

**City and County of San Francisco  
Civil Grand Jury 2011-2012  
“Déjà vu All Over Again”**

**To: Hon. Katherine Feinstein  
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court**

**From: Trent Rhorer, Executive Director  
San Francisco Human Services Agency  
Vakil Kuner, CIO  
San Francisco Human Services Agency**

**Subject: Response to Civil Grand Jury Findings and Recommendations by the San Francisco Human Services Agency**

**Date: October 1, 2012**

Here is the response from the San Francisco Human Services Agency (HSA) to the Civil Grand Jury report entitled “Déjà vu All Over Again” dated June 2012. You have requested responses from the department head and CIO to specific findings and recommendations contained in this report. The HSA response combines the requested responses from the HSA Department Head and the HSA CIO. For purposes of organization, we have divided this response by first addressing the report’s findings and then addressing the report’s recommendations.

**Findings**

You have asked whether the Human Services Agency agrees or disagrees with the following specific findings:

F2: Partially disagree. DT network engineers and the group that pulls the fiber cables through the street provide good service and initiatives such as enterprise agreements (e.g. Nuance, pending agreement with Adobe and VMWare) have been constructed in ways that are entirely positive for departments. DT has struggled in other areas such as planning and delivering a consolidated, Citywide e-mail system that meets all departments’ needs.

F4: Disagree. Over the past several years, departments have agreed to consolidate data centers, virtualize servers, consolidate purchasing and move towards a Citywide e-mail system. All of these efforts have been initiated by DT and endorsed by COIT.

F5: Partially disagree: Most COIT policies are posted on the COIT web site and major initiatives are communicated to department CIOs and other administrative staff members.

F9: Partially disagree. The COIT sub-committees partially address this need as do the 'brown bag' technology sessions hosted by DT. In addition, departmental CIOs are in regular communication on subjects of mutual interest.

F10: Disagree. The lack of a functional reporting relationship between the City CIO and department CIOs has not prevented the implementation of Citywide programs such as e-mail, data center consolidation, coordinated purchasing, server virtualization, the development of a Citywide fiber network and the development of Citywide enterprise licenses for applications software.

F11: Disagree. Although San Francisco has a decentralized model of IT organization, there is little evidence of unnecessary spending as a result of that model and recent efforts to coordinate purchasing and licensing within the decentralized model have produced savings.

F13: Partially disagree: The ICT plan and the COIT projects define major elements of Citywide ICT spending. In addition, the Mayor's Budget Office, the Board of Supervisors and DHR approve all IT staffing requests from all departments.

F14: Agree with the finding but disagree with the premise that technology should be treated by a distinct citywide organizational entity. Different departments have very different technological requirements and needs.

F15: Disagree. The ICT plan is a comprehensive annual report of technology.

F16: Agree with the finding but disagree with the premise that there should be consolidated citywide financial data apart from departmental budgets. Departmental budgets are the most accurate source of ICT spending plans. Furthermore, the Controller has produced a consolidated ICT budget for all City departments which is included in the Grand Jury report.

F17: Disagree. The COIT Budget and Planning Subcommittee reviews the planned costs and savings of IT projects from all City departments and the COIT Performance Subcommittee monitors those projects.

F18: Disagree. DT has collected an inventory of ICT equipment for all City departments and is using this inventory to develop ICT equipment standards.

F19: Disagree. Most of the classifications used for ICT personnel are unique to IT and are readily available from the Annual Salary Ordinance and reports from the City's personnel database.

F20: Disagree. There is a substantial effort by the Controller and COIT to gather and use comprehensive financial data about ICT spending. There are also ICT performance metrics in departmental efficiency plans.

F21: Agree.

F22: Agree.

F23: Agree.

F24: Agree.

F25: Disagree. There is no inherent contradiction between individual department missions and needs and Citywide needs. DT and COIT have attempted to identify common ground for all

departments so that individual needs of departments can be accommodated in Citywide IT strategies.

F26: Disagree. A cooperative attitude among departments and between departments and DT/COIT is growing, not fading.

F27: Disagree. Departments frequently work together to solve common problems. COIT and the COIT sub-committees help to facilitate this communication.

F28: Partially agree. However, DT's efforts to secure enterprise licenses and establish common purchasing practices are addressing this issue.

F29: Disagree. The Executive Director and the CIO of HSA are very cognizant of the authority of COIT and follow the processes of COIT and CIO reviews of projects procurements, and spending.

F30: Disagree. The City CIO and COIT have created and enforced citywide policies on purchasing, equipment standards, licensing, e-mail, data center consolidation and server virtualization.

F31: Disagree. There are immediate consequences to budgets and the use of staff resources when citywide initiatives or timelines are not met.

## **Recommendations**

You have asked that the Human Services Agency respond to specific recommendations as to whether those recommendations (1) have been implemented, (2) have not been implemented but are planned, (3) require further analysis, or (4) will not be implemented because they are unreasonable. In some instances, however, the recommendations cannot be implemented by the Human Services Agency. Therefore, the Human Services Agency response includes a fifth category of response to recommendations as follows: (5) cannot be implemented by the Human Services Agency.

R2: (5) This recommendation is directed at the Budget Analyst and Controller. The Human Services Agency cannot implement this recommendation.

R5: (1) Although the Human Services Agency cannot implement this recommendation, the Controller, the Mayor's Budget Office and the City CIO already take the lead in developing the annual ICT plan and budget.

R6: (1) Although the Human Services Agency cannot implement this recommendation, adherence to the annual ICT plan is monitored by the CIO review process and the COIT sub-committees.

R7: (4) Although the Human Services Agency cannot implement this recommendation, a 'dotted line' reporting relationship would conflict with the duty of a Department Head to fulfill the mission of the department by making departmental ICT resources subject to non-departmental priorities.

R8: (1) Departments, including the Human Services Agency, already support the City CIO and COIT by providing the City CIO and COIT with positions and with many staff hours attending COIT, COIT subcommittee, and ICT planning meetings. The Human Services Agency has members on two COIT sub-committees and is an active participating member of COIT.

R11: (5) This recommendation is directed to the City CIO and Controller and cannot be implemented by the Human Services Agency.

R12: (1) The City CIO already reports monthly to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on the state of technology via COIT meetings. The City CIO also reports annually to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on the state of technology as part of the annual budget review process.

R13: (1) The Human Services Agency has a complete list of IT assets which has been provided to DT as part a DT initiative to develop a citywide list of such assets.

R14: (5) This recommendation is directed to the City CIO and DHR. The Human Services Agency cannot implement this recommendation on a citywide basis.

R15: (5) The Human Services Agency cannot revise the Charter.

**C: Mario Choi, Foreperson Pro Tem  
2011-2012 Civil Grand Jury**