# A G E N D A

AD HOC TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, DECEMBER 11, 2017, AT 9:00 AM
BUNKER ROOM – CREEKSIDE COMPLEX


1.  MEETING CALLED TO ORDER:  Fredrick J. Kern, Chairman


2.  ROLL CALL:  Kern, England, Lanier, Slee, Weihrich, and Kelso, ex-officio member


3.  APPROVAL OF REPORT:  Regular Meeting of November 20, 2017 (Attachment)


4.  RESIDENTS' FORUM


5.  CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

    a. Announcement of New Members
    b. Scheduled Meeting Times for 2018

6.  UNFINISHED BUSINESS

    a. Review Updated Project Definition/Description Documents (Attachments)
    b. Progress Update of Web Portal


7.  NEW BUSINESS

    a. Draft Committee Project Selection Document (Attachment)


8.  ADJOURNMENT


9.  NEXT MEETING:  The next regular meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 8, 2018, at 9:00 a.m. in Multipurpose Room #3 at Gateway Complex.



FJK/dr

cc: GRF Board

AD HOC TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE REPORT

REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2017, AT 9:00 A.M.

A regular meeting of the Ad Hoc Technology Committee was convened by the Chairman, Fredrick J. Kern, at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, November 20, 2017, in the Board Room at Gateway Complex.

Present, in addition to the Chairman, were Mary A. England, Vice Chairman, Sheldon Solloway, Secretary, Wayne B. Lanier, Christopher J. Slee, Heinz Weihrich, and Robert D. Kelso, ex-officio member and GRF Board representative. Also attending were Timothy O'Keefe, CEO; and one resident. — **Attendance**

Prior minutes were accepted with changes as identified by Ms. England which deleted a "Comprehensive Project Plan" replaced with "Draft Project Process" 42-page document. — **Report Approved**

A draft document was circulated by Ms. England and also Mr. Kern to discuss Category and Technology projects lists. The drafts were presented and reviewed, with numerous changes and updates being made. Committee members are to continue to review the identified areas to make additions/changes/ deletion suggestions. The suggestions will be returned to Mr. Kern, who will incorporate them into a new draft document to identify Project Categories and Project ideas. — **Discussion Re. Category and Technology Projects List**

A summary Project Description form (TPD) was presented by Mr. Kern and discussed by all. Committee members are to review and submit change suggestions to the Chair. Chris Slee is to add detail clarifications as identified. Mr. Kern is to email the TPD templates to the committee members. An updated draft is to be reviewed at the December 11 meeting. — **Summary Project Description Form (TDP)**

Mr. Slee demonstrated the pilot version of the web product. He will send log-in information to all members to they can test and evaluate the product. — **Pilot Website Demo**

Mr. Kelso and Mr. Slee will meet to review and propose web-site use policies and inform Committee for discussion. — **Website Use Policies**

During the Residents' Forum, Steve Bajada, cautioned that prior to rolling out the web site and the customer comments section, a policy should be developed on accepting/rejecting or removing resident's comments. — **Residents' Forum**

There was discussion on electric vehicles. Tim O'Keefe commented that he had been in contact with several companies wanting to pilot a self-driving program. An open question, not yet decided, was what the level of involvement should be from the Tech Committee in supporting Tim's efforts. — **Discussion re. Electric Vehicles**

Ms. England will develop and distribute a draft Committee Project Selection and Prioritization Criteria document. — **Committee Project Selection and Prioritization Criteria Doc.**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

The next regular meeting of the Ad Hoc Technology Committee will be held on Monday, December 11, 2017, at 9:00 a.m. in the Bunker Room at Creekside Complex.

Adjourn-
Ment/
Next Mtg
12/11/17

_____
Fredrick J. Kern, Chairman
Ad Hoc Technology Planning Committee

FJK/dr

# GRF Technology Project Description

| Project Title: | Guidance Template |
|---|---|
| Project Sponsor: | Category: |
| Time Frame: | Importance: |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Business Objective** | • *Focus your description on simple descriptive language*<br>• *Avoid technical descriptions. Remember your audience is the GRF and the Rossmoor public*<br>• *What is the project about, what is its purpose, what benefits will it produce?*<br>• *How will it affect existing processes?*<br>• *What problems will it solve?* |
| **Target Client** | • *Who are the primary and secondary beneficiaries of this project?*<br>• *How will they benefit?*<br>• *Will it cause significant modifications to existing routines or user practices?*<br>• *Is there a direct impact on Rossmoor Residents?* |
| **Key Technology and Features** | • *What Technologies will be utilized, enhanced or replaced*<br>• *What is the Key technology around which the project success depends?*<br>• *Does this project have a technology vendor identified or under consideration?*<br>• *What are the specific features required to meet the customer needs?*<br>• *Benchmarks? Actual examples or possible comparisons?*<br>• *Finally, don't get buried in technical details or jargon. Remember our audience.* |
| **Crucial Factors** | • *Interaction with existing systems or procedures*<br>• *Reliability and quality*<br>• *Will it require a (major?) conversion of existing databases or other record keeping systems?*<br>• *Maintainability (likelihood that support will be available in future)*<br>• *Potential for design growth or modification*<br>• *Ergonomics, if applicable* |
| **Relevant Numbers** | • *What is the overall size of this project and can it have a phased implementation?*<br>• *Cost – both upfront and ongoing*<br>• *Cost savings, if any*<br>• *Implementation budget*<br>• *Time to implement*<br>• *Will contract negotiations with vendors be required?* |

3 December 2017

| GRF AD HOC TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE | | Sponsor | Priority |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Category** | **Technology** | **Sponsor** | **Priority** |
| | | | |
| Physical Infrastructure | LED Street Lighting | | |
| | LED office lighting | | |
| | Sewage recovery systems | | |
| | Irrigation Watering technology | | |
| | Drone Technology | | |
| | Water Conservation/Reclamation | | |
| | Solar Systems for common areas | | |
| | Vehicle tracking and maintenance software | | |
| | Emergency Back up infrastructure | | |
| | | | |
| Customer Interactions | Online Event Management | | |
| | EFT system | | |
| | Electronic signature -- Docu-Sign | | |
| | Member access to services (online/email/other  such as Utube, meeting recordings, etc) | | |
| | Online room reservations | | |
| | Single Sign on for all Rossmoor services | | |
| | | | |
| It Projects | Data Base Integration/ synchronization | | |
| | Online Work Order system | | |
| | Improved Data Capacity via Fiber Optic Ring | | |
| | Improved UPS and AC systems | | |
| | More robust Back Up systems (Cloud Store) | | |
| | Document scanning & online retrieval  (Project currently in process) | | |
| | Expand/upgrade access control systems | | |
| | | | |
| Transport Services | Electric Bus and Mntc vehicles | | |
| | "On Call Services"  (Consider UBER/ Lyft, etc) | | |
| | Self Driving vehicles (Develop success criteria) | | |
| | Electric Vehicle charging stations in common areas | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Communications | Eliminate Dead spots in valley -- Cell Service | | |
| | Eliminate Dead spots in valley -- WiFi | | |
| | Upgade Rossmoor News to "Smart Technology" | | |
| | Web site improvements | | |

# GRF Ad Hoc TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE DRAFT PROJECT SELECTION AND PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA

The GRF Strategic Planning Process Hierarchy of Initiatives, Projects

Let it be said "there are many moving parts" to an enterprise, an organization such as GRF. To make sense of the "many moving parts", the Committee will need to categorize, organize, and structure our output. Although GRF Technology Project Areas can be categorized a number of ways, one such way of designating and defining a hierarchy of project priorities as follows:

A **GRF Technology "Initiative"** can be an umbrella for a collection of projects. An example would be the area of Universal Communications (see attached Initiative Definition Document). A Universal Communications Initiative will encompass a spectrum of projects, each necessary for GRF member and staff communication, anywhere, anytime, by any communication channel (voice, mobile device, email, text, web portal, etc).

A **GRF Technology "Project"** will have a narrower scope than an Initiative. An example would be MOD Work Order System Project. (see attached **Project Definition Document**).

The Committee anticipates that there may be several "Initiative" level recommendations and a number of "Project" level recommendations. Projects may have significant dependencies which may elevate the dependencies, such as infrastructure requirements to the "Initiative" level.

## PROJECT/INITIATIVE SELECTION CRITERIA

There are a number of dimensions which influence Project/Initiative **selection criteria.** Projects and Initiatives are **selected** for further Committee assessment, analysis, evaluation, and perhaps recommendation based minimally on the following criteria:

1. **Financial Impact**: Project/Initiative projected to net "cost-savings" if implemented (Capital, Operations, Trust Budget)

2. **Operational Efficiencies**: Project/Initiative projected to improve business process and adjust workforce requirements

3. **Return on Investment**: ROI is challenging concept to prove, but the cost of NOT looking at a Project/Initiative is high (Business Continuity)

4. **Dependencies:** If a number of other High Priority Projects depend on implementing this technology

5. **Time-frame: projected time-line** to acquire this technology to enable other projects to move forward (on-going, short-term, long-term)

6. **Competitive advantage**

Maryaengland4@gmail.com

**PROJECT/INITIATIVE PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA**

Strategic Planning requires an assessment of business opportunities (to partner) and technologies that competitors utilize to achieve business goals. GRF Board strategic business direction will be valuable in terms of defining:

1. Core GRF Competencies: Is this business process a core competency?
2. If a business process is a GRF core competency, does GRF want to outsource it?
3. If not, should we outsource it? Is GRF managing IT strategically? What does that mean?
4. Will GRF partner with suppliers/vendors/contractors/consultants/entrepreneurs?

Prioritizing Initiatives/Projects essentially repositions recommendations along the lines of above **selection criteria**.

Assessing the IMPACT of Initiatives/Projects to recommend priorities will best be done in a visual way such as a graphic which includes Criteria:

| CRITERIA | Project 1 | Project 2 | Project 3 | Project 4 | Project 5 | Project 5 | Project 6 | Project 7 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Financial Impact** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Operational Efficiencies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **ROI-Lost Opportunity** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Dependencies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Time-frame** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Competitive Advantage** | | | | | | | | | |

Maryaengland4@gmail.com

**7a-2**