City of Milwaukee

Meeting Minutes

CITY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

ALD. NIK KOVAC, CHAIR
Chuck Burki, Jane Islo, James Klajbor, Jennifer Meyer,
James Owczarski, Judy Pinger, Aycha Sirvanci, Richard Watt,
amd Deborah Wilichowski
Executive Secretary, Nancy Olson
Staff Assistant, Chris Lee, 286-2232, Fax: 286-3456,
clee@milwaukee.gov

Thursday, June 9, 2016	10:00 AM	Room 303, Third Floor, City Hall

1. **Call to Order.**

Meeting called to order at 10:10 a.m.

2. **Roll Call.**

Present 8 - Islo, Owczarski, Klajbor, Kovac, Watt, Wilichowski, Sirvanci and Pinger

Absent 2 - Meyer and Burki

Individuals also present:

Nancy Olson, DOA - Information & Technology Management Division
Jacquelyn Block, City Clerk's Office - City Records
Atty. Peter Block, City Attorney's Office

3. **Review and Approval of the Previous Meeting Minutes from March 10, 2016.**

Mr. Klajbor moved approval, seconded by Ms. Wilichowski, of the meeting minutes from March 10, 2016. There was no objection.

4. **Records Retention**

-Proposed Department Record Schedules for Approval

Ms. Block gave a summary. There are 26 record schedules for approval from Intergovernmental Relations Division (IRD), Office of Small Business Development (OSBD), Department of City Development (DCD), Office of the Comptroller - Financial Advisory Division, and City Treasurer. IRD is doing a comprehensive redo of its schedules and removing schedules after 10 years. OSBD is updating its schedules to reflect business operations and current practices. DCD is also redoing its schedules comprehensively, requesting to remove schedules regarding the Milwaukee Commission on Community Relations, and creating a new schedule retention for the records and minutes of the Business Resource Committee despite the committee not being one created by the Common Council. The schedules from the Financial Advisory Division from the Comptroller's Office relate to police audits,

police trust fund activity, and billing and collection records for mobile home parks. The City Treasurer's office has standard schedules.

Mr. Klajbor moved approval, seconded by Ms. Wilichowski, of the proposed department record schedules. There was no objection.

-State Record Board Approval of Previous Schedules

Ms. Block said there were no submissions to the State Record Board's last record cycle.

5.   Old Business.

-Citywide Study of IT Positions from the Department of Employee Relations (DER)

Ms. Olson said that the Department of Employee Relations has not made any progress on its citywide study of IT positions to share with the committee.

Ms. Sirvanci moved to hold this item. There was no objection.

-HIPPA Compliance on Outlook 365 Email Use

Ms. Pinger moved to hold this item. There was no objection.

-What Works Cities Presentation

Individuals appearing:
Noel Isama, Sunlight Foundation
Alyssa Doom, Sunlight Foundation
Katherine Klosek, Johns Hopkins Center for Government Excellence

Ms. Klosek was present via conference telephone.

Mr. Isama, Ms. Doom, Ms. Klosek, committee members, and individuals in the audience gave brief introductions.

Mr. Isama and Ms. Doom said that they help research best practices and assist cities to implement open data policies and programs through the What Works Cities project.

Mr. Isama and Ms. Doom gave a presentation on open data governance relative to the What Works Cities project, defining open data, open data benefits, Milwaukee's work with the What Works Cities project, committee responsibilities, and next steps.

The What Works Cities project is a Bloomberg Philanthropies two fold initiative to help 100 mid sized cities over the course of three months to use data and evidence to improve the lives of residents and operations within cities. The first part of the project is to provide technical support implementing open data. The second project component is to, assist in improving performance management, and assist in help establish a peer network linking cities together to learn best practices from one another. Sunlight Foundation is helping cities to draft and adopt open data policies.

Open data is the concept that government data be made public, machine readable, up-to-date, accessible, and automated. Published datasets should live in the public domain and be easily accessible as directly as possible to the community within

some sort of central portal. Datasets should be available in formats, such as excel format, which computers can understand and users can manipulate. Datasets should routinely contain current, accurate information to encourage maximum use. Datasets should be accessible to the broadest range of users to use for varying purposes without barriers, such as special request processes or licensing. Datasets should be automatically uploaded to relevant systems whenever created or updated.

Benefits of open data include saving time, creating opportunities for collaboration, smarter decisions, and adding capacity. Public record requests can be lessened resulting in more time available for both city departments and citizens. There may be cases of further inquiries as a result of open data sets. Oftentimes, the additional desired datasets are already available, and people can be redirected to access those datasets. Capacity may be gained from citizens and groups who may become involved to solve problems. Open data produces more available information for city departments to use to make better informed and smarter decisions. Due to more time saved with open data, city departments can add capacity to or reuse capacity for other important functions.

Ms. Wilichowski inquired about the misinterpretation of data and increased inquiries from the public due to available open data information.

Mr. Isama replied. These instances allow a city to tell their story, clarify data, or confirm data in how the city is doing its job. Most of the time citizens draw conclusions that are incorrect, perhaps due to mishandling datasets. Increase inquiries by citizens for clarification of data are a possibility; however, opportunities are created for collaboration and clarification. Usually cities will have tools on the portal sites to assist users to interpret data and be given context.

Mr. Isama and Ms. Doom proceeded with the presentation.

Interdepartmental collaboration can occur among city departments where departments can access each other's relevant information to assist their respective operations. Open data makes it easier for departments to use each other's data. An example is a social worker cross referencing data from different agencies to manage child welfare situations on their iPad or laptop as opposed to having to visit those agencies for the information.

Benefits for external users include easier access to current information, data to drive research, business opportunities, increased transparency, and increased accountability. Public record requests processes are lessened or removed, and users will not have to spend that time to obtain data. Open data adds to public engagement and helps city employees engage with the public. The City of Philadelphia engages and asks its external users for input on which datasets to release.

The City of Milwaukee is connected with the What Works Cities project network composed of Bloomberg Philanthropies, The Center for Government Excellence at Johns Hopkins University, and Sunlight Foundation. Sunlight Foundation has been evaluating the City's open data and performance management. There is a memorandum of understanding for a three month engagement. The MOU's goals are to strengthen open data practices and governance by codifying and standardizing processes and policies to inventory, prioritize, and release data for internal and public consumption. The MOU's outcomes include the establishment of a governance team (CIMC), the development of an open data policy, and making data available to the public.

Progress so far include an existing open data portal to build upon, drafting of an open data policy, and planned meet-ups with various outside stakeholders for feedback.

Mr. Klajbor questioned the list of stakeholders to be met.

Aaron Szopinski, Mayor's Office, responded that the stakeholders include Community Development Alliance, various media outlets, MSOE, UWM, Safe and Sound, Nonprofit Center, and Milwaukee Data Initiative. There will be ongoing engagement through September.

Mr. Isama and Ms. Doom continued the presentation. The overseeing and implementation of the open data program and policy will be taken on by Ms. Olson and the committee (CIMC). Ms. Olson will lead the responsibilities, and the committee will participate. Responsibilities include identifying open data coordinators for each department responsible to participate in the program, overseeing the creation of citywide data inventory, developing a process for determining and handling security and privacy risks, developing a process for prioritizing the release of datasets based on various input, establishing a process and method for publishing datasets onto a central online portal location, ensuring datasets meet quality and current standards, overseeing dataset publication, and participating in producing an annual report to the committee (CIMC). The report is to show how well the open data program is meeting the policy.

Next steps for the City is to review an open data policy, complete data inventory process, clarify roles and responsibilities, and establish a process for prioritizing datasets for release.

Ald. Kovac inquired about live data and cities at the forefront of open data.

Ms. Doom replied. Mesa, Arizona provides visuals and interaction with data for users to understand. Visuals were supported internally and through a vendor.

Mr. Isama added that the City of Victorville, California has an internal IT person assigned to develop and manage the open data portal there. Technologies to support a portal are expensive. Some cities may or may not be able to do it in-house. The City of New York has multiple live transportation apps built based on its open datasets. Similarly, the City of London has increased a better quality of living for its citizens with its live transportation apps and available data. Cities have different ways to provide live data. For example, some cities put GPS sensors on its snow plows. The City has the opportunity to manage and explain its information as a part of open data.

Ald. Kovac said the City may just put up machine readable formatted information. Investments from the outside may come in to decipher the data and produce apps, which vendors may want to profit from. Perhaps live data on firetrucks may not present a problem, but the same cannot be said on police cars or units.

Ms. Olson said that the City portal may have both visual information as well as raw data in a machine readable format for the public. Police and fire dispatch information is already available from the City.

Ms. Doom said that City should link open data and performance management together. Moving forward the City may want to include the datasets, that measures performance measurement goals, to its portal to measure its progress towards those goals.

Ms. Sirvanci questioned the negatives of open data and backlash for providing inaccurate information.

Mr. Isama said inaccurate open datasets are a possibility, but cities have the opportunity to quickly fix its data when notified of any wrong data from the public.

Ms. Doom said that the open data policy can establish proper mechanisms to ensure quality open datasets.

Ms. Wilichowski commented. Proprietary and sensitive information available for internal use by city departments should be protected versus data that can be consumed by the public. There is the concern regarding department capacity and manpower, which may be limited, to participate in open data.

Mr. Isama said that there should be data that is protected by law due to sensitivity. Open data helps the security of data with better organizing and identification of data. Over time and through automation, participation in open data would be made easier and costs or manpower issues would be lessened.

Ms. Olson said that the open data initiative will be incremental. Several factors, such as security, will be considered to determine priorities. Open data will not happen instantaneously to include all datasets. Departments would be asked initially to provide two to three datasets that are most sought after by external stakeholders and through public records.

Christopher Lee, American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), questioned the manner of automation of datasets being transferred to the open data portal. Will data be grabbed and transferred to the portal automatically after it's entered or will departments be able to authorize the transfer of data to the portal?

Mr. Isama replied that the City should determine the manner and level of automation of its datasets to the open data portal. Perhaps automation would occur after datasets go through departments first.

Ms. Olson said that several aspects of datasets need to be addressed prior to automation: original system and technology, proprietary information, type, frequency, and fluidity.

Mr. Owczarski said that the records of the Common Council through the Granicus system are in an open data platform and may already be in compliance.

Mr. Isama said that the portal may simply provide access to the Common Council records. The City already has much of the building blocks to produce a successful portal.

Ald. Kovac said the real interest in records will be those in the fire, police, and public works departments.

Ms. Pinger asked if cities with successful open data portals have their portals built and maintained internally or through outside venders.

Ms. Doom replied that it varies.

6.   **New Business.**

-Open Data Policy Review

Ms. Olson gave an overview on the open data policy draft and resolution draft. The policy is in standard format indicating purpose, scope, and definitions. Definitions include those that will be part of data inventory such as format, open format, metadata, and protected data. Atty. Block has reviewed the policy and has made some contributions, especially in the protected and sensitive definitions. The general policies consist of five different sections: open data program, governance, central online location for published data, open data report and review, and open data legal policy.

In the open data program the committee (CIMC) would be the governing body of the policy. Her office will present inventory, identify department stakeholders to review inventory details, and present the inventory to the committee to govern.

The governance section concerns how the committee's governance would work and the mechanism to solicit feedback from the public. Details need to be defined yet, and the committee would be briefed as such.

The central online location for published data would be the City's current open data website at www.milwaukee.gov/opendata, which currently contains a list of available data existing on current departmental websites that she has found. Her office is looking at products at a cost.

She will report to the committee annually on the progress of the open data policy and goals. The report perhaps can be integrated into the committee's annual report.

Mr. Klajbor questioned departmental record custodians making final decisions on their departments' open datasets.

Mr. Owczarski inquired about procurement for products purchased in the policy.

Ms. Olson replied. She would not oppose department record custodians making final decisions on their respective open datasets. Procurement is mentioned under "Section 1, General Policy, e". The Chief Information Officer shall work with the City Attorney and the Purchasing Director to develop contract language to promote the Open Data policy in technology-related procurements. These provisions may include, where appropriate, requirements to post data on the City's open data portal or to make data available through other means.

Mr. Owczarski said that procuring software and a vendor is expensive, especially with charges for retrieving databases that are formatted through a vendor.

Mr. Isama said the policy allows for the development of contract language to prevent chargebacks. Language can be included in contracts to state that the City should be able to access its data free of charge.

Ms. Olson said that current IT contracts have language stating that vendors cannot keep data hostage and have to respond to open records requests. She will work with the City Purchasing Director and the City Attorney's office to include such language contractually.

Atty. Block said that the public records law requires City contractors to provide the City's records to a requestor. However, there are struggles to include such language in contracts.

Mr. Owczarski questioned who oversees the redaction of records and redaction costs? He added that it may be cost prohibitive to make records publishable if part of it requires redaction, and he would not be comfortable with record custodians being responsible in determining what resources to make publishable. There has been and may be possible cases of public records noncompliance leading to court judgements. Oversight of records should be someone other than the respective record custodians, which the policy does not grant.

Atty. Block said that the record custodians of each department would be responsible over its records and redaction. There is an exception in the policy under "Definitions, f, 2", for instances of undue financial or administrative burden.

Mr. Klajbor said that trust should be placed on custodian heads to be responsible for determining publishable and unpublishable records.

Mr. Isama said that the policy does allow the committee (CIMC) to have the role of evaluating and reviewing datasets on appropriateness.

Atty. Block said that he was concerned with inconsistent procedural language in the policy pertaining to the terms "overseen" and "affirm" for the committee, especially regarding the absence of "affirm" in the policy under "General Policy, Section 1: Open Data Program, b."

Ms. Olson said that the procedure could be the same one done for record schedules. She can work with department custodians to present inventory and recommendations to the committee at every meeting where the committee can vote on the datasets to make available next based on a scoring mechanism.

Mr. Szopinski said that the committee should be the body to affirm record fields to publish and to redact. The Mayor may exercise the power to direct compliance for any dataset.

Ald. Kovac said that the committee should be informed of and should affirm a custodian's decision.

Mr. Klajbor moved approval of the Open Data Policy with the amendment to include "and affirm" after "overseen" under "General Policy, Section 1; Open Data Program, b". There was no objection.

Mr. Klajbor moved to recommend approval of the resolution on the open data policy, as amended, to the Common Council. There was no objection.

Ald. Kovac said that he will sponsor the resolution.

7. **Adjournment.**

Meeting adjourned at 11:37 a.m.
Chris Lee, Staff Assistant

Materials for this meeting can be found within the following file:

160157   Communication relating to the matters to be considered by the City Information Management Committee at its June 9, 2016 meeting.

**Sponsors:**   THE CHAIR