Introduction
The Regional Transportation Council (RTC), in collaboration with Vancouver, WSDOT, Clark County, and C-TRAN has been engaging with IDC to help educate our partners on current trends in smart communities and mobility so that we are better able to create our next strategic roadmap.

The Smart Community Assessment Project starts with a Maturity Benchmark. This allows the IDC Team to uncover the basic needs and requirements in advancing a smart community. The process of developing the Maturity Model requires the agency partners collaborate through interviews, strategy sessions and surveys to assess needs and benchmark our region to other US cities.
Throughout the survey results and benchmarking process, the region does fairly well across a number of areas with solid foundations present in network/connectivity, data privacy, cybersecurity, and a culture encouraging of innovation. Overall, the region is mostly aligned with its peers coming slightly ahead in some areas, such as cybersecurity, and slightly behind in others, such as formal processes and siloed progress.

To take these strengths and build upon them, attention should be given to formalizing and standardizing tools and processes, sharing data and best practices, and education about smart community practices/technologies. This will advance the region and put it on a maturity level with the leaders in the space and help to drive success in future initiatives.
Objectives & Methodologies
IDC conducted an online survey, using its Smart City Maturity benchmark questionnaire. It was sent to VAST member organization employees selected by the project management group.

Data was collected via the 30-minute online survey which was scored and weighted to provide an overall benchmark score.

The objective was to collect data to provide an assessment of the current capabilities and readiness for Smart City & Community initiatives.

The maturity model rates key areas from ‘ad hoc’ to ‘optimized’

The Assessment was done across 5 dimensions (Vision, Culture, Process, Technology and Data).

The region’s scores were then compared to out national benchmarking data.
The Maturity Model

1. AD HOC
   Siloed Experimentation

2. OPPORTUNISTIC
   Intentional Investment

3. REPEATABLE
   Established Processes

4. MANAGED
   Operationalized Outcomes

5. OPTIMIZED
   Systemic Transformation

Proof of concept demonstrated
Tactical, experimental ad hoc projects or pilots; department-based planning without formal governance or citywide coordination

Foundational strategy and governance
Stakeholder buy-in begins led by executive sponsor, proactive collaboration within and between some departments

Repeatable success across multiple organizations
Recurring projects, events, and processes identified for integration and build-out based on improved outcomes

Citywide transformation brings improved service delivery
Technology and data assets shared and governed by formal systems for work/data flows, new services and policies nudge behavior change

Innovation and continuous improvement bring differentiation
Sustainable agile innovation, strategy, IT, and governance for an integrated system of systems
Measuring the Critical Success Factors

- **Vision**
  - Strategy
  - Leadership
  - Business Case
  - Budgeting

- **Culture**
  - Innovation
  - Citizen Engagement
  - Transparency

- **Process**
  - Governance/Controls
  - Partnerships
  - Organization Structure
  - Measurement

- **Technology**
  - IT Architecture
  - Network Infrastructure
  - Citizen Data Architecture
  - Innovation Accelerators Adoption

- **Data**
  - Citizen Data Protection
  - Open Data
  - Data Discovery & Analysis
  - Data Sharing
Preliminary and Custom Questions
Included in the survey were both preliminary questions as well as some custom additions. These, while informative and valuable do not contribute to the overall maturity benchmarking.

• Overall we had a good number of respondents across the member organizations, at different levels of knowledge and decision making, and from different areas of expertise.

• Both the knowledge of ‘smart cities’ concepts and the knowledge of what the VAST program is was lacking. This shows a real opportunity to communicate and educate across the region.

• This fact is also reflected in responses that rated “identifying and coordinating areas of common interest” as the most important thing that could be done in the region.
## Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Link #</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>Invited</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RTC (Includes Onsite Session Attendees)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>C-Tran</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>77</strong></td>
<td><strong>181</strong></td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Respondents

Percent of Total Completions (77 Total)

- RTC: 43%
- Vancouver: 12%
- Clark County: 13%
- C-Tran: 23%
- WSDOT: 9%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTC (Includes Onsite Session Attendees)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark County</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Tran</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are Smart Community initiatives currently on your department/organization’s roadmap?

- Yes, currently using or implementing a pilot/test/proof-of-concept: 18.2%
- Yes, currently using or implementing a project (post-pilot phase): 7.8%
- Yes, currently researching with a plan to implement Smart Community solutions within one year: 2.6%
- Yes, currently researching with a plan to implement Smart Community solutions within two to three years: 3.9%
- Yes, currently researching with a plan to implement Smart Community solutions in three years or more: 16.9%
- No, it is not in our current plan though I am familiar with this concept: 19.5%
- No, it is not in our current plan and I am not familiar with this concept: 6.5%
- Don’t know: 24.7%

31.2% of respondents answered either ‘don’t know’ or that they weren’t familiar with smart community concepts.
Which of the following best describes your department/organization's function?

- Transportation (Traffic management, Traveler Information Systems, Transportation Planning, Parking)
- Other
- Economic Development, Urban Planning, Community Development
- Executive Offices, Government Administration
- Innovation, Technology, IT
Survey Respondents

Which of the following best describes your job title or role?

- Elected Officials or chief policymaker
- Department Head or Division Manager
- Supervisor or Manager, non-IT
- Supervisor or Manager, IT
- Non-supervisory, non-IT
- Non-supervisory, IT
- Public Safety
- Technician, Operator Specialist, Inspections, Field-Worker
Survey Respondents

At what level of your organization are you most comfortable responding to questions?

- County, district, city or town-wide (36.4%)
- Line of business, agency or department level (i.e. City Police Department, Public Works Department) (36.4%)
- Program/group level (i.e. Parking Enforcement within the Police Department) (27.3%)
Which of the following best describes your knowledge of the VAST program?

- 20.8%: I have not heard of it
- 18.2%: I have heard of it, but do not really know what they do
- 16.9%: I know what they do, but do not interact with them
- 11.7%: I know what they do, and my department/organization is directly impacted by their work
- 14.3%: I know what they do, and interact with them occasionally
- 18.2%: I know what they do, and interact with them regularly

40% of respondents answered either they had not heard of VAST or that they didn’t know what they do.
What factors are the most important for policy makers to consider in developing a regional smart communities' strategy for transportation? (multiple choices allowed).

- Modal choice: 13.0%
- Policy and Process Frameworks: 23.4%
- Access to transportation choices: 31.2%
- Impact on the transportation system: 32.5%
- Equity: 36.4%
- Staffing and Resource limitations: 39.0%
Because of our unique situation as part of bi-state region with the Portland metropolitan area, what do you see as the key areas for coordination in developing a robust smart communities’ vision? (multiple choices allowed).
Maturity Benchmark Results
The VISION dimension includes strategy, leadership, business cases, and budget responses. As shown, the region is slightly behind the *thrivers* in the space and could advance by focusing on standardizing and centralizing core processes for budgeting and smart community leadership, moving it from isolated departments to a more prominent and visible place that can function across verticals and interact cross-jurisdictionally.
Q3. Which of the following best describes your organization’s approach to Smart Community STRATEGY?

- No Smart Community strategy or vision exists. Individual Smart Community strategies are at the departmental level. Strategy documentation is inconsistent. (26.0%)
- Common multiple department Smart Community strategy. Vision, mission and strategic goals are documented but are still siloed and/or inconsistent. (41.6%)
- Smart Community strategy involves all departments and is accepted community-wide. Documentation shows consistent vision, strategy and includes clear Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and associated timelines. (23.4%)
- Smart Community strategy defines a consistent community-wide view of the future. Smart Community strategy involves all departments and is accepted community-wide. All aspects, including strategic planning and governance processes are documented. (9.1%)
Q4. Which statement best describes your organization's Smart Community LEADERSHIP?

- Decentralized, or uncoordinated, leadership for Smart Community strategy execution. 59.7%
- There is a community/agency-wide executive sponsor for the Smart Community vision, but collaboration for Smart Community strategy execution is still project-based and sporadic. 26.0%
- There is a community/agency-wide Smart Community executive sponsor who coordinates multiple organizations for strategy execution. An informal team is placed in charge of major Smart Community projects. 2.6%
- There is a community/agency-wide Smart Community executive sponsor who oversees Smart Community joint committees that bring together high-level officials to agree on strategic decisions with a formal project management team. 7.8%
- A formal group of leaders actively supports Smart Community strategy execution, with a formal Smart Community program management office team that oversees projects and strategic planning. 3.9%
Q5. When making the BUSINESS CASE for new Smart Community projects or initiatives, what type of justification is required for project approval?

- 24.7%: Defined business problem with identified project costs and expected cost savings.
- 36.4%: Defined business problem, and a formal return on investment (ROI), cost savings or cost/benefit evaluation method at the project level (without a common, organization-wide justification method).
- 10.4%: Defined business problem, and a formal ROI, cost/benefit or performance evaluation method that is widely accepted throughout the Community.
- 15.6%: Defined business problem, and a Formal ROI, cost/benefit or performance evaluation method that includes triple bottom line metrics (financial, social, and environmental benefits).
- 13.0%: Not required for Smart Community projects or initiatives.
Q6. Which best describes your organization's approach to BUDGETING for Smart Community initiatives?

- 51.9%: Budgeting is characterized by siloed (department level) processes and decentralized decision-making for Smart Community projects.
- 15.6%: Some multi-department budgets and decision-making for major Smart Community projects. Leadership discusses sustainability of funding for Smart Community initiatives across departments.
- 22.1%: Some multi-department budgeting and decision-making for major Smart Community projects but sustainable funding for Smart Community initiatives (i.e., a line item within the budget) is not yet in place.
- 2.6%: Community-wide sustainable funding for Smart Community projects with annual and multi-year planning and budgeting for Smart Community initiatives.
- 7.8%: Smart Community budgets are allocated based on city/region-wide impact and heavily reliant on business case metrics and analysis.
The CULTURE dimension includes innovation, constituent engagement, transparency, workplace culture and digital inclusion culture responses. As shown, VAST agencies are fairly strong in this category but still slightly behind the *thrivers* in the space and could advance by focusing on creating methods to manage risk in innovation, being proactive in sharing info/data about projects, and broadening constituent engagement.
Q7. Which of the following best describes your organization’s approach to INNOVATION?

- 40.3%: Opportunistic innovation supported by risk-management processes (iterative processes, trial and error, low cost trials, etc.).
- 18.2%: Some support for opportunistic innovation, but we don’t have set methods to manage risk as we try new things.
- 16.9%: Operationalized approach to innovation supported by risk-management processes (pilot management, iterative processes, trial and error, low cost trials).
- 10.4%: Innovation is encouraged, institutionalized, and managed for all departments with established incentives and the implementation of rapid iterations to scale new initiatives.
- 14.3%: Little innovation within an overall risk-adverse culture.
Q8. Which statement best describes your organization's approach to CONSTITUENT ENGAGEMENT?

- **We mainly use traditional methods to inform and engage the community (public meetings, web sites, working groups that may include citizens).** - 49.4%
- **Experimenting with community engagement using digital tools (social networks, hackathons, and mobile apps) as well as other interactive ideas like games, surveys, information workshops.** - 15.6%
- **Using tools to foster community engagement using partially personalized direct communications, digital tools, and gamification (such as mobile apps, social media, hackathons), but it is not consistently applied for all services.** - 16.9%
- **All community-facing departments use established tools across multiple channels (dynamic portals, social networks, hackathons, mobile apps) to engage communities in two-way interactions.** - 15.6%
- **A formalized, city/region-wide multi-channel engagement model enables ongoing inclusive, personalized, and interactive collaboration with the community.** - 2.6%
Q9. Which statement best describes your organization's TRANSPARENCY?

- Organization does not share information on projects, data use and data collection to the public. 3.9%
- Information on projects, data use and data collection are available to the public if requested. 39.0%
- Information on projects, data use and data collection are proactively made available to the public by some organizations, or departments, but not all. 19.5%
- Transparency is a stated goal and priority; information is easy to find and proactively provided on projects, data use and data collection in a consistent manner. 15.6%
- Transparency is central to service delivery; information on project, data use and data collection are publicly available, easy to find, and consistently and proactively provided with regular reviews and timely public updates. 22.1%
Q10. Which statement best describes your organization's WORKPLACE CULTURE?

- 37.7%: Shared mission and vision contributing to workplace culture present, but we are not asked to help define it.
- 24.7%: Workplace culture is engaging and inclusive and contributes to my job and the mission.
- 18.2%: A shared culture amongst the various departments/jurisdictions but not one holistic culture in the region.
- 13.0%: Not a known or cohesive culture in our organization.
- 6.5%: Workplace culture present, but we are not asked to help define it.
Q11. Which statement best describes your organization's DIGITAL INCLUSION CULTURE?

- **26.0%**
  - Basic compliance with accessibility and inclusion standards is inconsistent or sporadic and not all services and information are accessible regardless of user’s physical ability, technology ownership, or digital literacy.

- **39.0%**
  - Basic compliance with standards and policies to ensure that most services and information are accessible regardless of user’s physical ability, technology ownership, or digital literacy.

- **18.2%**
  - Proactive efforts beyond basic compliance to ensure that all services and information are accessible regardless of user’s physical ability, technology ownership, or digital literacy.

- **9.1%**
  - Dedicated staff ensure compliance so that all services and information are accessible regardless of user’s physical ability, technology ownership, or digital literacy. Some departments begin to apply innovative ideas to ensure digital inclusion.

- **7.8%**
  - Agency-wide investments driven by consistently applied standard guidelines and processes. Metrics include continuous progress on triple bottom line outcomes.
The PROCESS dimension includes partnerships, policy and governance, performance management, organizational structure and procurement responses. As shown, the region is behind the *thrivers* in the space and overall this is their weakest dimension. Progress can be made by standardizing and centralizing processes and innovation teams, creating formal policies and governance structures especially for procurement, and defining trackable key performance metrics.
Q12. Which statement best describes your organization manages partnerships and external relationships?

- **53.2%** We mainly have traditional vendor relationships based on purchases of equipment/supplies/technology/services.
- **27.3%** We are beginning to develop an ecosystem of interested partners such as academia, foundations, non-profits, utilities, business groups, constituent groups etc. around a specific set of Smart Community issues.
- **11.7%** We collaborate with a set of partners (academia, non-profits, utilities, business and constituent groups etc.) by creating to working groups that meet regularly with consistent attendance.
- **2.6%** We have a well-developed Smart Community ecosystem involving academia, citizens, and suppliers using formal MOUs, partnership agreements and/or long-term contractual relationships.
- **5.2%** We have created, or we belong to, a Smart Community expertise center involving government, academia, citizens, and suppliers.
Q13. Which statement best describes your organization's smart community policy and governance?

- **No written policies or guidelines around Smart Communities (such as for data management, privacy and transparency, operations etc.)**: 67.5%
- **Written policies or guidelines, but they have not been formally adopted or enforced**: 9.1%
- **Written and adopted policies or guidelines that have been adopted and are enforced**: 10.4%
- **Formally accepted policies and guidelines, and a standardized approach and framework for implementation and enforcement**: 9.1%
- **A flexible, semi-automated approach is implemented to quickly respond to digital developments with guidelines and policies**: 3.9%
Q14. Which statement best describes your organization's methods of MEASURING THE PERFORMANCE of an initiative or project?

- 58.4%: No defined specific Smart Community KPIs (key performance indicators) or criteria that measure success or failure of a project.
- 24.7%: Some specific Smart Community KPIs or criteria that measure the level of success of a project, but they are poorly defined and/or qualitative.
- 10.4%: Defined Smart Community KPIs to measure the level of success of a project, but they are still inconsistently tracked.
- 2.6%: Defined Smart Community KPIs to measure the level of success of a project that are high-quality, quantitative, and consistently tracked.
- 3.9%: Defined Smart Community KPIs to measure the level of success of a project that are high-quality, quantitative, and consistently tracked, and we have continuous assessments to improve measurement and tracking of projects.
Q15. Which statement best describes your organization's ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE?

- **75.3%**
  - No centralized Smart Community team, or we have a centralized team with a limited role.

- **9.1%**
  - Centralized Smart Community team that supports innovation and initiatives of organizations in the region.

- **5.2%**
  - Centralized Smart Community team that acts as an internal center of expertise for within departments or organizations, supported by a centralized team that takes care of region-wide execution.

- **6.5%**
  - Smart Community team leads embedded within departments or organizations, and interaction between cross-functional/departmental teams.

- **3.9%**
  - There is a Smart Community program management office that acts as the central team supporting regional project execution.
Q16. What statement best describes how your organization is PROCURING Smart Community technologies?

- **66.2%**
  - No clear process or templates to approach buying new or innovative technologies.

- **6.5%**
  - Started testing new processes and templates to support buying new technologies or working with start-ups and small companies.

- **10.4%**
  - Have developed a clear process that addresses need areas for modern tech purchases, such as RFIs, reverse pitches, vendors days, but this has not been widely adopted.

- **10.4%**
  - Have developed a clear process that addresses need areas for modern tech purchases, such as RFIs, reverse pitches, vendors days, which are widely adopted.

- **6.5%**
  - Procuring technology is agile and responsive to the broader tech marketplace functions. Process is well documented and templated to buy digital innovations and technologies.
Q17. What statement best describes how your organization finances Smart Community technologies?

- 71.4%: Financing initiatives rely on traditional methods only, such as capital/operations budgets.
- 19.5%: Financing initiatives rely mostly traditional methods, such as capital/operations budgets and grants, but begins to pilot new models such as public-private or academic partnerships or performance-based contracting.
- 3.9%: Financing initiatives includes both traditional methods and larger scale uses of new models such as public-private or academic partnerships or performance-based contracting.
- 2.6%: Financing initiatives rely heavily on non-traditional models and they work within the department/city/region but there is no clear way to create or manage them.
- 2.6%: Financing initiatives rely heavily on non-traditional models and they work highly efficiently within the department/city/region, being encouraged and well managed.
The TECHNOLOGY dimension includes platforms, IoT deployment, network connectivity, cybersecurity, and the use of disruptive technologies. As shown, the region again is only slightly behind the *thrivers* and even exceeds them in certain areas, with high marks for cybersecurity. Improvement can come by moving more applications to the cloud, deploying IoT/Sensors, and finding innovative disruptive technology projects to pilot.
Q18. Which statement best describes your organization's technology PLATFORMS?

- 27.3%: We only use traditional on-premise solutions with limited mobile or cloud uses.
- 7.8%: Mix of on-premise and cloud solutions, but they are managed by vendors/partners only.
- 22.1%: On-premise, mobile, and cloud-based technologies but managed/deployed in a siloed manner.
- 23.4%: On-premise, mobile, and cloud-based technologies with some standards and limited central management.
- 19.5%: Centrally managed advanced and complex digital ecosystem that comprises on-premise, cloud, mobile, software as a service, vendor managed, and edge devices.
Q19. Which statement best describes your organization's use and adoption of sensors/cameras deployed in the field and the INTERNET OF THINGS?

- **58.4%** Limited or basic levels of sensors, cameras, and advanced devices deployed and in use.
- **9.1%** Focused build out of sensors, cameras, and advanced devices in strategic, localized areas for specific department-level projects (i.e. acoustic sensors or video in high crime areas, parking sensors in congested business districts).
- **7.8%** Focused build out of sensors, cameras, and advanced devices which are leveraged for multiple projects typically within a single department or organization (i.e. cameras may be used for public safety, but data isn't shared with transportation).
- **22.1%** Large-scale deployment of sensors, cameras, and advanced devices that are leveraged for multiple projects and shared across multiple departments and/or organizations.
- **2.6%** Ubiquitous, or almost ubiquitous, coverage city-wide of sensors, cameras, and advanced devices that are leveraged for across multiple departments and organizations for multiple uses.
Q20. Which statement best describes your organization's LEVEL OF NETWORK CONNECTIVITY?

- 6.5% Suffers from poor reliability and limited bandwidth. Inconsistent availability across geography or departments.
- 28.6% Mostly reliable but may lack bandwidth across all departments/geographies for day-to-day operations.
- 23.4% Reliable and with sufficient bandwidth for operations but lacks ability to scale for new use cases.
- 13.0% Reliable with sufficient capacity to scale across org. Cellular and other forms of connectivity not broadly available.
- 28.6% Secure and reliable with high uptime across entire org. 5G and other forms of connectivity being actively developed.
Q21. Which statement best describes your organization's CYBERSECURITY?

- **2.6%** Minimal security controls, tools, and standards are in place.
- **11.7%** Basic tools for security in place but not applied consistently. Security patches may be inconsistent.
- **11.7%** Security patches deployed regularly, but security functions not consistent across all areas/applications.
- **31.2%** Basic security audits conducted. Security protocols in place for day to day operations.
- **42.9%** Regular security audits including penetration testing. Training for all staff on security. Security standards effective across all applications.
Q22. Which statement best describes your organization's use and adoption of DISRUPTIVE TECHNOLOGIES?

- 67.5%: Currently little or no adoption or use of disruptive technologies.
- 2.6%: Disruptive technologies are considered as options for new projects or initiatives, but we have few cases of using them.
- 13.0%: Pilots of some disruptive technologies are being carried out, such as 3D printing for zoning and/or drones for public safety.
- 7.8%: Implementation and use of some disruptive technologies happening at scale in the region.
- 9.1%: We have implemented the use of some disruptive technologies at scale in the region and have policies on acceptable use.
The DATA dimension includes privacy, use and analysis, discovery and quality, sharing, and advanced uses. VAST agencies are aligned with their peers for the most part, with opportunities for improvement being creating standard and universal data catalogs and documentation, sharing analysis tools/techniques and data across silos in a repeatable fashion, and innovating with advanced uses of data such as machine learning.
Q23. Which statement best describes your organization's approach to DATA PRIVACY?

- 3.9%: No tools or standards exist for protecting privacy when data is used internally or externally.
- 15.6%: Some tools or standards are in place but inconsistent application across departments or use cases.
- 20.8%: Tools are in place and effective, but they vary by department and may not be managed centrally.
- 23.4%: Tools are in place, effective and centrally managed. They are consistently used but without ongoing audits or improvements.
- 36.4%: Tools are in place, effective and used across all analytics and data sharing functions. Effectiveness audited and there is a process of continuous improvement.
Q24. At what stage is your organization in terms of deploying and using analytics or business intelligence software for DATA USE AND ANALYSIS?

- **39.0%**: Data specialists use analytic methodologies for ad hoc requests, standard reporting. Limited automation is in place to for data analysis.
- **39.0%**: Multiple sources used for analysis. Some standard tools in place for dashboards and reporting.
- **11.7%**: Automated analytic techniques are used by specialists and non-specialists to explore data from multiple sources and provide interactive reports.
- **5.2%**: Analytics support workflows in near real-time detecting patterns, root causes and predicting events. Policies and operations are more data-driven than not. Cross-domain analysis common.
- **5.2%**: Analytics are embedded in everyday workflows in real-time. Automated tools apply metrics to KPIs for strategy execution. Consistently data-driven policies in operation.
Q25. To what extent do you agree with the following as related to DATA DISCOVERY AND QUALITY to support decision making?

- **9.1%**
  - Data is not cataloged, in poor quality, and generally unavailable to broader user base.

- **27.3%**
  - Documentation exists but is not consistent. Data quality is variable. No program exists to manage data.

- **31.2%**
  - Data catalogs and dictionaries are available but are not for all data. Data partially standardized. No enterprise program in place to manage data.

- **23.4%**
  - Data catalogs available, data dictionaries are current, data standards in select areas. Programs in place to address quality.

- **9.1%**
  - Data catalogs available, data dictionaries are current, data standards widely implemented, robust master data management program in place.
Q26. Which statement best describes your organization's approach to DATA SHARING between departments or organizations?

- 29.9%: Data sharing across departments is dependent on bilateral, sporadic collaboration and non-repeatable/scalable methods.
- 23.4%: Some shared mechanisms exist for the transport and availability of data. Little to no open data available or may be one-off projects.
- 18.2%: Data access is limited to single organizations due to issues with data access, privacy/security, and integration.
- 13.0%: Data standards and mechanisms by which to share data are available region-wide but may not be systematic. Open data exists but is inconsistent.
- 15.6%: Data sharing standards and technologies are highly promoted throughout the org. Open data offerings are robust and timely.
Q27. Which statement best describes your organization’s approach to ADVANCED USES OF DATA?

- **67.5%**: No capacity exists for data usage beyond standard reporting and ad hoc requests.
- **18.2%**: Some AI/machine learning functionality is explored as offered in existing vendor solutions.
- **10.4%**: AI/machine learning functionality is explored but within departments for specific use cases. Some functionality or in-house development shared across organizations.
- **1.3%**: AI/machine learning are used in multiple departments for key services; there is staff to manage centrally with some in-house development.
- **2.6%**: AI/machine learning tools are embedded in several mission critical processes. Promoted widely and managed/developed centrally. Operational improvements are recognized.
Overall, survey respondents overwhelmingly rank the region as ‘at par’ or ‘lags behind’ their peers when it comes to smart community strategy and execution. This is accurate with the 5 dimensions scores when compared to peers and shows that the survey takers have a good sense of where they are, including strengths and weaknesses.
Overall VAST agencies ranks in the middle of their peers in maturity, ahead of regions that are lagging or just surviving but not quite at the level of thriving programs. This confirms respondents' views on where the area is, as well as gives clear direction on opportunities to grow and expand the initiatives VAST spearheads. Moving from the ad hoc to more formal/managed approaches and processes by breaking down silos and creating standards to do so will pay dividends.
VAST Overall Maturity Score

Strengths

• Inclusive and supportive workplace culture and vision
• Well managed Cybersecurity program
• Strong Data privacy principles
• Network / Connectivity
• Good overall support levels for innovation

Weaknesses

• Lack of formal policies
• Siloed innovation / budgeting / planning
• No standard KPIs to measure success
• Minimally proactive data/info sharing
• Communication / Education about VAST and Smart Communities
Conclusion & Recommendations
The Vancouver/Clark County region is one with a lot of strengths and a growing culture of innovation that shines through not only in the responses to the survey but also from the leadership of the various member organizations.

Next step in increasing their smart communities maturity will be to formalize and standardize processes, technologies, and metrics of success in order to break down silos and foster a more cohesive and consistent approach to smart communities and transportation.
IDC offers these recommendations on how the region can move their transportation and smart community initiatives forward with specific actions (next slide) designed to address each one of the 5 dimensions analyzed:

• Break down silos within and between jurisdictions
• Standardize how projects are planned, documented, and measured
• Help members find resources to meet the demands of innovation
• Increase communication/education opportunities at all levels
• Create channels for sharing of tools, data, information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Launch Emerging Smart Leaders Program</td>
<td>Smart community initiatives are siloed and in departments, encourage member organizations to elevate these efforts and innovation to a higher centralized role/team within their jurisdictions to coordinate and align resources. Creating an initiative that can help define, fill, and train people for such a role will be an important step.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Build Innovation Network</td>
<td>Build a group around the VAST partnership model that can centralize innovation across members and create a model that members can use in their own jurisdictions. This will begin to break down the silos of innovation and elevate the good work being done at department levels to a higher and more coordinated place. By using a federated model it still keeps control local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Templatize Procurement / Budgeting / Tech Assessment / Performance Management tools and forms</td>
<td>It is difficult to do performance measurement without an easy ability to compare like processes. While many processes are similar due to legal compliance reasons the way they are executed often is not. Build a library of documents to be used by members to streamline the process for budgeting, buying, assessing, governing, sharing and measuring the success of data, transportation, and innovation projects across the region. It will help jump start the process, speed up time to implementation, and make results comparable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Foster Disruptive Pilot Programs</td>
<td>Encourage the adoption of disruptive technologies including IoT by convening vendors, building partnerships, and working with academic and civic tech groups to aggressively pilot innovative new approaches in the area. By serving as a gateway to innovative projects and groups for the region, VAST can help these projects get off the ground with ability to equally serve the different membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Launch Regional Data Program</td>
<td>Increase proactive sharing, both amongst agencies, departments, and with the public by creating a formal program, including both open and protected data, to both catalog/document information assets as well as maintain and share data to stakeholders, partners, and the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Develop and Implement VAST Engagement Plan</td>
<td>With so many respondents not knowing about what the VAST partnership is and can help with, there is a need to plan better communications to keep people informed and engaged with what is happening as well as what is possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Create Smart Communities Education Plan</td>
<td>Implement a strategy to level-set a broad cross section of stakeholders around smart community strategies and technologies, i.e. &quot;Scale up&quot; the IDC onsite sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>VAST @ Scale</td>
<td>The #1 reported concern for policy makers to consider was 'staff &amp; resource limitations', consider how VAST can convene partnerships and opportunities to share talent and resources better across the area to help stakeholders achieve goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>