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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, The Civil Grand Jury has requested that the Board of Supervisors respond 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,
24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 as well as Recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 contained in the subject Civil Grand Jury report; and

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

WHEREAS, Finding No. 2 states: "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;" and

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

WHEREAS, Finding No. 4 states: "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;" and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, Finding No. 8 states: "The strategic role of the City CIO and the operational role of the Director of DT are two fundamentally different and equally full-time jobs;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 9 states: "Departmental CIOs have no formal forum to communicate with each other or coordinate common technology issues;" and

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

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

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

WHEREAS, Finding No. 13 states: "There are no consolidated citywide ICT budget and staffing plans;" and

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, Finding No. 18 states: "There is a need for a citywide ICT asset management system;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 19 states: "There is a need for a citywide database of ICT personnel;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 20 states: "There is no effort to gather and utilize comprehensive quantitative data to track how ICT currently functions;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 21 states: "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;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 22 states: "City ICT managers are experiencing a growing difficulty in hiring technologists with "cutting edge" knowledge, skills, and experience;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 23 states: "Relying on Permanent Civil Service as a standard way of hiring technologists is too slow and cumbersome for the business needs of ICT units;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 24 states: "Relying on Permanent Civil Service as a standard way of hiring technologists prevents the city from attracting top talent from the private sector;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 25 states: "City technology culture is based in the belief that operating departments focus on their individual missions at the expense of citywide needs;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 26 states: "The cooperative attitude among departments and DT previously found by an earlier Civil Grand Jury has faded;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 27 states: "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;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 28 states: "A department-first perspective, not the citywide perspective intended in the Administrative Code, results in duplication of common technology services and products;" and
WHEREAS, Finding No. 29 states: "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;" and

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

WHEREAS, Finding No. 31 states: "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;" and

WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 2 states: "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;" and

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

WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 5 states: "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;"
and

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

WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 7 states: "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;" and

WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 8 states: "Provide staff support to both the City
CIO and COIT;" and
WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 9 states: "Amend Administrative Code, Section 22A.4 and 22A.7, to separate the position of City CIO from the Department of Technology;" and

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

WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 11 states: "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;" and

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

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

WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 14 states: "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;" and

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

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

WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 17 states: "The City CIO be included, with department heads, in the performance review process of senior ICT personnel in all departments;" and
WHEREAS, the Recommendation No. 18 states: "Pending revision of the Charter, the Mayor develop methods for speeding up the hiring process for ICT personnel;" and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it partially disagrees with Finding 10 for reasons as follows: The City's inability to manage interdepartmental IT projects and to centralize functions could benefit from a functional reporting relationship between the City's CIO and departmental CIOs; and, be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with Finding 11; and, be it

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with Finding 28; and, be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it agrees with Finding 29; and, be it

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 8 has been implemented; and, be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further analysis for Recommendation 9 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the Department of Technology return to the Board with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it

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

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

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

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

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

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that it requires further analysis for Recommendation 15 for reasons as follows: The Board intends to investigate the matter, and the Board requests that, before February 2, 2013, the Department of Technology return to the Board with an evaluation of potential options; and, be it
FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors reports that Recommendation 16 has been implemented; and, be it

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

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

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors urges the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and the recommendation through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.
Resolution responding to the Presiding Judge of the Superior Court on the findings and recommendations contained in the 2011-2012 Civil Grand Jury report entitled "Deja Vu All Over Again: San Francisco's City Technology Needs a Culture Shock" and urging the Mayor to cause the implementation of accepted findings and recommendations through his/her department heads and through the development of the annual budget.

October 29, 2012 Government Audit and Oversight Committee - AMENDED, AN AMENDMENT OF THE WHOLE BEARING SAME TITLE

October 29, 2012 Government Audit and Oversight Committee - RECOMMENDED AS AMENDED

November 06, 2012 Board of Supervisors - ADOPTED

Ayes: 11 - Avalos, Campos, Chiu, Chu, Cohen, Elsbernd, Farrell, Kim, Mar, Olague and Wiener

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was ADOPTED on 11/6/2012 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

Date Approved

Date: November 16, 2012

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution, not being signed by the Mayor within the time limit as set forth in Section 3.103 of the Charter, became effective without his approval in accordance with the provision of said Section 3.103 of the Charter.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board