



Minutes

Thursday, September 22, 2011

Enterprise/Collaborative Applications Governance Workgroup

Room 730, Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV)

2300 West Broad Street, Richmond, VA 23220

Attendance

Members present

Linda D. Foster
Cathy Nott
Belchior Mira

Members absent

Richard D. Holcomb
Ernest F. Steidle

Others present

Janice Akers, VITA
Cathie Brown, North Highland
Dave Burhop, DMV
Jerry Simonoff, VITA

Call to Order

Jerry Simonoff called the meeting to order at approximately 3:34 p.m. Mr. Simonoff asked Ms. Akers to call the roll. Ms. Akers confirmed the presence of a quorum. Mr. Simonoff asked for approval of the draft meeting minutes from June 23, 2011 and each member approved.

Technology Business Plan – Review of Draft Outline and Proposed Initiatives

Mr. Simonoff kicked off the discussion by reviewing the *Code of Virginia* mandate that the IT Advisory Council develop a Technology Business Plan, in collaboration with the Council on Virginia's Future (COVF), by December 31, 2011. The COVF has been working with the cabinet secretaries and the Department of Planning and Budget over the last several months to develop the Commonwealth's Enterprise Strategic Priorities (ESP) and associated strategies. That ESP document, published on September 9, is intended to bridge the gap between the COVF's long-term goals and agencies' strategic plans. Those ESPs, in turn, provide a logical starting point for building a Commonwealth Technology Business Plan that will focus how technology can best support the state's most important business initiatives.

Using that starting point, staff of VITA and the COVF reviewed the ESPs in detail, as well as recommendations of the Governor's Reform Commission, to determine those broad technology oriented initiatives that could best leverage technology to support the broadest range of the Commonwealth's business priorities. Staff has recommended that available resources are best utilized by focusing in on a select few initiatives, and is recommending five such initiatives for the IT Advisory Council's consideration.

Mr. Simonoff then reviewed the previously distributed brief description of the five recommended Technology Business Plan initiatives, explaining how each was derived from the aforementioned reference documents. These initiatives, in turn, would then be the starting point for the statewide strategic IT plan, outlining identified technology actions planned over the next two biennia.

Mr. Simonoff then walked the workgroup through the previously distributed draft outline for the Technology Business Plan, noting the purpose of and background on each section. He placed particular emphasis on the recommendations for implementation of the proposed Technology Business Plan initiatives via the Commonwealth Strategic IT Plan, the next version of which is due for development in calendar 2012.

Ms. Foster asked how stakeholders would be brought in and utilized. Mr. Simonoff stated staff's recommendation that a workgroup be formed around each proposed initiative. Each workgroup would have a cross-section of agencies represented, with perhaps 10-12 people in each group, as well as a representative from ITAC to facilitate communication with and feedback from the Council. How workgroup members would be chosen remains to be determined, perhaps by self-nomination or ITAC nomination. Secretary Duffey has indicated he wants this to be a collaborative effort with the agencies. Ms. Nott asked for clarification that the workgroups would draft an IT Strategic Plan for each initiative and would then be involved in its implementation. Mr. Simonoff stated such an approach would be encouraged, including building milestones into each plan.

Mr. Mira asked where the funding would come from to assist in the implementation of these projects. Mr. Simonoff stated that several ideas have been discussed, including the Productivity Investment Fund (PIF), or Treasury loans, possibly on a revolving fund basis.

Ms. Nott noted that we need to track the progress of tasks and how to capture what agencies are already doing. Ms. Foster agreed and suggested an information gathering meeting. Mr. Mira suggested using the information in CETR that VITA uses to inventory agencies' technology applications.

Ms. Foster asked about the scope of the initiatives as they would be further outlined in the statewide strategic IT plan and how far would they go-- all the way to implementation? Mr. Simonoff believes the preference will be to take them as far as the workgroups can, in collaboration with participating agencies.

Mr. Simonoff then asked the members to look over the proposed initiatives document and to cite any other topics that they think we should focus on. Ms. Foster commented that she liked all the proposed initiatives and suggested adding e-commerce as a priority of focus to get away from paper. Ms. Nott agreed and suggested it could be added to Initiative #4 (Emphasize programs and tools that enable citizens to interact with government 24x7—when, how, and where they want it) with some wording changes. Mr. Simonoff agreed and he will revise and bring back to the group as well as add bullet points to Initiative #1(Improve information-sharing to optimize current business functions and supporting systems) that will relate back to strategy to tie it together. Ms. Nott then drew attention to Initiative #3 (Leverage technology to improve worker productivity and make state employment more attractive to the future workforce) and asked that wording be added to expand to include exports and attracting businesses to the Commonwealth.

Mr. Simonoff stated it was his intent to have a first draft of the Technology Business Plan ready for the workgroup's review before the next workgroup meeting on October 20. He will also plan to meet with Mr. Holcomb and Dr. Steidle to review this discussion and get their input prior to the next meeting.

Agency Agreements Composite Discussion

Mr. Simonoff introduced Cathie Brown from North Highland Consulting. From the four inter-agency memorandum of agreement (MOA) examples discussed at the June 23 Workgroup meeting, Ms. Brown assembled the previously-distributed composite MOA for enterprise/collaborative services. Ms. Foster asked the extent to which agencies would be required to use this composite, expressing her concerns about trying to make this a one-size-fits-all document. Ms. Nott also noted that we don't want to mandate the MOA document or force agencies to change MOAs already in place. Mr. Simonoff acknowledged both concerns and suggested the composite could be proposed to the full ITAC as guidance we share with agencies to use as they can so they don't have to "reinvent the wheel". Ms. Foster suggested that old or prior MOA's be grandfathered in if this does become a common practice.

Mr. Mira also agreed that it should not be mandated, but rather used as a guide to build from for each agency.

Mr. Simonoff suggested two possible further steps. One would be review and comment by the Office of the Attorney General, to ensure any potential legal issues are addressed. A second would be to take the draft composite and give it a "real world" test, as a means of further refining before any wider distribution as guidance.

Mr. Burhop noted that he was currently working with a multi-agency data-sharing workgroup that would need some form of interagency agreement and volunteered to use that opportunity as such a test. He believes this will be a great tool to start with and feels he can get back to the workgroup with comments and suggestions in January. The workgroup members agreed to accept Mr. Burhop's offer as the next step in refining the draft composite MOA.

Ms. Nott pointed out that she didn't see a section addressing compliance with security or a payment component. She suggested they be added, and Ms. Brown agreed to do so. The workgroup agreed that progress to-date and next steps on the composite MOA will be reported to ITAC at its November 7 meeting.

Public Comment

Mr. Simonoff asked for public comment. There was no public comment.

Next Meeting Date

October 20, 2011 at 3:30 p.m. at DMV

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5 p.m.