Implementing the Roadmap

Legislative, Executive, Regulatory and Administrative Actions for 2027–2031

Centralize what creates enterprise value.
Preserve autonomy where mission specialization creates value.

Peter Mantos
Mantos IT Consulting, Inc.
November 2026

Important legal and drafting limitation
The author is not a lawyer and has never drafted legislation. This document is a policy and implementation analysis, not legal advice and not proposed bill language. References to statutes, administrative rules, executive orders, personnel rules, procurement requirements or other legal authorities identify areas for review and possible action. Any legislative, regulatory or executive language should be developed and validated by qualified counsel, legislative drafting staff and the responsible state agencies before use.

Purpose and Implementation Approach

This package of documents establishes a policy direction, governance spectrum, executive case, five-year roadmap and evidence base. The Roadmap document adds two implementation requirements that materially affect this action map: formal functional accountability between agency CIO/IT leaders and the State CIO, and a sustainable DoIT operating and financial model. This document translates those requirements into an implementation agenda.

The central implementation principle is to use the least burdensome durable mechanism that actually supplies the required decision right. Existing authority should be operationalized before new authority is created. Legislation should be reserved for genuine gaps, structural or funding changes that require statute, or governance mechanisms that need durability across administrations.

A Significant Finding: The State CIO Already Has Substantial Enterprise Authority

Section 9-27-6 NMSA 1978 already gives the Secretary of Information Technology, acting as State CIO, significant enterprise responsibilities: agency IT planning; reduction of duplication; interoperability and data accessibility; project oversight and approval before procurement; data standardization, ownership and sharing; architecture and strategic-plan compliance; review of IT appropriation requests; project risk and lifecycle oversight; cost-recovery and rate recommendations; and other IT functions assigned by the Governor. [S19]

The 2025 amendment is important. HB 618, enacted as Chapter 51, shifted DoIT away from approving IT contracts and procurement documents and toward approving IT projects before procurement. The implementation model should respect that legislative choice: GSD/State Purchasing owns procurement execution; DoIT/State CIO owns enterprise technology governance and project approval; DFA owns relevant budget and fiscal controls. Those systems should be connected so procurement cannot bypass an enterprise technology decision. [S19, S20]

Accordingly, the first task is not a broad new State CIO powers bill. It is an authority-to-roadmap crosswalk identifying: (1) authority that already exists but is not fully operationalized; (2) authority that can be clarified through executive direction, rule or policy; and (3) genuine statutory gaps.

New evidence since the September edition: The LFC's October 20, 2026 evaluation of IT procurement, implementation and oversight reports a combined $456 million increase over initial estimates for four major ongoing projects. Its recommendations reinforce a separate project-delivery reform track: modular procurement where appropriate, government product ownership, working-capability demonstrations and outcome-based vendor accountability. This is complementary to—not a substitute for—the enterprise governance and authority crosswalk. [S31]

1. Use New Mexico's Existing Functional-Governance Pattern

New Mexico already governs several statewide administrative disciplines through enterprise authorities that reach functionally into otherwise autonomous executive agencies. The relationships are not identical, and technology should not copy any one of them mechanically. They do, however, establish a useful operating principle: statewide accountability can coexist with agency administrative reporting and mission ownership. [S22, S23, S24, S25]

Function	Enterprise authority / mechanism	Agency-level relationship	Lesson for technology
Financial governance	DFA / State Controller; statewide accounting controls and approval of delegated agency CFO assignments.	Agency CFO remains embedded in the agency while operating within statewide fiscal rules and controls.	Functional accountability can be formal and consequential without moving the entire function into the central organization.
Procurement governance	State Purchasing Agent; statewide CPO certification, registration and procurement authority.	Agency CPO is agency-based but must be approved/certified under the statewide procurement system.	Enterprise professional authority can govern agency practitioners while agencies retain operating responsibility.
Personnel governance	State Personnel Director / State Personnel Office; classified-service rules, approvals and statewide HR administration.	Agency HR organizations execute agency personnel work within statewide rules and selected transaction controls.	A statewide function can set standards, qualifications and controls while delivery remains distributed.
Legal governance	Governor-level legal leadership; documented New Mexico practice includes supervision of agency general counsels and gubernatorial appointment of some agency GCs.	Agency general counsels serve agency leadership while participating in administration-wide legal governance.	Executive functional coordination across agency professional leaders is an established New Mexico practice.
Technology governance — proposed	State CIO; enterprise architecture, portfolio, project approval, standards, data, interoperability, shared platforms and lifecycle governance.	Agency CIO/IT director remains accountable to agency leadership for mission delivery, with formal functional accountability to the State CIO for enterprise responsibilities.	Use an explicit functional relationship tied to defined decision rights, escalation and professional expectations — not wholesale transfer of mission ownership.

2. First 100 Days — Executive and Administrative Actions

Action	Lead	Mechanism	Required result
Approve target operating model	Governor	Executive direction	Adopt Hybrid Enterprise / Enterprise-Led direction for common capabilities; preserve agency mission ownership and documented exceptions.
Establish cabinet-level enterprise technology governance	Governor / State CIO	Executive order or equivalent directive	Create recurring enterprise decision forum with DFA, GSD, SPO, agency CIO representation and legal participation as needed.
Complete authority-to-roadmap crosswalk	State CIO / Governor's counsel / agency counsel	Legal and administrative review	Map every roadmap decision right to statute, rule, policy and executive authority; identify actual gaps.
Formalize agency CIO participation	Governor / State CIO / agency secretaries	Executive / administrative direction	Define functional accountability, required participation, escalation, enterprise standards and mission-accountability boundary.
Create statewide technology baseline	State CIO / agencies	Administrative process	Inventory systems, projects, lifecycle risk, technical debt, duplication, cost, dependencies, cloud patterns and enterprise-platform use.
Baseline DoIT operating and financial model	DoIT / DFA / Rate Committee	Financial and administrative review	Document P-code/program constraints, authorized vs. funded staffing, vacancy assumptions, service rates, overhead allocation, reserves/funds, utilization and barriers to new services. [S29]
Design portfolio and investment governance	State CIO / DFA / GSD	Administrative process	Define thresholds, decision criteria, exception path and integration with budget, procurement and project certification.
Select 2–3 cross-agency pilots	Enterprise governance body	Executive / administrative action	Use real service journeys to prove identity, workflow, integration, data-sharing and accountability patterns.

3. 2027 Authority, Rule and Process Package

The 2027 package should be built from the crosswalk, not from a presumption that every objective requires legislation.

In May 2026, DoIT proposed repealing and replacing 1.12.5 and 1.12.9 NMAC to modernize project oversight and certification requirements. As of November 5, 2026, the published NMAC continued to reflect the existing rules rather than the proposed replacements. Future changes to oversight and certification requirements should account for the final disposition of this rulemaking. [S33]

Policy area	Required decision / capability	Preferred mechanism	Lead
State CIO decision rights	Operationalize existing §9-27-6 authority for architecture, portfolio, project approval, lifecycle governance and enterprise exceptions.	Executive direction / DoIT rule or policy first; statute only for identified gaps.	Governor / State CIO / counsel
Agency CIO functional accountability	Define participation, enterprise responsibilities, professional expectations and escalation while preserving agency administrative reporting and mission accountability.	Executive framework; coordinate with SPO and agency enabling authorities.	Governor / State CIO / SPO
Portfolio & investment	Connect statewide portfolio decisions to agency plans, appropriations, procurement, certification, reuse and retirement.	DoIT/DFA/GSD process; rule where necessary.	State CIO / DFA / GSD
Architecture & cloud	Make architecture/cloud guardrails and documented exceptions operational before major commitments.	DoIT rule/policy under existing authority where sufficient.	State CIO / DoIT
Data & interoperability	Operationalize standards, ownership/stewardship, lawful sharing and reusable exchange patterns.	Use §9-27-6 data authority first; add structure only where needed.	State CIO / agencies / counsel
Shared platforms	Establish enterprise-first selection, service levels, funding and exceptions for workflow, content, integration, identity and collaboration.	Policy/service governance + procurement/budget alignment.	State CIO / DFA / GSD
Operating & financial model	Separate enterprise governance, shared fixed infrastructure and consumption services; create sustainable funding and transparent allocation.	Budget/appropriation, Rate Committee, DoIT/DFA administrative changes; statutory amendment only if required.	DoIT / DFA / Rate Committee
Procurement alignment	Ensure technology approval occurs before procurement while State Purchasing retains procurement execution.	Joint DoIT/GSD process consistent with 2025 §9-27-6 amendment.	DoIT / GSD / DFA

4. Enterprise Technology Funding Is a Governance Mechanism

A Hybrid Enterprise operating model cannot be sustained if enterprise governance and statewide fixed costs are recovered primarily by increasing the unit prices charged to voluntary consumers of individual DoIT services. The financial model must reinforce the operating model rather than reward agencies for behaving as independent buyers.

New Mexico's current statutory model already recognizes cost recovery and a Rate Committee. DoIT's published rate methodology is built around direct and indirect costs, usage, asset replacement and annual federal cost-recovery reconciliation. That is appropriate for many billable services, but the roadmap introduces capabilities whose value is statewide even when no single agency consumes a discrete billable unit: enterprise architecture, EPMO/portfolio governance, cybersecurity governance, cloud control-tower governance, data governance, enterprise vendor management and statewide identity architecture. [S21, S26, S27]

Cost class	Examples	Recommended funding logic
Enterprise governance	State CIO functions; enterprise architecture; EPMO/portfolio governance; cybersecurity governance; data governance; cloud governance/control plane; statewide standards and strategy.	Fund broadly through General Fund appropriation, statewide assessment, or another enterprise allocation. Do not force all costs into individual service-unit prices.
Shared fixed infrastructure	Network backbone; shared security infrastructure; enterprise directory; cloud landing zone/control plane; integration infrastructure; common ITSM.	Allocate fixed costs using a rational statewide methodology tied to beneficiaries — e.g., FTE, scale, utilization, or a blended allocator.
Consumption services	Microsoft licensing; compute/storage; hosting; phone/radio; developer hours; specialized managed services.	Charge based primarily on attributable consumption and service cost, with transparent service-specific overhead.

California provides a useful current comparison: it separately recovers broad-benefit statewide technology governance and enterprise project oversight through a Statewide Services Distribution allocated by agency FTE, while maintaining consumption rates for individual services and a blended allocation for shared network infrastructure. New Mexico need not copy California's formula, but the separation of enterprise-wide cost from consumption pricing directly addresses the incentive problem. [S28]

- Determine which DoIT functions are statewide obligations that should be appropriated or broadly assessed rather than embedded in optional service rates.
- Determine which fixed enterprise infrastructure costs should be allocated across agencies even when an agency can source an individual end service elsewhere.
- Keep pass-through or competitively negotiated products close enough to their attributable cost that statewide purchasing power remains visible to agencies.
- Make overhead allocation explicit. Avoid a cycle in which agency departures reduce the denominator, increase rates for remaining customers, and create additional incentives to leave.
- Use the Rate Committee as a governance forum for the target financial model, not merely as an annual approval step for a legacy service-rate schedule.

5. Current-Law and Recent-Legislative Findings

2025 §9-27-6 amendment: technology governance, not procurement administration

HB 618, enacted as Chapter 51 in 2025, removed DoIT's former approval of IT contracts and procurement documents and substituted approval of IT projects prior to procurement. That is a recent legislative policy choice. The implementation model should not transfer ordinary procurement execution back to DoIT. Instead, it should establish a connected gate: DoIT technology/project approval first; State Purchasing procurement execution second; and DFA budget/fiscal controls where applicable. [S19, S20]

§9-27-7 Rate Committee

The Information Technology Rate Committee consists of five gubernatorial appointees from agencies that use IT services and pay internal-service-fund rates, the DFA Secretary as chair, and the DoIT Secretary. It reviews the proposed rate and fee schedule, federal cost compliance and equitable cost recovery. The roadmap should review whether the statute, committee process and rate methodology adequately support the new three-part financial model. [S21]

2023 SB 269: useful precedent and caution

SB 269 proposed a much more prescriptive DoIT-centered model, including a requirement that, whenever feasible, DoIT be the purchaser and vendor of IT goods and services for agencies and that agencies acquire offered IT goods and services from DoIT. It did not become law. The current roadmap is materially different: enterprise-first for common capabilities, governed exceptions, agency ownership of mission technology, and evidence-based decisions on consolidation. [S30]

Functional-governance precedents

The CFO, CPO, HR and general-counsel examples should be used as design precedents, not as claims that every relationship is legally identical. The strongest lesson is that New Mexico already accepts statewide professional standards, approvals, supervision or functional control over agency-embedded leaders when an enterprise administrative discipline requires it. [S22, S23, S24, S25]

6. Proposed Enterprise Technology Governance Body

The incoming administration should establish a cabinet-level enterprise technology governance body early, initially through executive direction if legally sufficient. Its purpose is not to manage agency programs. It is to make or escalate decisions whose value, cost or risk crosses agency boundaries.

- Chair: State CIO, with gubernatorial executive sponsorship.
- Core participants: DFA leadership, GSD/State Purchasing leadership, State Personnel Director, and representative agency CIO/IT leadership.
- As-needed participants: Governor's counsel/agency counsel, agency secretaries/program executives, cybersecurity, privacy, data, budget and procurement leaders.
- Decision scope: enterprise standards; major investment/portfolio issues; common platforms; cross-agency dependencies; architecture/cloud exceptions; lifecycle risk; service/funding model; recommendations requiring gubernatorial or legislative action.
- Guardrail: agencies retain accountability for statutes, program policy, business rules, eligibility, service outcomes and mission-specific systems.

7. Legislative Drafting Agenda — Questions for Counsel, Not Draft Bill Language

- Does §9-27-6 already authorize each intended enterprise decision, or only review, recommendation, monitoring or a narrower project-approval action?
- Which functional-accountability expectations for agency CIOs can be established by executive direction, and which implicate the Personnel Act, agency enabling statutes, classified positions or collective bargaining?
- Does the Act adequately support enterprise portfolio governance across the full lifecycle, including technical debt, reuse and retirement?
- Are existing data-standardization, ownership and sharing provisions sufficient for the proposed statewide data-governance operating model?
- Is additional authority needed to establish common enterprise platforms as the default with a governed exception process?
- How should §9-27-7, appropriations and Rate Committee procedures distinguish enterprise governance, shared fixed infrastructure and consumption services?
- Do current budget, procurement or contracting processes create a gap between a valid State CIO technology decision and the ability to enforce that decision before commitment?
- Which governance and financing mechanisms should remain executive/administrative for adaptability, and which should be codified for durability?

8. Master Action Register

ID	Action	Mechanism	Lead	Timing	Gate
A1	Approve Hybrid Enterprise / Enterprise-Led direction	Executive	Governor	First 100 days	G1
A2	Establish cabinet-level enterprise technology governance	Executive	Governor / State CIO	First 100 days	G1
A3	Complete authority-to-roadmap crosswalk	Legal/admin	State CIO + counsel	First 100 days	G1
A4	Baseline systems, projects, lifecycle risk, cost and dependencies	Administrative	State CIO / agencies	First 100 days	G1
A5	Baseline DoIT P-codes, staffing, rates, overhead, reserves and service economics	Financial/admin	DoIT / DFA	First 100 days	G1
A6	Formalize agency CIO participation and functional accountability	Executive/personnel	Governor / State CIO / SPO	2027	G2
A7	Establish enterprise portfolio/investment governance	Admin/rule	State CIO / DFA / GSD	2027	G2
A8	Establish architecture/cloud guardrails and exception process	Rule/policy	State CIO / DoIT	2027	G2
A9	Design target DoIT operating/funding model	Financial/policy	DoIT / DFA / Rate Committee	2027	G2
A10	Align technology approval with procurement execution	Administrative	DoIT / GSD / DFA	2027	G2
A11	Establish enterprise data/interoperability operating model	Policy/rule	State CIO / agencies	2027–28	G2–G3
A12	Define workforce IAM and constituent identity strategy	Architecture/policy	State CIO / DoIT	2027–29	G2–G3
A13	Select and scale shared enterprise platform pilots	Service governance	State CIO / agencies	2027–29	G2–G3
A14	Implement transparent rate/allocation reforms and sustainable enterprise funding	Budget/rate/admin	DoIT / DFA / Rate Committee	2028–29	G3
A15	Improve deployment of funded staff; consolidate selected scarce/common skills where measured value supports it	Personnel/admin	State CIO / SPO / agencies	2028–29	G3
A16	Use measured results to decide what scales, consolidates, remains federated or retires	Governance	Enterprise governance body	2029	G3
A17	Close identified statutory/rule gaps; codify durable governance and financing where needed	Legislative/rule	Governor / Legislature / agencies	2028–30	G4
A18	Evaluate selective broader service/personnel consolidation	Executive/admin	Governor / State CIO	2030	G4
A19	Institutionalize operating/funding model and periodic rate/program review	Financial/governance	DoIT / DFA / Rate Committee	2030–31	G4–G5
A20	Refresh statewide technology strategy for next administration	Strategic	State CIO / Governor	2031	G5
21	Baseline the four largest and all other high-risk active IT projects: initial and forecast costs, schedule, deliverables, product owner and vendor accountability. [S31]	Executive / portfolio directive	State CIO + agency owners + DFA/GSD	First 100 Days	Gate 1
22	Pilot modular, outcome-based delivery and frequent demonstrations on suitable major projects; retain GSD procurement execution. [S20, S31]	Administrative / procurement process	State CIO + GSD + agency owners	2027	Gate 2
23	Review DoIT's proposed revisions to 1.12.5 and 1.12.9 NMAC, determine whether additional oversight changes are needed, and establish measures for ServiceNow adoption, service levels, costs and agency uptake. [S32, S33]	Rule verification / performance baseline	DoIT + agencies	First 100 Days	Gate 1

9. Measures of Implementation Success

- Percent of major technology investments reviewed through enterprise portfolio governance; agency CIO participation and exception disposition.
- Percent of major investments conforming to enterprise architecture or carrying a documented, time-bounded exception.

- Reduction in unsupported technology, duplicative capabilities and avoidable separate procurements.
- Adoption and performance of common identity, security, workflow/content and integration capabilities.
- Production cross-agency workflows and exchanges with measurable acknowledgment, status and completion visibility.
- Service levels, resilience, skill coverage and total statewide cost for capabilities moved to shared or consolidated delivery.
- Funded-versus-authorized staffing visibility; inter-program staffing flexibility; rate transparency and stability; enterprise-service adoption.
- Sustainable funding for enterprise governance and new capabilities without distorting individual service prices.
- Verified statutory/rule gaps closed, distinguished from existing authorities operationalized without new legislation.

10. Sources Used for This Implementation Review

Document 05, Evidence Base & Source Map, is the authoritative source registry for the package. Source identifiers S1–S18 are preserved from the earlier evidence base; implementation-specific authorities and comparative sources are registered there as S19–S30. This document uses those stable identifiers rather than maintaining a separate source list.

As of this November revision, the package addresses the incoming Haaland administration as the 2027 transition audience; the recommendations remain independent and do not imply transition-team endorsement.

Principal implementation references used in this document are: S19–S20 (State CIO authority and the 2025 HB 618 / Chapter 51 amendment); S21 (Information Technology Rate Committee); S22–S25 (New Mexico functional-governance precedents); S26–S28 (DoIT/LFC rate evidence and California comparison); S29 (program-level budget control); and S30 (2023 SB 269, not enacted). Full citations, public links, scope and limitations are maintained in Document 05.

November 2026 additions: S31 (LFC evaluation and delivery reform), S32 (ServiceNow shared-service deployment), and S33 (proposed DoIT project oversight/certification rules). Preserve the distinction between reported findings, proposed rules, and adopted law.

Authorship, Independence and AI Disclosure

Prepared by Peter Mantos, Mantos IT Consulting, Inc. This document presents the independent analysis and recommendations of the author. It does not represent the views or policies of the State of New Mexico, any current or future administration, gubernatorial candidate, state agency, elected official, or other individual or organization unless expressly stated.

Generative artificial intelligence tools were used to assist with research, source discovery, analysis, editing and document preparation. The author directed the work, reviewed the supporting sources and resulting analysis, and accepts responsibility for the conclusions presented. Factual claims are supported by cited sources wherever practicable.

The author is not an attorney and has never drafted legislation. Nothing in this document should be construed as legal advice or as proposed bill, rule or executive-order language. Legal sufficiency, drafting, statutory interpretation and procedural requirements should be reviewed by qualified counsel, legislative drafting staff and the responsible state entities before implementation.