 5-year plan is not a strategic plan and does not calculate how changes in ICT systems would impact City operations and costs.

DPH Response: Disagree. While it is possible that additional strategic elements could be added, the ICT 5-year plan is a strategic plan in that it is the document that codifies the citywide IT strategies. DPH views the strategies outlined in the IT plan as a guide for its role citywide IT initiatives. The ICT plan also includes extensive financial data, including multi-year cost estimates and savings from reductions and reallocations of funding associated with IT initiatives.

**R11.** The City CIO work with the Controller to conduct a survey, including, but not limited to, performance data, client satisfaction, decision-making and evaluation criteria, inventory of services, and needs assessment, first for baseline figures and then annually to measure improvement over the baseline figures.

DPH Response: Agree. Assuming the CIO and Controller wish to move forward with such a survey, DPH will participate as directed by the CIO and COIT.

**R12.** The City CIO report annually on the state of technology in the City to the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors.

DPH Response: Agree. Since extensive information and reporting already exist, DPH is unclear about what type of additional reporting the Civil Grand Jury recommends. However, DPH will participate in any effort to satisfy a request for information from the Mayor and Board of Supervisors.

**R13.** The City CIO and the Controller create a citywide asset management system for ICT equipment.

DPH Response: Partially agree. If funding is identified, DPH would participate in a citywide effort to establish such a system.

**R14.** The City CIO and DHR create a citywide skills database for personnel, to catalog such skills as programming languages, web development, database, networking, and operating systems.

DPH Response: Partially agree. If funding is identified, DPH would participate in a citywide effort to establish such a system.

**F22.** City ICT managers are experiencing a growing difficulty in hiring technologists with “cutting edge” knowledge, skills, and experience.

DPH Response: Agree. DPH has experienced recruitment challenges filling some IT positions, primarily due to the Bay Area job market for IT professionals and the IT skill set needed in a healthcare environment.

**F23.** Relying on Permanent Civil Service as a standard way of hiring technologists is too slow and cumbersome for the business needs of ICT units.

Partially Agree. A civil service system is not necessarily incompatible with efficient hiring. However, DPH supports efforts to expedite the City's hiring processes. DPH has experienced delays in obtaining City approval of special conditions to establish the minimum qualifications necessary for an IT professional in a healthcare setting on certain positions, as well as adoption of some Civil Service eligible lists. DPH has also had permanent civil service employees from other City departments "bump" into IT positions without experience in the systems used by DPH, which has been disruptive to DPH's IT operations.

**F24.** Relying on Permanent Civil Service as a standard way of hiring technologists prevents the city from attracting top talent from the private sector.

DPH has not experienced difficulty attracting top talent because the available positions are permanent civil positions. In the last economic downturn, DPH had many qualified applicants seeking more secure, long-term employment. DPH would support greater flexibility in the City's job specifications and appointment structure to attract and maintain IT talent with the knowledge, skills and ability needed for healthcare reform and future technology advances.

**R15.** Revise the Charter so that all vacant and new technology positions be classified as Group II exempt positions.

DPH Response: Disagree. DPH cannot address this recommendation. DPH has selected "disagree" since DPH is required to respond to this recommendation and none of the allowable responses are appropriate. Authority over amendments to the City Charter rests with the Mayor, Board of Supervisors, and voters. DPH will participate as appropriate in discussions of this issue if directed.

**F25.** City technology culture is based in the belief that operating departments focus on their individual missions at the expense of citywide needs.

DPH Response: Disagree. DPH makes every effort to both accommodate its mission-specific IT needs and participate in citywide efforts. In most cases these are not in conflict. As the Civil Grand Jury acknowledges, a large part of DPH's information technology operation is focused on health related systems that have little impact on other departments. However, DPH is attempting to align its departmental IT strategy with citywide initiatives. For example, the planned data center consolidation will provide DPH with an opportunity to access new equipment and technology that it would be unable to afford to purchase independently. Similarly, DPH relies heavily on DT for operational needs that it cannot deliver with its existing staff and funding.

**F26.** The cooperative attitude among departments and DT previously found by an earlier Civil Grand Jury has faded.

DPH Response: Disagree. DPH makes every effort to maintain a cooperative attitude in its relationship with DT.

**F27.** A department-first perspective, not the citywide perspective intended in the



Administrative Code, results in a lack of coordination and communication between and among the different departments.

DPH Response: Partially agree. DPH agrees, as stated in the Civil Grand Jury report, that any large organization (such as the City and County of San Francisco) with diverse services and business lines must have an approach to IT management that includes decentralized decision-making for department-specific functions and centralized decision making for common functions. DPH has attempted to balance these needs, developing a departmental IT function for health care IT systems while also participating in citywide initiatives.

**F28.** A department-first perspective, not the citywide perspective intended in the Administrative Code, results in duplication of common technology services and products.

DPH Response: Partially agree. As identified in COIT policies and by the Civil Grand Jury, certain IT functions are more efficiently managed centrally to minimize cost or maximize output. COIT efforts such as data center consolidation, purchasing changes, and email are designed to eliminate duplication.

**F29.** Department Heads and CIOs do not view the authority granted COIT and the City CIO in the Administrative Code as governing their own plans and actions.

DPH Response: Disagree. DPH makes every effort to act in accordance with all City Code provisions.

**F30.** Neither COIT nor the City CIO behave as if they fully believe in their authority to enforce policy and consolidation initiatives.

DPH Response: Disagree. DPH makes every effort to participate in consolidation initiatives as instructed by COIT and the CIO.

**F31.** There are no severe or immediate consequences resulting from City departments failing to abide by agreements to implement citywide initiatives or meet established timelines for completion.

DPH Response: Partially Agree. DPH is not aware of specific “severe or immediate consequences.” However, DPH makes every effort to abide by agreements to implement citywide initiatives.