Attendees: Gregg Plummer, Matthew Modarelli, Chris Lamb, Rose Bossio, Scott West, Michelle Tuscher, Donna Morgan (logistics/support)

Large Agency Representative

All members agree that David should continue his Council member status. The Council agreed to discuss the process of replacing a member mid-term in a future meeting. Chris will draft an email to update the CIO community and will send to the Council members for feedback and will connect with David to discuss appropriate timing for the email.

CIO Forum Sign-In Sheet

Members discussed whether name tags, tent cards or a sign-in sheet at the CIO Forum would be helpful. Having tent cards or name tags would help the note taker identify persons commenting and help attendees become more familiar with one another. Chris stated that the note taker should feel free to request a name if needed during the meeting to properly document comments. Donna agreed to find the maximum number of attendees permitted in the u-shape room setup (32), as room setup leaves some members seated in the back of the room. Donna and/or Laurel will explore options for accommodating all attendees at the tables.

WaTech/OCIO Org Changes

During the March CIO Forum, an attendee asked about the planned organizational changes, to which Jim replied that he wouldn't be ready to share until April. Scott updated the members of the following org changes:

- Ron Buchanan and the CISO staff will now report to Jim Weaver
- Dan Mercer and Scott Lindekugel will now report to Sue Langen (OCIO) to focus on state architecture.
- WaTech's PMO will now report to Sue Langen (OCIO)
- SDC and Disaster Recovery will now report to Brad Currah (Colocation Manager), who reports to Scott West
- Risk and Emergency Services and Facilities will report to Wendi Gunther (Administrative Services)
- Web and User Experience (Wendy Wickstrom's team) will now report to Scott Barringer (CSD)

Matt suggested that WaTech consider bringing their proposed organizational changes to the WAC before implementation in order to solicit WAC feedback and gain support. This was just a suggestion with the ultimate intent of enhancing partner agency support for WaTech success.

Discuss Tenant Survey Results – Next steps and Future CIO Forum Topics

Chris stated that he has concerns about keeping the CIO Forums balanced in their approach to information sharing by WaTech and the desire to transform the CIO Forum into more of a CIO discussion and problem solving community. Chris stated that he had concerns going into the March CIO Forum that it was a bit WaTech presentation heavy and had a feel of the "old" style of CIO Forum. He has received some feedback that others have felt the same way. Chris believes the Council must be vigilant in its approach to setting the agenda and how much time should be dedicated to WaTech presentations and the content therein. We must be sensitive to keeping this forum in a collaborative mindset and not drift back into the top-down feel of prior CIO Forum formats.

There were requests during the March CIO Forum to include the Tenant Survey Results at a future CIO Forum.

In addition, there were requests to add Identity and Access Management and Multi Factor Authentication to a future Forum agenda. Scott stated that he would like to have a discussion around the SDC when time permits.

There was discussion around SAW and the RFI. Scott stated the RFI was sent to all SAW customers (32 agencies). Scott feels expanding that could be too broad. Rose stated she is interested in the objectives, and whether there may be a better option. All agreed that SAW/Enterprise Security is another potential CIO Forum topic.

Matt suggested that all CIO Forum topics need to kept top level (policy and business risk level), and relevant to all (not just WaTech customers). More specific, customer-related topics belong at the Quarterly Customer Meeting. Potential topics could be raised at the Forum to check interest. Scheduled meetings about customer-related topics should be shared at the CIO Forum so that CIOs can be sure the appropriate IT leaders are present at those meetings.

Another request from the CIO Forum was to have a demo of Smarsh. Rose agreed to reach out to Debbie Kendall to inquire whether she or a member of her team can accommodate this request. All agreed this would be good use of the Forum. Michelle stated the web group (Governor's Social Media Workgroup) might know of agencies who use Smarsh and could be an alternative if DOC is unable to provide a demo. Update - Michelle talked with Jessie.Payne@gov.wa.gov to see if we could get a list of agencies using Smarsh. Jessie will put out a request to the group. Scott stated there needs to be more discussion around the MDM policy.

Any agency who feels strongly about a topic should share and lead a discussion around the subject. Mark (MIL) could share his Cloud Experience.

Should Tenancy be discussed again? Scott doesn't know that further discussions are helpful. Chris stated there needs to be a recommendation, likely a shared tenant with a waiver process outlined. The actual decision would go to the Core Team. Scott raised some concern over whether the Core Team is technical enough to understand and make the decision. Matt felt caution and moving slowly in any case was important. Scott is unaware of any business requirement to prevent anyone from going into the shared tenant, but said there are many unknowns. He shared the story of DLP being turned on which resulted in redacted emails at ATG. There is also computer code that Microsoft would need to manage for agencies in a private tenant.

Matt suggested that tenant discussions should be based on policies, not technology. He raised concerns about the speed of development of cloud technology and the as-a-service software trends that will likely outpace any efforts to try and build large centralized services, as was experienced with the building of the SDC and the subsequent financial challenges... Matt also mentioned that some Agency Directors may not be willing to transfer significant amounts of IT risk to WaTech. If the Governor's office made an executive decision to put all the risk on a single agency (WaTech), it could be done, but that is not likely and may not be the best solution anyways. Perhaps there should be a business and risk discussion of why it might be better, safer, cheaper, and faster to centralize services and/or manage the risk in one place. Scott shared concern over the continuing discussions causing more delays. Matt stated technology decisions in the public sector are always at risk due to biennium funding cycle and technology changing so fast. In any case, it appears we will need a shared or enterprise tenant for a number of small/medium sized agencies. Scott said decisions have to be made first. He also noted that the current waiver process is flawed because there are no consequences if an agency doesn't follow the waiver process. Scott feels the EAD discussion needs to be elevated and feels agencies can have their own authority within a central administration for security, but centralizing won't happen without Governor mandate or policy. Matt once more pointed out the importance of understanding the existence and industry

trends toward "federated" tenant models similar to what is used in large states like California. Matt cautioned against using the "private" tenant terminology as it implies that agency managed tenants can't be federated and fully interoperable, with configurations managed under one central policy office (OCIO).

Michelle suggested comparing the costs of the different options. Scott said the team would need to go to GOV/OFM for help financially. Scott said that Sue Langen had stated that we need to keep discussions to business and technical needs, not finance. Michelle stated this hasn't been working. How many people would need to join the shared tenant in order to be cost-recoverable? There is concern over financial concerns crippling the waiver process.

Scott shared that there is currently 10,000 people in the tenant now and approximately 52-56k in the EAD. If all were to go into the shared tenant, Scott estimates (based on other states) that the cost would be about $6.50pp vs. $12.50pp if only half of the users were in a shared tenant.

Scott shared his idea of having a co-op or global admin team. The global admin would be under a single manager, where logs are monitored and actions are visible. Agencies have shared concern over the trustworthiness of a co-op or centralized admin, but he wonders why an agency would find a state employee less trustworthy because they were working at WaTech. Matt supported the idea of exploring this co-op concept further and said that WSDOT would participate.

Michelle mentioned that all logs would be watched and a rogue actor wouldn't get away with it, and collateral damage is a risk we all face now. Michelle suggest that she and Scott work together to develop a presentation on the three options, including the costs associated with each option. Michelle will lead the conversation. Michelle shared that Matt Stevens' comment regarding security was that the SGN was built for all agencies to be able to work together. Scott mentioned that Microsoft spends way more than the state on security so why wouldn't we put our trust in them?

The Council agreed to meet by phone for one hour on 4/11 to finalize the CIO Forum agenda.

Scott shared that the planned SDC maintenance has been postponed to the first half of September due to many agencies, including WaTech, finding that they still have single-corded devices. He will be communicating this and the status of Exchange soon.