

CIO Management Council

April 22, 2008

approved 05/06/2008

Attendees: Dugan Petty, Ben Berry, Rick Howard, John Margaronis, Bret West, Sandy Jefferson and Kathryn Naugle

EISPD Staff: Darren Wellington, Nick Betsacon, Sean McSpaden, Paula Newsome, Scott Riordan and Charlene Wood

Others Present: Melody Riley (DHS), Bryan Nealy and Julie Bozzi (SDC)

Dugan Petty called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Approval of Minutes – Dugan Petty

The April 9, 2008 minutes were approved as revised by the members.

Action: EISPD will resend the request for participants for the software contract and RFP evaluation team to the CIOs. EISPD will forward the responses to Chris Mahoney, SPO.

Dugan distributed an e-mail written by Dorothy Oliver as she was not able to attend the meeting today.

Information Technology Service Management – Dugan Petty & Bret West

Sean McSpaden provided a high level overview of the Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) pilot. The effort began in 2000 with the initial focus on asset management. DAS/IRMD, under the direction of Don Mazzioti's leadership, needed to initiate a portfolio management initiative. Phase 1 of the effort was to focus on asset management. Phase 2 was to focus on portfolio management. DAS/SCD/BAM, DAS/IRMD, DHS, and ODOT formed a multi-agency work group. There was a business need to put in place asset management repositories and auto discovery capabilities. The workgroup effort discovered that DOC had an existing contract for Remedy software. The DOC contract with Remedy was primarily for a helpdesk solution but there were other tools available to use through the contract. The Gartner Group identified Remedy as one of the top tools at that time. The direction received from the steering committee was to bring together a broad base of technical agency representatives to review the Remedy application. The technical group determined that Remedy was a viable product. A purchase order was nearing finalization when Remedy was purchased by Peregrine. The group started to reengage with Peregrine but that company ended up in financial difficulty. The effort was then dropped.

In 2001, the IT Portfolio Management law established through House Bill 3372 was passed. DAS had submitted a Policy Option Package (POP) to implement portfolio management with asset management being the initial focus. DAS/IRMD leadership indicated IRMD could fund the project with the exiting funds. So positions and dollars were removed from the budget request.

In 2003, the DAS Director and the Governor's office began focusing their attention on data center consolidation as a key effort in their cost saving initiatives. One of the core elements of the data center consolidation was to conduct and document an IT asset inventory. Prior to implementation of a state asset management policy, establishment of

an asset repository at the data center for the data collection was needed. The collection of asset information was anticipated to occur at the agency level with a push to a central repository.

DHS, DAS and ODOT purchased the Remedy Helpdesk in 2004. ODOT implemented an asset system. The plan was to have the Remedy infrastructure hosted at the eventual data center. Within the Management Domain Team (MDT) there was discussion about policies. Should the state have multiple helpdesk applications hosted at the data center? Further, should the state have multiple asset management repositories hosted at the data center? The decision recorded in the minutes at that time indicate the answer was, "no." It does not make sense to have multiple applications and repositories if we can prove that it is viable to have one shared instance. There would clearly be a need for the agencies to continue to have their own helpdesk staff but what was needed was a shared infrastructure. The MDT felt it was reasonable for DAS to put a requirement in place for agencies, when purchasing or implementing new asset management repositories that they would either need to use the shared instance at the data center or submit a compelling business case on why this approach would not work for them. A waiver letter issued by Don Fleming and Laurie Warner was requested by the MDT.

Later in 2004 a key issue came up in regards to asset inventory collection software. In the absence of the discovery tools and a shared repository it was virtually impossible for agencies to collect the required data. It was the intention of DAS to put in an asset repository in place at the data center.

An RFP for ITSM was put in place in 2005 but was unsuccessful. In 2006 there was a decision by the CIOMC to form an Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) academy and to pursue a second RFP. A business case was developed for the ITSM pilot. In 2007 the contract was awarded, the academy continued, and BMC began to do some analysis for the pilot.

DAS/EISPD submitted a POP in 2007 and again in 2009, but the POPs were not approved and did not go forward. Both POPS were intended to enable IT Service Management. DAS and DHS committed to provide funding near the close of the 2005 - 07 biennium.

The POP's were predicated upon a successful completion of the Remedy ITSM pilot. The pilot would have to prove that a single instance could be shared by multiple agencies for it to be deemed successful. DAS and DHS committed to provide the core funding for the pilot. DAS/TSC and DAS/EISPD each provided \$150,000 for a total of \$300,000. DHS was to provide \$300,000 but had to pull back those dollars. Instead DHS committed in-kind resources (Melody Riley and James Foster).

Bret West added that the DAS Operations Division does have one Remedy administrator FTE request in the 2009–11 budget.

Melody distributed the ITSM decision document. The decision matrix document was created to inform the CIOMC of the various features and benefits of each of the ITSM implementation options. Melody asked how we are going to share the tool based upon the following three options:

1. Multiple agencies share a single instance and utilize the capabilities provided by allowing interaction between the agencies

2. Multiple agencies share a single instance, but act in an isolated fashion
3. Each agency operates its own, independent instance

If Option 1 or 2 are selected with multiple agencies sharing a single instance, it will require a commitment to:

- Make the SDC support request for the ITSM environment a priority (ITSM suite will run in this environment)
- IT staff involvement and time
- Equipment
- The shared instance pilot project
- Agreement to share foundational data

If Option 3 is selected with each agency implementing their own instance, resource investment would be dependent upon individual agency prioritization and commitment to implementing an ITSM system:

- Agency IT staff involvement and time
- Equipment based upon agency isolated requests
- Individual agency funding
- Individual agencies would need to support and maintain administrative access for full system

The ITSM Academy Website is located at:

<http://www.oregon.gov/DAS/EISPD/ITSM/index.shtml>

Julie highlighted that the SDC does not do any application support. Application support in a shared environment is outside of the scope of the SDC. The CNIC steering committee decided this was out of scope during 2005-2006. She pointed out the SDC does not need such a tool, nor are they ready for it.

Dugan would like to avoid developing a tool that would not be realistic to use at the SDC. There is a need to understand the relationship between the helpdesks at the different agencies. This is not only just about hosting an application on the enterprise level but that the application needs to interact with the application that the SDC is using.

Kathryn said we need to look across the enterprise and determine if Remedy meets the needs of the agencies. Further she asked what it would take for the SDC to support this action.

Bret pointed out that the SDC asset inventory is important as DAS is legislatively mandated to report IT assets to the legislature.

Ben Berry said e-mail and helpdesk were determined to be out of scope but what is being discussed now is an operational tool.

Julie said she sees this as an application not as an operational tool. It is a database not a tool integration. In order for it to be an enterprise tool it must be integrated at the database level. In that case any of the options can satisfy the solution. Julie said the investment is a lot boarder and greater then what is being understood in this discussion.

Melody said the issue comes back to the operational tool. We recognize there is a relationship between the assets. There are relationships between IT components and the changes that are made. One of the issues is the duplication of effort at the helpdesk level.

Members discussed the need to look at this issue on the basis of a shared approach. A final decision would come after the construction of a business case to present to the agency directors. The next step would be to inform the SDC Advisory Council. The important issue is about the collecting and keeping of the asset inventory. We are going to need some guidance on whether this is a policy question. The smaller agencies would need a smaller solution. The value added would have to be there in order for it to be a viable solution. The ITSM vision was shared use with the infrastructure placed at the SDC. The question is not that it is too expensive but what do we have invested already.

Dugan called for a membership decision on what option to proceed with.

1. Multiple agencies share a single instance and utilize the capabilities provided by allowing interaction between the agencies
2. Multiple agencies share a single instance, but act in an isolated fashion
3. Each agency operates its own, independent instance

Decision: The membership agreed to adopt scenario 1 and to take the issue to the SDC Advisory board for agreement/direction on how to proceed. In the event the SDC Advisory board does not agree we will proceed with option 2.

Action: The development of a new business case after the ITSM pilot is complete.

Action: EISPD to research minutes for past decisions on this subject.

Dugan adjourned the meeting at 2:41 p.m.