

## APPENDIX A

# AZTECH SO&M CAPABILITY MATURITY MODEL (CMM) SELF-ASSESSMENT

Monday, May 10, 2010

This memo provides a summary of the half-day Systems Operations and Management (SO&M) Workshop conducted by AZTech on May 10, 2010.

The Workshop was held in conjunction with the Arizona Operations Academy co-sponsored by the Arizona DOT, The Maricopa County Association of Governments, Maricopa County and the cities and towns in the AZTech partnership.

The workshop was facilitated by Steve Lockwood of Parsons Brinckerhoff and Phil Tarnoff, with assistance from Reno Giordano of Parsons Brinckerhoff. It is part of an effort to validate the evaluation framework developed in SHRP 2 L06 research being utilized in the AASHTO SO&M Guide currently under development.

The workshop was reported in the first day of the Operation Academy.

The purpose of the Workshop is to provide a snapshot consensus evaluation of the state of play and promising next steps in advancing the effectiveness of the Regions SO&M program. The attached memo describes the concept, intent and structure of the Workshop.

The tables below provide a summary of the consensus issues and views of the participants regarding current level of maturity and key improvement actions to get to the next level. The articulation of these views and comments are documented as brief bulleted points in order to minimize interpretation by the facilitation team.

The dialogue in the Workshop appeared to reflect considerable current dialogue on many of the relevant topics and a high consciousness of many of the key issues. The Workshop's identification of the current levels of maturity in the key dimensions may assist the region in defining the priorities among an array of possible actions to improve the regional SO&M program.

The tables present the conclusions for each of six key dimensions. The highlighted levels indicate the levels identified for each dimension by Workshop participants. It should be noted that in several cases, the evaluation of levels incorporated two levels. This reflects the participants' views that among the large number of players in the Region, there is a range of states of play.

### Attendees

#### AZTech

Debra Bieber (City of Chandler)  
Darrell Bingham (ADOT)  
Tom Buick (Consultant)  
Tomás Guerra (OZ Engineering)  
Kiran Guntupalli (MAG)  
Barbara Hauser (MCDOT)  
Sarath Joshua (MAG)  
Leo Luo (MAG)  
Madhuri Uddaraju (City of Phoenix)

#### FHWA

Steve McKenzie (City of Peoria)  
Michael Pacelli (Town of Queen Creek)  
Paul Porell (City of Scottsdale)  
Faisal Saleem (MCDOT)  
Bob Steele (MCDOT)  
Nicolaas Swart (MCDOT)  
Lydia Warnick (ADOT)  
Faranza Yasmin (ADOT)

Jennifer Brown  
Stephen Clinger  
Joe Gregory  
Kris Milster



## APPENDIX A

<b>DIMENSION: Planning/Programming/Resources</b>				
	<b>LEVEL 1 PERFORMED</b>	<b>LEVEL 2 MANAGED</b>	<b>LEVEL 3 INTEGRATED</b>	<b>LEVEL 4 OPTIMIZING</b>
	Each jurisdiction doing its own thing according to individual priorities and capabilities	Consensus regional approach developed regarding SO&M goals, deficiencies, C/B, networks, strategies and common priorities	Regional program integrated into jurisdictions' overall multimodal transportation plans with related staged program	SO&M integrated into jurisdictions' multisectoral plans and programs, based on a formal continuing planning processes
<i>Staff evaluation of program maturity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ITS capital investments closely tied to regional planning and Regional ConOps that have been developed</li> <li>• Planning limited to transportation entities: Public safety agencies (PSAs) not integrated</li> <li>• No transparent investment criteria or formal benefit/cost evaluation -- or basis for comparison with capacity investments</li> <li>• Planning doesn't include transit</li> </ul>			
<i>Staff identification of Strategies to get to the next level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold Operations Summit to establish role of SO&amp;M</li> <li>• Bring PSAs into the formal programming and planning processes for operations to align budgeting, resource allocation</li> <li>• Develop tools to evaluate operations improvements on the same level as capacity improvements and show trade-offs</li> <li>• Gain equal level of participation from all players (especially the larger ones)</li> <li>• Attach recurring costs to the capital investment they must support</li> <li>• Relate planned investment level to specific objectives and payoffs</li> <li>• Ensure new capacity/reconstruction includes ITS infrastructure as standard operation procedure</li> </ul>			

## APPENDIX A

<b>DIMENSION: Systems and Technology</b>				
	<b>LEVEL 1 PERFORMED</b>	<b>LEVEL 2 MANAGED</b>	<b>LEVEL 3 INTEGRATED</b>	<b>LEVEL 4 OPTIMIZING</b>
	Ad hoc approaches to system implementation without consideration of systems engineering and appropriate procurement processes	Regional conops and architectures developed and documented with costs included, appropriate procurement process employed	Systems & technology standardized and integrated on a regional basis (including arterial focus) with other related processes	Architectures and technology routinely upgraded to improve performance; systems integration/interoperability maintained on continuing basis
<i>Staff evaluation of program maturity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Systems Architecture/concepts of operations in place</li> <li>• Lack of standardization of systems/technology = interoperability relationships among jurisdictions</li> <li>• Inconsistent technology, operations along inter-jurisdictional corridors</li> <li>• Legacy systems upgrade cost burden (ADOT)</li> <li>• Regional procurement contracts in place -- set up through ADOT</li> <li>• Variation in staff technical capabilities among jurisdictions</li> </ul>			
<i>Staff identification of Strategies to get to the next level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop systems engineering checklist in conjunction with FHWA</li> <li>• Document systems for future development</li> <li>• Improve interoperability among systems (signals, Integrated corridor management) across jurisdictions</li> <li>• Develop approaches to increase level of shared operational control (after hours)</li> <li>• Communicate lessons learned in systems engineering, technology to all participants</li> </ul>			

## APPENDIX A

<b>DIMENSION: Performance Measurement</b>				
	<b>LEVEL 1 PERFORMED</b>	<b>LEVEL 2 MANAGED</b>	<b>LEVEL 3 INTEGRATED</b>	<b>LEVEL 4 OPTIMIZING</b>
	Some outputs measured and reported by some jurisdictions	Output data used directly for after-action debriefings and improvements, data easily available and dashboarded	Outcome measures identified (networks, modes, impacts) and routinely utilized in common for objective-based program improvements	Performance measures reported internally for utilization and externally for accountability and program justification
<i>Staff evaluation of program maturity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some output measures (i.e. incident management) done well by some jurisdictions - but not utilized to improve operational procedures</li> <li>• Current measures used not standardized</li> <li>• Very limited customer-related performance measures (outcome measures such as travel time) available</li> <li>• No outcome measures utilized to communicate SO&amp;M payoffs to decision-makers, general public</li> <li>• No outreach regarding current performance (dashboards)</li> <li>• Limited after-action debriefing, reporting and feedback</li> </ul>			
<i>Staff identification of Strategies to get to the next level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define performance measure strategy, including utilization and audiences (tap national state of the practice)</li> <li>• Increment towards outcome measures (travel time) of interest to customers - and use on DMS, 511, etc.</li> <li>• Capitalize on commercial data sources of travel time</li> <li>• Build on REACT experience and extend to additional participants</li> <li>• Establish consistency across jurisdictions on basic levels of measurement including public safety agencies</li> </ul>			

## APPENDIX A

<b>DIMENSION: Culture/Outreach</b>				
	<b>LEVEL 1 PERFORMED</b>	<b>LEVEL 2 MANAGED</b>	<b>LEVEL 3 INTEGRATED</b>	<b>LEVEL 4 OPTIMIZING</b>
	Individual Staff heroes promote SO&M - varying among jurisdictions	Jurisdictions' senior management understands SO&M business case (champion-independent) and educates decision makers/public	Jurisdictions' mission identifies SO&M and benefits with formal program and achieves wide public visibility/understanding	Customer mobility service commitment accountability accepted as formal, top level core program of all jurisdictions
<i>Staff evaluation of program maturity</i>	<p>Evaluated level: depends on the agency/jurisdiction; overall 1.8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some jargon/terminology confusion (“operations”)</li> <li>Outward reflections of SO&amp;M activity not visible outside of MPO (websites, annual reports)</li> <li>Region has good champions/leaders</li> <li>Statewide initiatives have been discouraging (e.g., removal of traffic cameras) may indicate a lack of respect for professional engineering judgment</li> <li>Leadership turnover - negative impact on forward momentum in program improvement</li> <li>Sense of program vulnerability -- budgets for operations have been reduced. job security weakened</li> <li>Business case not made for SO&amp;M. Lack of upper management appreciation for SO&amp;M benefits</li> <li>Anecdote re article criticizing ramp metering had positive comments showing the public understands its benefits</li> <li>Success is contagious - can be communicated to others</li> <li>AZTech has taken lead on public outreach -- Broadcasters summit forum for discussion on helping on another</li> <li>ITS-Arizona also effective</li> </ul>			
<i>Staff identification of Strategies to get to the next level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage executive-level attendance at the Operations Summit</li> <li>Define what operations is (make business case) - a description of what difference SO&amp;M will make, why should leaders care, how it can be a tool</li> <li>Capitalize on examples of success among participants</li> <li>Definition needed for operations and to make a distinction between management and maintenance</li> <li>Make Comparisons between “building new” and applying ITS - before-and-after demonstrations with performance measures would help make such comparisons</li> <li>Consider audiences: example: customer survey data shows Bell Road project was appreciated</li> <li>Observe what happens without ITS tools in place (e.g. photo enforcement)</li> </ul>			

## APPENDIX A

<b>DIMENSION: Organization/ Staffing</b>				
	<b>LEVEL 1 PERFORMED</b>	<b>LEVEL 2 MANAGED</b>	<b>LEVEL 3 INTEGRATED</b>	<b>LEVEL 4 OPTIMIZING</b>
	SO&M added on to units within existing structure and staffing - dependent on technical champions	Organizational concept developed within/among jurisdictions with core capacity needs identified, collaboration takes place	SO&M Managers with direct report to top management; Job specs, certification and training for core positions	SO&M senior managers at equivalent level with other jurisdiction services and staff professionalized
<i>Staff evaluation of program maturity</i>	<p>Evaluated level: depends on agency (MCDOT 2-3, Phoenix 3); overall regionally 1.5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited opportunity for external recruitment -- staff is “stolen” from one another</li> <li>• Uneven level of technical capacity among agencies</li> <li>• Conditions of employment - no job specs, no clear career path for operations staff</li> <li>• ADOT has TOC Operator certification program and stipend (additional salary upon completion)</li> <li>• Some jurisdictions vulnerability to layoffs and freezes. ADOT operators exempt from furloughs and hiring freeze</li> </ul>			
<i>Staff identification of Strategies to get to the next level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop good position descriptions to achieve equivalency across jurisdictions</li> <li>• Need for cooperative training --- among jurisdictions - and with public safety agencies (MPO function?)</li> <li>• Outreach to HR departments, improve their understanding of operator functions and develop appropriate position descriptions</li> <li>• Consider outsourcing of TMCs to gain technical capacity and reduce staffing burden and turnover</li> </ul>			

## APPENDIX A

<b>DIMENSION: Resource Allocation to SO&amp;M</b>				
	<b>LEVEL 1 PERFORMED</b>	<b>LEVEL 2 MANAGED</b>	<b>LEVEL 3 INTEGRATED</b>	<b>LEVEL 4 OPTIMIZING</b>
	Ad hoc resources - often external - for occasional major projects	Resource allocation at project or “initiative” level based on deferring jurisdiction commitment	Long-term/annual budget commitments made (and known) driven by transparent criteria on lifecycle needs basis (clear C/B justification)	SO&M as formal, visible, sustainable line item in each agency’s budget (capital/ operating/ maintenance)
<i>Staff evaluation of program maturity</i>	Evaluated level: 1 (recurring costs); 3 (capital costs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional budget exists and agencies take it seriously, but it is for capital, not operations</li> <li>• ADOT, previously had operations budget, but things have changed recently</li> <li>• Prop 400 sales tax extension has its own portion devoted to capital ITS improvements</li> <li>• With budget cuts, non-capital operations funding (staffing, maintenance) is constant at best, otherwise reduced</li> <li>• Some projects are utilizing capital funding to cover recurring costs on an as-needed basis</li> <li>• Freeway Service Patrol levels tied to increasing freeway miles (funded through Prop 400)</li> <li>• Degree of formality of budgeting for SO&amp;M varies among jurisdictions</li> </ul>			
<i>Staff identification of Strategies to get to the next level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focus on incorporating ITS into standard capital improvement projects</li> <li>• Develop criteria for establishing recurring costs budgets - link capital to operating costs</li> <li>• Develop a revenue stream for recurring costs, which will depend on making a compelling argument for why it’s critical and should not be cut when resources are tight</li> </ul>			

## APPENDIX A

<b>DIMENSION: Collaboration</b>				
	<b>LEVEL 1 PERFORMED</b>	<b>LEVEL 2 MANAGED</b>	<b>LEVEL 3 INTEGRATED</b>	<b>LEVEL 4 OPTIMIZING</b>
	Relationships ad hoc, and on personal basis (public-public, public-private)	Objectives, strategies and performance measures aligned among organized key players (transportation and PSAs) with after-action debriefing	Rationalization/ sharing/ formalization of responsibilities among key player with by co-training, formal agreements and incentives	High level of SO&M coordination among owner/operators (state, local, private)
<i>Staff evaluation of program maturity</i>	<p>Evaluated level: 1.5 with PSAs; 3.5 otherwise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relationships with PSAs are the most informal, the weakest link—esp. when staff turns over</li> <li>• Recent restructuring at DPS has led to loss of person connected to AZTech and MPO</li> <li>• Need better understanding of why PSAs make their decision on freeway closures, procedures</li> <li>• State roads have quick clearance law applied</li> <li>• Best practice study done nationally to examine TIM - result was to develop a pilot coalition to engage local police departments, DPS, traffic operators on Loop 101</li> <li>• Collaboration within cities is at a high level, REACT on arterials</li> <li>• Good relationships with media (3 summits)</li> <li>• DPS CAD and Phoenix Fire pushes data to ADOT and the county</li> </ul>			
<i>Staff identification of Strategies to get to the next level</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement Loop 101 pilot and advance study of incident management collaboration based on results</li> <li>• Expand collaboration beyond planning to include field protocols (incident command, etc.)</li> <li>• Consider co-training, build on federal requirements (TSA’s National Incident Management System)</li> </ul>			

# SO&M Capability Maturity Workshop

## Introduction

**Systems Operations and Management (SO&M)** – SO&M is defined as the program of real-time activities (and supporting ITS infrastructure) focused on maintaining or improving the performance of the existing transportation infrastructure. It is used in response to the causes of both recurring and non-recurring delay, disruption, unreliability, and related safety and security problems.

**Improving SO&M program effectiveness** – Recent research and guidance development - conducted by both TRB and AASHTO - has focused on how to improve the effectiveness of the ITS/SO&M management activities of DOTs. The research suggests that the key challenges to improved effectiveness are no longer primarily technology or understanding of best practice. The effectiveness of DOTs appears to be closely related to development of *the processes and institutional arrangements tailored to the special characteristics of SO&M strategies*.

Capitalizing on the full service potential and cost-effectiveness of SO&M requires that the full range of problem-responsive strategies be applied where appropriate, at state-of-the-practice “aggressiveness” and on a continually improving basis. Reaching full potential requires that supportive processes and institutional arrangements be put in place and managed - just like the other formal core program of DOTs. Several regions (including AZTech) have been undertaking various initiatives to improve their SO&M effectiveness - and struggling with some of these process and institutional issues. The research indicates the importance of focusing on the most critical elements, including:

- *Process* – Development of supportive key technical and business processes such as integration into planning, standardization and documentation and performance management
- *Institutions* – Evolving supportive institutional characteristics such as leadership, organizational structure, staff capacities, external partnerships, etc.

**This workshop** – The purpose of the AZTech Operations Capability Maturity Workshop is to provide a mechanism by which the management of the regional transportation agencies can assess the current state of play regarding SO&M-related processes and institutional arrangement. It will help identify the key next steps to get on a path to continuous improvement. This evaluation will use a methodology focused on the key issues as described below.

## The SO&M Capability Maturity Model (CMM)

### The Capability Maturity Model

Research in SO&M effectiveness has resulted in the development of an “Operations Capability Maturity Model” (CMM) that is designed to support self-evaluation and identification of critical priority “next steps to” putting SO&M activities on a path to continuous improvement and formal program status. There is no black box “magic” about the CMM: it organizes the results of research in this area into a framework that focuses on the factors most essential to effective SO&M and what constitutes logical improvement steps.

The CMM concept was originally developed in the information technology industry and is widely applied in the US and internationally as a means of improving the products and services - as related to effectiveness, quality, costs and schedule and other key performance measures. Some government entities have used the CMM in the past; some government IT contracts require that contractors demonstrate a commitment to “capability maturity”. There are also several entities that provide CMM quality verification for the government. CMM has also been applied to other disciplines in the public and private sector.

## APPENDIX A

The CMM framework to be used in the Workshop has two key features:

- **The identification of key elements** – As noted above, there are several features of process and institutions that experience shows are critical to achieving continuously improving effectiveness. Improved capability maturity is essential in each of the elements.
- **The use of maturity levels** – Discrete levels (stages) of maturity have been observed and related to those developed within other applications of CMM. There are criteria for each level for each element based on research.

### Key Elements

**Process Elements** – Predictable and repeatable processes - both business and technical - within an organization are the key to effective, “surprise free” operation. Achieving predictability and repeatability requires planning for SO&M, standardization and documentation of systems and technology, training and performance measurement. These features are also the tools required for continuous improvement - putting the program on a stepwise path to improved effectiveness. Many of these considerations have long been embodied in how regional transportation agencies do their other core business such as capital project development and maintenance. But the requirements of a high tech, real-time customer service activity like SO&M are different and need to be specifically accommodated with appropriate processes. Organizations that want their SO&M processes to be predictable and repeatable and tailored to the incremental high-tech, low-cost nature of the improvements, must evolve through a series of *stages of maturity* from informal (at the lower end of the scale) to highly routinized and with continuous improvement embedded at the higher end. As each process develops in this way, its capability will improve.

The *Process* elements to be considered in the workshops are:

- *Planning and programming for SO&M* - Programs are planned and executed based on mobility needs. Capital, operating and maintenance costs are properly allocated to ensure that SO&M has its appropriate place in the agencies’ overall improvement programs.
- *Technology and Systems* - Documentation of systems and procedures, including applications selection, conops, architecture and field procedures, are standardized to ensure consistency and reliability.
- *Performance management* including measurement, reporting, and use in continuous improvement to achieve customer service outcomes.

**Institutional elements** – The “architecture” of the organization must be appropriate to promoting the alignment of understanding and objectives, authority and accountability, technical capacity and resources and roles and relationships, as needed for SO&M. The existing culture and organizational structure of most transportation agencies has been established to support the traditional core programs. It is not surprising that a new program focus - with its service and performance focus and its dependence on external partners - requires certain organizational adjustments.

The *Institutional* elements to be considered are:

- *Culture* that reflects an understanding of SO&M potential and its role in the transportation agencies customer service mission and investment context
- *Organizational structure* and staff capabilities to promote technical focus, efficiency and accountability
- *Resource allocation* process for SO&M on a sustainable, transparent and competitive basis
- *External partnerships* aligned to ensure effective application of SO&M strategies

## APPENDIX A

### Capability Levels

Discrete levels (stages) of maturity for the various elements have been defined from an analysis of state DOT SO&M programs - and have been interpreted in terms of the capability maturity concept - ranging from ad hoc/start-up activities to an ideal level. The CMM levels are:

Level 1 - Activities and relationships largely ad hoc, informal and champion-driven - substantially outside the mainstream of other transportation activities

Level 2 - Basic strategy applications understood - but limited accountability and external alignment; processes and support requirements identified, key technology and core capacities under development

Level 3 - Standardized strategy applications implemented in priority contexts and managed for performance; SO&M technical and processes developed, documented and integrated into the regional transportation agencies, partnerships aligned

Level 4 - SO&M as full, sustainable regionwide, established on the basis of continuous improvement with all partners

### The “Rules” of CMM

One of the key features of CMM is its rules of application. They include the following considerations:

- Some of the elements are “harder” to deal with than others. However, the elements included are all essential and must be addressed. Omitting improvement in any one element will inhibit continuous improvement of program effectiveness.
- The element at the lowest level is usually the principal constraint to improvement of program effectiveness and therefore the highest priority (and often most difficult!)
- Performance levels are incremental combinations of the process elements and the institutional arrangements that are needed to support them. Getting on the path to continuous improvement requires replicable, consistent processes & supportive institutional structure.
- For any element, levels cannot be skipped. Steps taken for a given element need to be in place for a period (one year) to become embedded as the basis of the next level of improvement.
- Each level builds on organizational readiness of previous level

### ***CMM process for AZTech self-evaluation***

The workshop is a self-evaluation exercise based on the CMM to be conducted by Phoenix metropolitan area transportation agency staff based on their knowledge of the state of play. The consultants (Steve Lockwood and Phil Tarnoff) are simply the facilitators. The focus of the Workshop is to achieve consensus on the current state of play in the Phoenix metropolitan area with respect to a level for each element, to review the next level as suggested by the framework and to identify the specific actions AZTech might take to move up to that level.

Based on the review of current regional practices, a CMM framework has been established for the AZTech workshop. This framework is attached as Attachment #1.

As an internal agency activity, there are no external judgments. This is not a test!! All comments are confidential. It is essential to be candid about the current state of play.

The draft workshop agenda is attached as Attachment #2. At the Arizona Operations Academy on Tuesday, Steve Lockwood will summarize the conclusions of the workshop.

APPENDIX A

## Workshop CMM Templates

AZTech PROCESS CAPABILITY MATURITY SELF EVALUATION				
ELEMENTS	LEVEL 1 PERFORMED	LEVEL 2 MANAGED	LEVEL 3 INTEGRATED	LEVEL 4 OPTIMIZING
Planning and Programming	No SO&M in statewide or metro planning/program	Statewide plan/program for ITS/SO&M prepared	ITS/SO&M integrated in statewide and metro plans	ITS/SO&M integrated into planning processes including deficiency and investment analysis
Systems and Technology	Ad hoc approaches at regional levels	Statewide and regional conops and architectures developed and documented	Systems & technology standardized and integrated with related other DOT processes	Architectures and technology routinely upgraded to improve performance
Performance Measurement	Some outputs measured and reported	Output data used directly for after-action debriefings and improvements	Outcome measures identified and routinely utilized for program improvements	Performance measures reported externally and used to justify program value

AZTech INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITY MATURITY SELF EVALUATION				
ELEMENT	LEVEL 1 PERFORMED	LEVEL 2 MANAGED	LEVEL 3 INTEGRATED	LEVEL 4 OPTIMIZING
Culture/ Outreach	Middle management heroes promote SO&M	Top management understands SO&M potential and importance to DOT mission	Agency leadership visibly support SO&M in front of external stakeholders	Customer mobility service commitment and accountability accepted as formal core program
Organization/ Staffing	SO&M staff tacked on to existing organizational units	Organizational concept developed (central and regional) and core capacity needs identified	Senior Operations Managers with direct reporting to top management and professionalization of core positions	SO&M as core program and a career path for SO&M professionals is established
Resource Allocation to SO&M	Ad hoc resources for occasional projects	Resource allocation at project or “initiative” level	Budget allocation for operations driven by transparent criteria on lifecycle needs basis	Operations is formal visible sustainable line item in agency’s budget—capital/ operating/ maintenance
Collaboration	Relationships ad hoc, distant and personal	Relationships formalized via MOU with targets	Rationalization of responsibilities by co-training and formal agreements	High level of operations coordination among owner/operators (state, local, private)

## APPENDIX A

# Agenda

### AZTech Operations Capability Maturity Workshop

Monday, May 10, 2010 from 11:30 am to 4:30 pm (Lunch Provided)

MCDOT Durango Complex  
2901 W. Durango, Phoenix, Arizona 85009

11:30 am - 12:00 pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lunch (provided)</li></ul>
12:00 - 12:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Welcome and introductions</li><li>• Background on the process</li><li>• Questions and answers</li></ul>
12:30 - 2:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Using the template, review current AZTech status (level) for each dimension</li><li>• Develop consensus on level of maturity for each dimension</li><li>• Using the maturity level consensus for each dimension, identify the most important specific steps and actions needed to move up to the next level</li><li>• 3 dimensions - 30 minutes each</li></ul>
2:00 - 2:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Break</li></ul>
2:15 - 4:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Using the template, review current AZTech status (level) for each dimension</li><li>• Develop consensus on level of maturity for each dimension</li><li>• Using the maturity level consensus for each dimension, identify the most important specific steps and actions needed to move up to the next level</li><li>• 4 dimensions - approx. 25 minutes each</li></ul>
4:00 - 4:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discussion</li><li>• Next steps</li></ul>