

Enterprise IT governance in a state government context is best seen as an evolving process, responding to new technological capabilities, organizational practices, and dynamic political environments. Designing an effective structure for state enterprise IT governance is not a matter of taking an established framework and applying it out of the box, but rather requires careful examination of the specific issues and characteristics of a given context. As discussed in the previous chapter, the states interviewed as part of the environmental scan all stated that **“there was no silver bullet”** and **“no one established framework worked in their individual context.”** Many used pre-existing frameworks as a starting point to start the change process, but few found an exact fit.

Currently New York has a federated authority arrangement to support decisions about IT investments and the development of IT policies and standards. In our current practices review of 18 states, we found a federated authority arrangement to be the most commonly used. Specifically, 15 of the states chose a federated arrangement where authority and power over IT decision-making and IT management was shared across a number of entities, including the central IT office and state agencies. In many states reviewed, however, a number of additional bodies were in place and had additional authorities not currently active in New York State.

In New York’s current federated authority arrangement CIO/OFT has some control over agency IT plans through the Annual Technology Plan (ATP) and Plan to Procure (PTP) processes, while agencies retain control of their overall IT budgets and operations. While our structure involves additional new responsibilities for oversight and alignment, we do not recommend eliminating the current ATP and PTP processes.

The recommendations contained in this report lay out a structure (see Figure 3) that builds on the foundations established in Technology Law §101-107 (see Table 3). Previous legislation, the subsequent Executive Order #117, and the CIO/OFT **Plan 2010: Strategic Roadmap** together created structures that appear to be moving New York toward new enterprise IT governance capability. The recommendations extend this earlier work by creating new clarity about the relationships among these entities. The recommendations also introduce a new level of transparency and checks and balances in the system. This transparency and oversight is realized to a great degree through overlapping membership in the governance framework. The degree to which the potential benefits of this structure will be realized depends not only on the quality of the recommendations themselves, but also on how they are carried out and sustained over time.

While the make-up of the governance structure was informed by experiences of other states and research on IT governance, the primary drivers behind the design were the value propositions and information gathered through interviews and workshops with New York State stakeholders. The recommendations will collectively create the governance capability the state needs to realize these value propositions by outlining new structures related to three primary areas of decision making: 1) IT investments, 2) ensuring alignment of IT investments with the overall strategic plan of the state, and 3) setting policies and standards.

Enhanced Enterprise IT Governance for New York State

- Executive Enterprise Governance Board
- Information Technology Investment Board
- Office of the State Chief Information Officer
- Chief Information Officer Council

Four entities form the foundation of the recommendations for enhanced IT governance for New York State: the Executive Enterprise Governance Board (EEGB), the Information Technology Investment Board (ITIB), the Office of the Chief Information Officer and the Office for Technology (CIO/OFT), and the Chief Information Officer Council (CIO Council) (see Figure 3). These entities are intertwined on several levels and therefore a certain degree of overlap of membership and information exchange is required to ensure transparency and to provide for checks and balances within the system. These four entities have specific roles and responsibilities with respect to the three decision making areas and their oversight responsibilities (see Figure 2.) A detailed description of each entity is provided below, along with a statement of their primary responsibility. Following a summary of the relationship between the governance framework and the original five value propositions, we present recommendations that, if implemented, will collectively create new value for the state through more coordinated and transparent IT investment decision making at the enterprise level and throughout state government.

Figure 2 – Enterprise Governance Relationships

[View larger image](#)

Figure 3 - An Enhanced Enterprise IT Governance Structure

The Information Technology Investment Board (ITIB) – The primary role of this body is decision making about IT investments. Its main job is to review and approve the state agency annual IT investment requests and supporting analysis submitted by CIO/OFT, with special attention to the implementation of enterprise-level investment and initiatives. In this role, the ITIB receives and responds to the investment analysis from CIO/OFT. Twice each year, CIO/OFT develops this analysis using the ATPs and PTPs from the agencies and any CIO/OFT initiatives, all based on state priorities and in consultation with the CIO Council. CIO/OFT prepares a summary analysis of the agency-level plans and procurement requests and a more detailed analysis of enterprise-level investment initiatives. The analysis should identify the rationale and expected benefits of the enterprise-level initiatives along with opportunities for combining initiatives, employing standards, or other enterprise-level coordinating actions. CIO/OFT submits the overall IT investment portfolio, analysis, and recommendations to the ITIB for review and approval.

The primary responsibility of the ITIB is to review and make final decisions about state agency IT investment requests and analysis submitted to the ITIB by CIO/OFT, with special attention to the identification and deployment of enterprise-level investment and initiatives. In this role, the ITIB receives and responds to the investment analysis from the CIO/OFT and assumes oversight responsibility for enterprise initiatives.

Executive Enterprise Governance Board (EEGB) – The primary role of this body is to provide oversight for alignment of IT investments with state plans and priorities. Following the CIO/OFT and ITIB reviews described above, the resulting portfolio is presented biannually to the EEGB for review in relation to overall state strategic plans. This biannual review is also an opportunity for mid-course correction of current IT investment projects in response to possible changes in state goals and strategies. Once these review steps are completed, the investment requests and initiatives can move into the normal planning and procurement processes.

The primary responsibility of the EEGB is to conduct semi-annual reviews of the IT investment portfolio in terms of alignment with the overall state strategic plan.

Office of the Chief Information Officer and the Office for Technology (CIO/OFT) – Leading the development of statewide policies and standards is the responsibility of the CIO/OFT. IT policy and standards are the more technical aspects of IT governance. As such, they involve more direct participation of the CIO community with CIO/OFT and other decision bodies. Policy and standards deliberations are envisioned as the responsibility of CIO/OFT, working with the advice and participation of the CIO Council and other possible stakeholders. The results of these policy and standards deliberations can then be reflected in the decisions on investment and alignment.

As envisioned, the structure purposely employs several levels of checks and balances of the investment decision making authority of CIO/OFT and the ITIB. This model ensures input from the CIO community and information sharing regarding proposed projects by combining CIO/OFT's primary responsibility for the review and subsequent analysis of the ATP and PTP processes with a consultative relationship with the CIO Council Leadership Committee. Similarly, by requiring a biannual presentation of the IT investment portfolio to the EEGB, the model ensures that IT investment decisions made by the ITIB continue to conform to the overall state strategic plan.

The CIO Council and the CIO Council Leadership Committee – The Council and Leadership Committee share responsibility for ensuring agency CIO input is incorporated into the governance process. More than a professional organization, the Council is envisioned as a research arm of the CIO/OFT. This function provides the open communication and context required for ensuring the agencies have the opportunity to address issues of mutual concern. The authority of this body is not in conflict with the current statutory authority of the State CIO or the agencies. It is an advisory body acting as a resource for the CIO/OFT regarding enterprise IT policies and standards.

The main responsibility of the CIO Council is to provide a mechanism for the New York State agency CIO community to advise and inform CIO/OFT on matters of information technology policy, management, and operations.

The proposed enhanced enterprise IT governance structure was recognized by stakeholders as delivering value to the state in the following ways:

- **Reduce redundancy and establish prioritization mechanism.** In a federated IT governance structure, authority over decision-making is distributed between CIO/OFT and individual agencies. This structure allows for the coordination of priorities with the overall state's interest being addressed. The

recommended governance framework provides the oversight and coordination for enterprise initiatives, allowing agencies to maintain autonomy within their own business functions.

- **Reduce political directions and swings.** While there is no way to completely isolate IT decision making from the impact of changes in the political sphere, a federated approach does allow for some continuity of government in the event a change to the central IT office does occur.
- **Establish standards.** Within this structure, standards can be set at the agency, domain, and enterprise levels since all interests are represented.
- **Foster sharing of services and information through agency collaboration.** The CIO Council traditionally provided the forum for agency networking, collaboration and knowledge sharing. In the new model, the CIO Council continues to provide this forum; however, the ITIB allows for an even greater opportunity of agency collaboration and enterprise initiatives through the review of the investment plans and the cross organizational composition of the board.
- **Align IT with business of the state.** The shared authority approach will create new capability to ensure alignment with the business of the state by enabling a review of the IT investment strategies and the strategic plan on a regular basis to ensure alignment.

The realization of these value propositions is explored more fully in the recommendations that follow.

Recommendation # 1

Establish the Executive Enterprise Governance Board as described to ensure alignment of enterprise IT decision making with current state policies and strategic priorities.

Rationale and description. The Executive Enterprise Governance Body (EEGB) fills one of the gaps in the current governance structure by providing a robust mechanism for ensuring alignment of IT investments with state plans and priorities. This body provides the forum for examining alignment of the proposed IT investment portfolio managed by the CIO/OFT with the state's plans and priorities.

Scope. Responsibility for ensuring alignment of IT investment plans with state plans and priorities rests with the EEGB. The IT investment portfolio, as approved by the Information Technology Investment Board, is presented twice annually to the EEGB for review in relation to overall state strategic plans. This biannual review is also an opportunity for mid-course correction for IT investment projects should the overall state goals and strategies change mid-year. Once these review steps are completed, the investment requests and initiatives can move into the normal planning and procurement processes.

The EEGB is also tasked with periodically reviewing the existing governance procedures and proposing changes if conditions deem it necessary. Similarly, their review and approval of the state IT strategic plan should be directly linked to the overall state strategic plan and the Governor's goals and priorities.

Authority. The EEGB has approval authority over the plans and policies presented by CIO/OFT and investment decisions presented by ITIB.

Membership. The EEGB is comprised of Deputy Secretaries or their equivalent, the Governor's Director of Operations and one representative each from the state Senate and Assembly. The State CIO and the chair of the CIO Council Leadership Committee are ex officio, non-voting members of this body. (See Appendix C for more detail on the membership of this body.)

Related responsibilities. The Governor's Director of Operations serves as chair of the EEGB to encourage engagement from the Executive Chamber. The State CIO may request additional meetings of the EEGB, subject to approval of the Chair.

Current practice. Several other states have established an oversight body of high level cabinet members. For example, California has an **Enterprise Leadership Council** with members from the governor's cabinet, which also includes representatives from the State Treasury and Controller. As in the proposed EEGB, this body is charged with providing guidance and support for enterprise-wide projects. Likewise, the state of Minnesota established the **Commissioners' Technology Advisory Board** comprised of cabinet level commissioners and chaired by the State CIO to provide review, consultation, and feedback to the State CIO on enterprise IT strategies and policies.

The Value Proposition for Recommendation # 1 <i>Establish the Executive Enterprise Governance Board as described to ensure alignment of enterprise IT decision making with current state policies and strategic priorities.</i>	
Value Proposition	Description
Reduce redundancy and establish prioritization mechanisms	An executive governance board whose main focus is to ensure alignment of enterprise IT decision making will bring value to the state by providing an enterprise perspective. This board will assist the overall state government by providing oversight to minimize duplication of systems across agencies and duplication of effort in developing, maintaining, and sustaining new systems.
Establish standards	By recommending an approval authority for the EEGB to set a given standard, the model enhances a connection between general statewide priorities and IT strategy of the state. The approval by the deputy secretaries and the Director of State Operations lends the proposed policy or standard a greater degree of overt executive support, which in turn enhances cooperation by agency CIOs.
Align IT with business of the state	The primary purpose of the EEGB is ensuring close alignment between state strategic plans and goals and statewide IT policy. By drawing on members from the governor's cabinet and the Director of State Operations, the EEGB is designed to promote open communication and collaboration between the IT side and the business side of the state.

Recommendation # 2

Establish an Information Technology Investment Board as described in the model.

Rationale and description. The Board will assist agencies and CIO/OFT in maximizing the value of IT investments and initiatives. The Board will also provide transparency and openness to a process that has previously been more closed. This board will allow the data generated through the ATP/PTP processes to inform decision-making about enterprise-wide opportunities, which will ultimately lead to better informed enterprise IT policies.

This structure will also provide continuity of governance beyond executive administrations, a concern that was raised by many key stakeholders throughout the project.

Scope. To review with approval authority the **proposed annual IT investment plan** prepared and submitted by CIO/OFT, with special attention to the implementation of enterprise-level investment and initiatives. In this role the ITIB receives and responds to the preliminary investment analysis from CIO/OFT. In addition, all projects over a specified dollar amount and all enterprise projects are to be presented to the ITIB and reviewed on a quarterly basis.

Authority. This body will have approval authority for the overall IT investment plans and procurement. It will have the authority to designate what projects are to be considered from an enterprise or domain perspective and potentially consolidated. This board will also have the authority to prioritize proposed projects based on the state's strategic goals and priorities and will review on a quarterly basis all enterprise projects currently underway and over a specified dollar amount. It will also serve as an advisory body to the State CIO on proposed enterprise related initiatives related to existing state priorities and strategic directions.

The Director of Operations or designee would serve as the chair of this body and convene meetings on a quarterly basis or as necessary to focus on a specific topic. The State CIO would have the responsibility to report

to this body on proposed enterprise wide initiatives, policies, and standards.

Members. The ITIB is comprised of the State CIO or their designee, the chair of the CIO Council Leadership Committee, one each representative from OGS and DOB, two representatives each from the Senate and Assembly, two members of the CIO Leadership Committee, one representative from the New York State Local Government Information Technology Directors Association (NYSLGITDA), and two members of the CIO/OFT staff selected by the State CIO. (See Appendix B for more detail on the membership of this body.)

Related responsibilities. Review criteria will be developed by the ITIB and will include criterion such as capability to deliver the expected benefit and availability of resources necessary to implement and manage an enterprise initiative.

The Value Proposition for Recommendation # 2 <i>Establish an Information Technology Investment Board as described in the model.</i>	
Value Proposition	Description
Reduce redundancy and establish prioritization mechanisms	The ITIB promotes reduction of redundancy in two ways. First, it increases information sharing and enhances transparency by involving additional actors in review of agency ATPs. The ITIB thus enhances the state's ability to identify potential duplication of efforts and identify opportunities for increased interagency cooperation. Second, by involving the leadership of the CIO Council and giving the CIO community a greater level of representation, the ITIB enhances the buy-in from agency stakeholders by involving them in the early planning and implementation process. By being more engaged in the planning stages of collaborative efforts, state agency CIOs will be more likely to either support such efforts or at least not feel as if their concerns have been ignored.
Reduce political directions and swings	The ITIB structure has the capacity to mitigate the effects of political swings by providing consistency and continuity in terms of operational issues for an incoming State CIO. Because of its composition, the ITIB membership is unlikely to be strongly affected by changes in administration.
Establish standards	By involving the ITIB in the standard setting process, the state can avoid unforeseen complications or unintended consequences in the implementation of those standards. In addition, the ITIB can collect intelligence on issues of an operational and management nature.
Foster sharing of services and information through agency collaboration	Similar to the reduction of redundancy, the ITIB promotes sharing of services and information through agency collaboration by bringing a representative from the CIO Council together with representatives from the control agencies and by involving them in the review of agency ATPs.

Recommendation # 3

Adopt the CIO Council Charter as drafted by the CIO Council Action Team Co-Chairs.

Rationale and description. The potential of the current CIO Council as part of an enterprise governance

structure is hampered by a lack of clarity regarding its relative role and responsibilities vis-à-vis CIO/OFT in policy setting and IT decision making. This lack of clarity is particularly troublesome in relation to decisions on identification, selection, management, evaluation, and sustainability of enterprise initiatives. The reestablishment of the CIO Council as outlined in the recently developed charter clarifies these roles and responsibilities in a more specific way.

Scope. According to the draft charter, the CIO Council has three main purposes:

1. provide a mechanism for the New York State agency CIO community to advise and inform the NY State CIO and CIO/OFT on matters of information technology policy, management, and operations,
2. provide a forum for the NYS CIO community to address issues of mutual concern and make recommendations on IT issues, and
3. promote information sharing and cooperation.

Authority. The CIO Council is an advisory body to the State CIO on matters of information technology policy, management, and operations. It provides a forum for the CIOs to address issues of mutual concern, make recommendations on IT issues, share information, and promote cooperation among the CIO Community. It has the authority to set the CIO Council agenda, form advisory committees, and conduct elections for the positions on the leadership committee, including chair of the Council.

The authority of this body does not conflict with the current statutory authority of the State CIO or the agencies. It is an advisory group to provide advice and act as a resource for the State CIO concerning issues related to enterprise IT policies and standards.

Membership. The CIO (or equivalent) of each state agency, all other entities over which the Governor has executive authority, and all public benefit corporations, the heads of which are appointed by the Governor. Also invited to participate are the CIOs (or equivalent) from the following: the NYS Assembly and Senate; the Unified Court System; the Office of the State Comptroller, the Office of the State Attorney General. Representation from local and regional government CIOs (up to 10 members) will include the President and Vice President of New York State Local Government Information Technology Directors Association (NYSLGITDA) and one representative from New York City as designated by New York City's CIO. The State CIO serves as an ex-officio member of the Council. The State CIO may appoint additional members of his or her executive leadership team to be members of the CIO Council. The CIO Council may appoint additional members on a temporary basis as needed to support specific subcommittee efforts.

The chair of the CIO Council Leadership Committee is a member of the ITIB and the EEGB to ensure communication with the agency CIO community. This cross-membership provides an environment for openness, transparency, and cross-organizational information sharing.

Process. The leadership committee has been designed to address a number of the inherent challenges associated with the size of the CIO Council as a discussion forum and to facilitate more effective communication and cooperation with CIO/OFT. The Leadership Committee consists of thirteen members, seven elected by the CIO Council and five appointed by the State CIO, and a chair who is elected from the general membership.

In adherence to the commitment to shared authority, the Council is established under the authority of the State CIO and the State CIO has the responsibility to call the quarterly meetings. The Leadership Committee has the responsibility to set the council agenda, to review requests to set up workgroups from the council membership and to submit official recommendations from the Council to the State CIO.

The subcommittees will report on their work at the quarterly meetings of the CIO Council and the Leadership Committee meetings when so requested. Once an official recommendation has been submitted to the Leadership Committee, and where appropriate reviewed by the full membership, a report is forwarded to the CIO/OFT for a response.

Related Responsibilities. Subcommittees of the CIO Council can be set up based on a request from a member of the Council and with a review by the Leadership Committee. The State CIO can also request the formation of subcommittees to address specific issues.

Current Practice. The state of California has a similar body, the **IT Council Executive Committee**, which provides oversight and leadership to their IT Council. The Council provides general guidance to the state CIO on proposed IT policies. The smaller body was established to facilitate more effective communication and collaboration between the State CIO and the agency CIOs.

The Value Proposition for Recommendation # 3 <i>Adopt the CIO Council Charter as drafted by the CIO Council Action Team Co-Chairs.</i>	
Value Proposition	Description
Reduce redundancy and establish prioritization mechanisms	The redesigned CIO Council has an increased focus on fostering agency collaboration and information sharing. By increasing information sharing and enhancing transparency, the CIO Council enhances the state's ability to identify potential duplication of efforts and identify opportunities for increased interagency cooperation. Second, by enhancing the level of involvement of the CIO community in the planning efforts and by giving them a stronger voice via the CIO Council Leadership Committee, the new Council will contribute to increasing the level of cooperativeness among agency CIOs and with the CIO/OFT.
Reduce political directions and swings	The CIO Council does not directly prevent political swings but can serve as a source of institutional knowledge for an incoming State CIO. The CIO Council Leadership Committee is designed to span terms of elected officials and thus should be able to inform an incoming State CIO of ongoing activities and provide insight on any potential changes in strategic direction.
Establish standards	The State CIO retains full authority over standards and statewide IT policies, but the state standards should be investigated in collaboration with a special subcommittee of the CIO Council. Further, by proposing an official recommendation and answer process between the CIO Council and the Office of the State CIO, the model enhances and formalizes exchange of information among these two entities.
Foster sharing of services and information through agency collaboration	The redesigned CIO Council has as part of its core mission providing a forum for the New York State CIO community to address issues of mutual concern and promote information sharing and cooperation. The redesigned CIO Council should set its own agenda and have a leadership group responsible for enhancing information sharing opportunities. These changes will allow the redesigned CIO Council to provide a more effective venue for agency collaboration. To promote collaboration, there should be a mechanism within the CIO Council that allows for crafting a shared vision. This mechanism will provide the means to create a more cohesive, statewide IT community with common goals. If these processes were developed within this framework, opportunities for shared or consolidated services could be identified.

Recommendation # 4

Establish a Technology Services Advisory Council to oversee the centralized IT services state agencies purchase from CIO/OFT.

Rationale and description. The Technology Services Advisory Council (TSAC) fills one of the gaps in the

current environment, as identified by New York State technology stakeholders, by providing a customer feedback mechanism regarding technology services provided by CIO/OFT.

Scope. The primary role of the TSAC is to provide a forum for CIO/OFT customers to engage in planning and decision making on the quality and cost of centralized technology services. TSAC is charged with reviewing current practices and collaborating with CIO/OFT to identify strategies for maximizing the value of the services provided to agencies.

Authority. The TSAC has the authority to make recommendations regarding the centralized technology services provided to agencies by CIO/OFT.

Membership. The TSAC is comprised of eleven members: ten executive agency CIOs who are customers of the New York State Data Center, who are selected by the Governor's Director of Operations, and the Deputy Secretary for IT Delivery Services, who acts as chair.

Process. TSAC will meet on quarterly basis and is responsible for devising an appropriate strategy for collecting feedback from CIO/OFT customers.

Current practice. Several other states have established an oversight body for monitoring the quality and cost of IT services provided by central IT office. For example, until recently the state of California had a Technology Services Board that governed the Department of Technology Services. Their primary role was to provide governance and guidance to the Department of Technology Services (DTS) to ensure appropriate oversight and customer orientation.

Recommendation # 5

Establish a temporary Enterprise IT Governance Implementation Committee with the responsibility to implement the new IT governance structures.

Rationale and description. The Committee is tasked with the implementation of the proposed governance structure. The Committee provides the forum to ensure these recommendations are enacted as outlined and provides accountability to the key stakeholders by making the governance development process transparent.

Scope. The Committee is responsible for implementing the proposed governance capabilities and advises the EEGB and the New York State IT community on progress toward implementation, issues limiting implementation, and recommendations for moving forward. The Committee is a temporary body and would be disbanded one year after the New York State IT community formally establishes the chosen governance structure.

Authority. This Committee has the authority to invite and convene the necessary individuals to create the governance structure. This body reports its progress directly to the Governor's Director of Operations on a monthly basis.

Members. The membership of this committee is comprised of the Director of Operations, who serves as chair, the State CIO, the Action Team co-chairs of the existing CIO Council, and one member each from the Senate and the Assembly.

Implementation Success Factors

Five implementation success factors emerged from the environmental scan and from conversations with the New York State stakeholders and key experts within the field. These are presented below to complement the recommendations and to support the goal of generating value for the state from successful implementation of an enhanced enterprise IT governance structure.

Implementation Success Factor # 1

Acknowledge and build upon the formal and informal collaboration efforts occurring throughout the state government IT community.

Within New York State, there are many formal and informal collaborative efforts currently in place. As with the other states reviewed, these bodies perform a very important function outside the obvious components of an IT

governance structure. These coordinating mechanisms, as described earlier, contribute to deliberation on policy, overseeing planning, creating standards, or coordinating stakeholders. These coordination mechanisms are both internal and external to the state IT office and exhibit structural, functional, and social integration capability.

While we believe that all four types of coordination mechanisms as described above are crucial to effective management and operations of IT in the state, our recommendations extend only to external committees and councils.

Implementation Success Factor # 2

Recognize the critical role of the Executive Chamber in implementing and sustaining.

Practitioner and academic research about IT governance consistently emphasizes the importance of executive sponsorship and champions in both the public and private sectors. Our interviews with the states support the idea that executive support is crucial for effective IT governance implementation. Within New York State, the need for executive support is particularly salient given the nature of the federated bureaucratic structures within the state.

Implementation Success Factor # 3

Formally adopt an incremental approach to the implementation strategy with respect to changes in enterprise IT governance. Adopt a continuous learning view.

Current research has shown that one of the reasons IT initiatives fail is because organizations try to do too much, too soon. It is better to have a vision and then an incremental approach to implementation. Many states have started with core components of their governance structure and then slowly started adding additional components as they made progress.

Implementation Success Factor # 4

Articulate the value an enterprise IT governance perspective would have for New York State as a whole.

It is important that the value derived from an enterprise IT governance framework is understood not only within the IT sector, but also from the programmatic sectors. Within the workshops, participants spoke about how the individual government IT managers have pre-established management paradigms that guides their actions. However, an enterprise perspective requires a different way of managing an agency's IT resources. The participants felt that executive leadership and influence, coupled with a clear expression of the value in enterprise IT governance, would mitigate resistance to changing management styles and ultimately support the state's overall objective of providing greater services to the citizens of New York.

Implementation Success Factor # 5

Establish a regular review of the performance of the enhanced enterprise IT governance structure.

Because of the dynamic nature of the political and economic environment in state government, as well as changing needs of the state, IT governance structures in all states reviewed have undergone relatively frequent changes. As one of the State CIOs said, "It seems that every six years, you have to overhaul your current system." Establishing an evaluation mechanism for the new IT governance structure and regular periodic review will ensure that New York State's IT governance structures will remain effective for the state's needs in the years to come.
