

CIO Management Council

June 17, 2008

approved 7/15/2008

Attendees: Ben Berry, Rick Howard, Sandy Jefferson, John Margaronis, Dorothy Oliver, Dugan Petty and Troy Rutten

EISPD Staff: Ed Arabas, Sean McSpaden, Scott Riordan, Angela Skyberg

Others Present: Tim Avilla (ODOT) and Brian King (DAS/Surplus)

Approval of Minutes, Agenda Overview and Action Items – Dugan Petty

The CIOMC adopted the May 20 minutes as presented.

Action items from May 20:

- Sean McSpaden is in the process of drafting the list of historical and concurrent enterprise activities and will be ready to present them at the July 15 CIOMC meeting.
- EA Core team brought the revised charter to the Management Council meeting today for approval.
- Dugan will invite Terry Meehan and Jennifer Woodruff to the Management Council on a quarterly basis.
- Dugan will share updates to the EISPD business plans on a quarterly basis. Schedule.
- SPO presented to the CIOMC on June 5.
- Dugan and Mark will have a conversation regarding the IBM Mainframe in the near future. The IBM Mainframe Conversion and Tool are on the SDC Advisory Council agenda.
- Sean McSpaden provided the CIOMC with the Governance policy and statute.
- Sean is on today's agenda to discuss the IT Asset Inventory and Management Policy and Program.

Announcement

Dugan announced that Sean McSpaden is the new Deputy Chief Information Officer for EISPD.

Enterprise Architecture ~ Scott Riordan & Tim Avilla

Scott Riordan and Tim Avilla handed out and presented a power point presentation on Enterprise Architecture (EA). Topics included: the history of the enterprise architecture concept in Oregon state government; sponsorship and consulting; the current program staffing model and assumptions; achievements; EA initiatives underway; the value of EA practices (to agencies, multiple agencies, and to the state as a whole); challenges to the EA concept; and planned actions for the next year.

The purpose for bringing the Enterprise Architecture concept to the CIOMC is to seek endorsement of assumptions and Work Plan with the intent that the CIOMC would forward it to the CIOC for their endorsement.

Dorothy Oliver asked what makes these initiatives EA initiatives versus just an initiative. Scott explained that using EA practices prompts a different set of questions and view. He told the story of the retired State Chief Architect in Kansas who was then hired by the

Kansas Legislature to re-design the legislative process. He did so in its entirety in 18 months at a very reasonable cost introducing a complete different view. He explained that over the course of that effort, legislative stakeholders shifted their view of business outcomes and processes. The EA process uncovered and then implemented a new set of business assumptions. He also pointed out once an EA body of work complete, new people can come in and use it as a launch pad for all subsequent efforts. EA first defines the business requirements of an agency. He pointed out that those business requirements can be pressed upward to be shared with other agencies allowing them to help. Discussions between agencies regarding their individual business architectures could help define state business architecture. Some of those discussions are beginning to take place. With EA a straight line between business requirements and technical architecture is drawn.

Rick Howard said that the information presented today does not give him clarity about the value of EA practices. Rick did not feel that Scott had answered Dorothy's question. He urged the EA Core Team to provide that clarity about EA before he would endorse it. Rick is concerned that if that level of clarity is not provided, a year from now there will be large amounts of work taking place but no one will know what's going on. Rick provided an example of a specific technical problem that could be solved in hours using current practices, or could be solved in a much longer time frame using EA practices.

Scott responded that what Rick described could be viewed and voiced as a business problem. The key difference using contemporary EA practices is in defining the problem in business as opposed to technical terms. This ensures that business problems are defined and business outcomes are the drivers for the change. That shift provides a business target that is actionable over time. Scott voiced his support for the desired outcome described in Rick's example, but that an EA approach could voice it as a business rather than technical issues. Scott said that we first need to learn how to talk in these terms and how to act quickly.

Dorothy said that she is looking for is something that improves the life of Oregonians. She does not feel that just aligning things will make a difference.

Tim Avilla responded that what has been done in the past is projects. Each project stands alone and project characteristics, by definition, does not enable you to think outside the project. A good project has a start, an end, and stays within the scope of the project. EA is the opposite of that. It seeks to link concepts to create a vision that informs multiple projects tying them together via common goals.

Dorothy said it seems that in using EA practices we are still doing projects the way we used to; we are just selling them differently. Dorothy thought the example of an EA project was taking a project plan and tie it to another project to make it look like it was aligned, making it an EA project. Tim and Scott disagreed.

Scott explained there were many staff attending TOGAF training classes. The EA Core Team queries participants about the value and benefit of EA. Scott said at the end of one of the trainings Ed Klimowicz (DHS) suggested agencies undertake a business architecture effort to enlighten the development of the SDC Technical Architecture underway now. That would ensure that agencies' business requirements guide development of the SDC Technical Architecture. The alternative is to have an SDC Technical Architecture that is exclusively operationally focused. Agencies have the

ability to get together using EA practices to define a combined business architecture to inform and guide the SDC's development.

Dugan did not feel the EA Core Team Charter was ready to be moved forward to the CIOC. Dugan felt the work plan was over ambitious and the lack of compelling rationale.

Ben Berry volunteered to meet with the EA Core Team and help them create a compelling rationale and succinct work plan using the ODOT's Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) as the focus. He observed that to be successful the EA charter needs to be paired down to an effort that can be delivered on in which agencies will have a stake. Dorothy Oliver and Rick Howard agreed with Ben. Dugan thanked Ben for his willingness to assist and indicated the CIOMC seemed to support that more targeted approach.

Action Item:
<i>The EA Core Team will schedule a meeting with Ben to refine the work plan and compelling rationale focusing on ERP.</i>
<i>Ben Berry will let Dugan know when the modified EA work plan is ready to be moved forward.</i>

ITSM Pilot Status Update ~ Dugan Petty

Dugan said the he, Bret West, Mark Reyer, Julie Bozzi and Sean McSpaden had met with DAS Director Scott Harra to discuss how to proceed with the IT Service Management (ITSM) Pilot. At that meeting Mark was concerned about expense to the SDC and the impact on projects there. Meeting attendees agreed to have a subsequent meeting that would include the pilot agencies' CIOs, the pilot team and Mark. The objective of the meeting is to understand the full range of potential costs and impacts: to each agency; to the State Data Center; and in a composite view. After that meeting the next step would be to take the information to the SDC CIO Advisory Board, and then to the SDC Advisory Board.

Ben said this was similar to a discussion at an earlier meeting in the day around the subject of consensus. In order to reach consensus all parties need to feel that they are heard. Ben believed that Mark wants to be heard on this subject. When the decision was made on Remedy, SDC was not at the table.

Dugan responded that Mark and Julie Bozzi have had many opportunities to voice their concerns and had done so. Dugan also pointed out a conversation between them and this group of stakeholders had not taken place.

Ben said that Mark is looking at this issue from an SDC cost perspective. We need to look at this from an enterprise perspective. We need to know how much this is going to cost when viewed as a composite. Agencies are paying for the same thing twice, so we must consider the total cost of adoption, not just parochial views.

Sandy Jefferson the pilot group is not representative of all those affected. Her concern is that of an SDC customer.

Dugan said the pilot group is a subset of SDC customers. There needs to be a dialogue between the pilot group and the CIOs of those affected agencies. Mark needs to hear

those concerns. That blended group might make a recommendation around the pilot. The next step would then be to take the recommendation to the SDC Advisory Board. If the pilot approach is implemented at the SDC, Remedy would be implemented as the helpdesk and configuration management system SDC would use. That is something the SDC is not prepared to do because it would have operational implications. These implications may or may not be acceptable to the SDC Advisory Committee. Only the SDC Advisory Committee can make that decision. For this reason, the project is split into two phases. The pilot agencies' CIOs and pilot team should have an initial discussion to work on these issues before taking it to the SDC Advisory Board.

John asked if Dugan was talking about the SDC Advisory Board or the SDC CIO Advisory Board. Dugan indicated he was referring to the SDC CIO Advisory Board. This concerned John because he does not know if the SDC CIO Advisory Board has the authority to make such decisions. Dugan said it depends. If it is an SDC scope decision it will need to go to a higher level, the SDC Advisory Board.

Dugan thinks the first step is to take the issue to the SDC CIO Advisory Board. If there is an impact on workload this is where that conversation needs to take place. John brought up the point that if there is a disagreement at the SDC CIO Advisory Board level, this issue will have to go to the SDC Advisory Board.

Ben asked Dugan if he saw this as a customer service issue. Dugan said he did. But he then noted what he considered a bigger concern; optimizing operations in the areas of configuration and helpdesk management using an enterprise perspective. Dugan was concerned about how such decisions are made, how the business and customers are engaged to make sound decisions. If the decision is made solely at the SDC and we have not figured out how to ensure alignment from a business standpoint, we have a problem.

Ben responded that he thought that is how the SDC CIO Advisory Board charter was done. It is a document that contains good words but has not resulted in action. Dugan said the charter is good but we have not been able to get the pilot on the agenda yet. The charter cannot help until we get the issue on the table. According to the SDC CIO Advisory Board charter, members have the ability to call a meeting, in this case regarding the ITSM pilot. So far we have asked for a special meeting of the SDC CIO Advisory Board and for the pilot to be put on the agenda but that has not taken place. Ben asked if it was time for members to call a meeting for the SDC CIO Advisory Board. Dugan responded that we will eventually get to that point. The meeting of the ITSM pilot team and SDC is the first step. Then it needs to go to the SDC CIO Advisory Board.

Dugan pointed out that there was a similar circumstance that occurred with regard to the mainframe, and the process is still unclear. There has to be a way when the SDC is contemplating a business decision that affects customers for the CIOs to be notified and for them to consider the impact or consequences. When the mainframe issue occurred it had an impact on DHS and ODOT. Ben asked if Dugan thought they covered that issue in the SDC CIO Advisory Board charter. Dugan responded that he did not think the charter could work unless on a routine basis the SDC: pushes this information out, asks customers if there is an impact on their business, and if so, to bring the issues forward to the SDC CIO Advisory Board to take appropriate steps. There is work to do on aligning actions the SDC would like to take and the effects on agencies. Dugan said the challenge in managing the SDC is in aligning customer service and business

processes. We are all involved in coming up with processes to meet these customer service and business needs.

Troy Rutten asked about the SDC's role in administering the enterprise application. There is a difference in the SDC's roles and enterprise applications that serves all agencies. She asked if members were presuming that all enterprise applications would be managed by the SDC. Dugan responded that we are not presuming this. Sean said the application and infrastructure management issue was discussed at the special meeting with the Director. Rick said the SDC is a customer of the ITSM application just like any other agency. Sean said this discussion will ultimately go to the SDC Advisory Board and they will determine if it is within the scope of the SDC to administer this particular application. Troy did not understand why this would even be a consideration. Sean explained that they currently manage similar tools. Troy pointed out that other agencies manage similar tools. We need to use caution when we presume what the SDC is going to do for us because they are struggling. According to Troy, it would be in everyone's best interest to have the enterprise applications administered separately from the hardware. ITSM needs to be administered at the enterprise level. The SDC is a service provider. She hypothesized, if DAS Application Services owns the application and the SDC is a user of the application, SDC just provides the hardware (the utility infrastructure). This approach starts to clean up everyone's stake in the issue. If the SDC has the perception that they have to install, develop, implement and manage the application, it will be a barrier for them to take on the work.

Sandy did not think we were that far into the conversation yet. We were trying to get the SDC to join in the discussion. Sean added that the discussion stalled when the SDC refused to commit to utilize an application that was hosted or administered by anyone else. The SDC said that they had a commitment, at this point, to implement tools used by the SDC only.

DAS Surplus – E-Waste and Recovery Policy and Program ~ Brian King

Surplus has been working on a revised policy draft. They made a couple changes to the existing policy. The biggest change with Garten Services is the QRF law being applied. This means that Garten, within their suitability service area, has the right, under state law, to get these services from state agencies, including cities and counties. If you send items somewhere other than Garten, a QRF could challenge that and say you are breaking the law by doing that. Brian proposed getting rid of the pricing matrix attached to the policy because it is ever changing and asked for feedback from the CIOMC by mid-July. This initial presentation is informational. Surplus will eventually look to the CIOC for endorsement. Dugan asked Brian to provide this overview of the draft policy to the CIOC inviting comments before bringing the final draft back. John Margaronis agreed to make the introduction of this topic at that CIOC meeting.

Action Items:
<i>Brian will distribute the E-Waste and Recovery Policy draft to the CIOC for review and input, using voting buttons.</i>
<i>CIO's will send comments to Brian by mid-July</i>
<i>Brian will be added to the CIOC agenda in July to present his findings and final draft.</i>

IT Asset Management Policy ~ Sean McSpaden

IT Asset management is a component of Remedy and will actually assist in analysis and reporting. Agencies will still need to collect the information locally. The issue is that we do not have a network configured in a way where central discovery can occur through the SDC identifying every node. The goal is a shared repository which would do away with the need to have someone report.

Ben said ODOT wanted to try to discover software on PC's regionally. The agency has responsibilities to tie software to the license. Ben said there are questions to be answered like: do we have licenses for all programs on PC's; where are they; and who has them? Further if we do not have the answer we are at risk.

Action Items:
<i>Sean will send a copy of the IT Asset Management policy to the CIOC for their review and comments.</i>
<i>Sean will revise the policy and present it at the CIOC in July.</i>

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 PM.