

# CIO Management Council

## June 22, 2005

Approved 7/6/05

---

**Attendees:** Curt Amo, Ben Berry, Bill Crowell, Bob DeVyldere, John Koreski, Stan McClain, Jean Straight

**Others:** John Margaronis, OAGITM; Dennis Wells and Janet Gerling, DHS

**IRMD Staff:** Sean McSpaden, Scott Riordan

Stan McClain called the meeting to order at 10 a.m. and discussed agenda strategy.

### **Draft Enterprise Information Resources Strategy (EIRMS)**

Sean McSpaden stated that as the schedule indicates, a special meeting was held on June 15 and the management council was asked to submit additional comments by close of business Monday, June 20. The clean version with received modifications was presented for review.

Sean indicated that some comments he had received concerned the way in which the objective narrative was presented. In general planning processes, objectives would be voiced a certain way. Sean acknowledged that some of the objectives presented are truly strategies or initiatives and asked for the Management Council's guidance on how this should be resolved or remedied in the strategy document.

Stan reminded the management council that the document should be reviewed in a high level manner and they should not get into "wordsmithing". The objectives as presented do not need to be revised.

Page 9: Reformatting has occurred. The page now includes a listing of the agency directors and the full CIO Council.

Page 10: It is virtually unchanged with exception of one point. In the initial discussion with the Management Council in May, five initiatives were presented. The list did not include the IT governance policy, which is now included. Also, the statewide public safety wireless network has also been added. It is not presented as a CIOC responsibility but it is an enterprise initiative that is the responsibility of the DAS director, and the Director of the Office of Homeland Security at this point in time.

Action: At the June 28 CIOC meeting, the draft EIRMS will be presented and the adoption process discussed. It is not expected to be adopted that day.

Page 14: The guiding principles and the outcome sections have been deleted and the content from those sections have been dispersed throughout the document. A matrix aligning the objectives with the key success factors is included in the appendix. The management council was asked if it makes sense to have the matrix in the body of the document.

Action: It was decided to use the 11x17 version of the business requirements matrix as a fold out if possible in the final published version. The matrix graphic should be inserted between pages 19 and 20. The heading should be amended to read "Business Requirements."

Page 18: A combined narrative was added to explain the graphic below.

Page 19: Objectives have been added.

Action: The objectives on page 19 are to have the bold formatting removed.

Page 20: This is where the document moves into the work plan. Appreciation was expressed for the creative approach in improving the readability. It was requested to include an alignment between the objectives and business strategy.

Action: Include an alignment between the objectives and business strategy in the Functional Expectations.

Discussion included evidence based practices in programs and reference to some interview material that provided justification for each objective. The Management Council preferred presentation of the to be added narrative in the context of a solution.

Action: On page 27, Objective 3.2 should include the deliverable included in the cyber security budget. Dates should be included to align with the budget and make sure there is a governance path.

Action: The time horizon (four years, through 2009) for the EIRMS should be included in the Executive Summary.

Action: When an acronym is used, make sure it is defined.

There was discussion of the importance of making a distinction between the implementation and strategy. It was questioned whether the distinction is clear enough.

Action: There should be a page between pages 19 and 20 to create a break between the strategy and work plan documents. A blank page with one paragraph of explanation of the work plan would be best.

Page 29: Should IT performance measurements be marked as a completed project? It will be presented at the June 28 meeting with a possible second deliverable addressing implementation.

Staff outlined the proposed process: There will be a recommendation forwarded to the full CIO Council for the June 28 meeting. An e-mail version of the document will be sent prior to the meeting.

Staff recommended at the same time the document is released to the CIO Council, each CIO that participated in agency director interviews would meet with their director to walk through the document and obtain general feedback from the director.

It was suggested that a discussion be held on June 28 regarding a process to regularly update milestones. Perhaps a quarterly report on the milestones is the process to use.

Additional issues to be addressed include:

1. Seek some informal feedback from key stakeholders regarding a sustainable process around plan and how to update for 07-09.
2. What is the communication plan? It is important to make sure discussions occur with legislators and directors to make sure initiatives are characterized appropriately in this document. Don Fleming, Laurie Warner and the CIO Council all need to be in agreement. There also need to be collaboration between the state and county entities.

Action: At the June 28 CIO Council meeting, Sean McSpaden and Scott Riordan will walk through the document with the council to see if there are any issues or omissions that need to be addressed. The

amended document will then be presented for adoption at the July 26 CIO Council meeting. The document should also be presented at the County Executive Council meeting.

John Margaronis stated the majority of counties will see this as good information without a direct impact on county governments. It will help to strengthen the relationship between the state and counties.

Action: Raelynn Henson will review the document and address communication planning issues. The plan should include sending the document to the governor's office with a request to include a "Governor's Message" and to Don Fleming with a request to include a "State CIOs Message."

Bob DeVyldere requested that the draft document be e-mailed right away with a message that amendments are being made and will be discussed at the June 28 meeting.

### **IT Equipment provided by State Agencies to County Government**

Curt explained that John Margaronis wanted a chance to speak to the full CIO Council about a concern and he was encouraged to bring the issue to the management council first. When options are identified, then a resolution recommendation can be taken to the full CIO Council.

John Margaronis, Marion County representative for OAGITM, discussed the relationship between the state and counties. One of the issues is the state acting as an agent on state or federal issues with directives to the counties. Delivery of services will be at the county government level and need to be delivered through appropriate channels. There is an evolution of the same approach in terms of software and hardware. Counties buy these through state cooperative purchasing but are not required to go through Smart Buy.

It is important to establish a relationship so that when there is a state issue that extending to the counties, there has been some upfront communications. It is important to make sure that when there is a state program, a specific hardware requirement is not attached. Counties would like the state to give the counties the option of having the state buy the equipment or providing the county with the money that would have spent on equipment. That way, the county can buy equipment that is compatible with their network, as long as meets the state requirements. There is not a recommendation or answer at this point, but there is a feeling that if the issue is raised, an answer can be sought.

Curt talked about the need to involve all stakeholders early in the process. Employment has kiosks and that would be an example of where the state cannot provide money to the county but would need to provide the equipment. There is a need to figure out some of the interface requirements and security requirements early in the planning piece.

It was agreed that communication is a key to solving the issue. As in any enterprise, different entities need to be working together from the beginning. When the communication is up front, everyone knows. It is agreed that just as in state government, county government has the issue of not always communicating between IT and business. It was suggested that when planning for the 07-09 budget, overlapping communities of interest (infrastructure and architecture) should be considered.

John Margaronis pointed out that each county government is an autonomous government. There is a recognized need to come together and OAGITM wanted to start raising the consciousness. The forum to use is not clear.

Action: It would be helpful for staff to prepare a PowerPoint presentation of the strategic planning document to use in meetings.

After the data center is up and running, the state should develop some connection with the counties to provide an opportunity to more tightly integrate programs. It would be helpful to have county voices on work groups. It is also important to get the smaller counties involved.

Action: The CIO Council is encouraged to attend the county/state forum on June 29. There will be an Agency Highlight presented by OAGITM at the August 23 CIO Council meeting to talk about the challenges, the issues, and strategies, and how the state and counties might work together.

### **Performance Measures**

Bill Crowell reported that he is presenting a report on performance measures at the June 28 CIO Council meeting. It will be requested that the council accept the report and acknowledge individuals. The pilot project has the task of working through the recommendations from the domain team and fine tuning the recommendations based on experience. The team that worked on it adopted some of the measures. They started with a strategic high level approach and solicited expertise. There needs to be another measure addressing spending on agency specific initiatives. It is important for some agencies to have the right comparisons. If this makes sense for a starting point, it is suggested to measure performance on an enterprise basis on a semi-annual basis. Key stakeholder groups in the process include business managers, agency directors, and the legislative community (at some point). A conversation about a communication plan is desired.

### **County/State Forum**

Stan McClain indicated he was unaware of the meeting on the June 29 and wondered if, as the council leadership group, the management council had a message to deliver at the forum. John Koreski will be facilitating two sessions and after June 29, it will be apparent what to do. It was suggested that the strategic plan be presented at future state/county meetings. The management council should determine what the state will contribute to those meetings and ought to solidify how to become a part of the agendas.

### **Minutes**

Motion: It was moved and seconded to approve the June 8 and June 15 minutes as presented. The motion carried.

### **Roundtable**

A discussion of frustrations with the E-Government program ensued. There is understanding that without a manager, it is hard to be on schedule. There is need for a resolution strategy for operational issues (what's wrong, what's working, what's next) and Scott Smith should present it. Scott Smith should survey members of the CIO Management Council before the meeting. There needs to be a business group and technical group.

Action: Scott Smith is to be invited to the July 6 CIO Management Council meeting to discuss the issue.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:51 a.m.