

# Chief Information Officer Council – Meeting Minutes

May 2, 2006

Approved 5/30/06

The Chief Information Officer Council met at 2 p.m. at the Department of Forestry, 2600 State Street, Tillamook Room, Salem.

**Council members present:** Stan McClain, Jeff Marecic, Dan Adelman, Curt Amo, Vikie Bailey-Goggins, Bill Carpenter, Rick Howard (for Bill Crowell), Bob DeVyldere, Brady Callahan (for Kathy Dryden), Mark Hall, Sandy Jefferson, Doug Juergensen, John Margaronis (OAGITM), Curt Pederson, Herb Riley, Baron Rodriguez, Jim Roys, Jean Straight, Shelly Wiles, Marc Williams, David Yandell, Mike Zanon and Heidi Zinsmann

**IRMD staff present:** Raelynn Hansen, Scott Riordan, Christine Samples and Cy Smith

**Other Staff Present:** Lindsay Ball and Kris Kautz with DAS, Dennis Wells with DHS, Tom Boettger with Revenue

## Scheduled Agenda Items:

### 1. Review of Agenda and Introductions – Stan McClain

Stan McClain reviewed the agenda for the meeting. The minutes were approved as submitted.

### 2. DAS Perspective and Dialog - Lindsay Ball & Kris Kautz

Lindsay Ball asked the CIO's if there is the best relationship between the CIO's and their Directors? Do the Directors understand what the CIO needs are and visa versa?

The council feels there is disconnect between the business side and the IT side of the state. Baron feels that it depends on the agency for what value the agency puts on IT. It depends on the leadership in the agency and if they value technology. Within SOS and PERS the CIO sits at the executive table. OSU has an equal partnership, since their chancellor was once a CIO. Revenue recognized there was a gap between IT and business and they chose a CIO with 25 years of business experience. DEQ has no CIO, they have three section managers that have been chosen to fill in. The staff drives IT at DEQ as to what they need, what would help them, etc. They do have a good relationship with their executive staff. At DOJ the CIO reports to the business manager. DCBS director is interested in what can be achieved within IT.

Lindsay agrees that there are short comings on both sides; business and IT. Can you as CIO's create a dialog with your agency administration? CIO's should be a tool to ease the workload of agencies. There should be a give and take relationship. How can we bridge that? It's easier to have enterprise discussions when you've been successful within your own agency. Some executive members do not want enterprise efforts and this creates a tug-of-war when it's pushed in both directions.

This group (CIOC) speaks as an enterprise instead of individually; we have recognized that there needs to be consistency. The CIO's work well together and want to start the enterprise, but when we speak to the directors some do not understand the enterprise. Individual discussion with directors has been difficult; there needs to be a group dialog with the business side. One issue is the constant leadership changes, each leader has a different idea of what to consolidate and technology is long term investment. After projects are started and leadership changes all the work is wasted and the project is gone because the new leader wants to go in a different direction. Another issue is if the agency/director is not in a good place politically then they can't request funding for IT and IT is an expensive investment.

Changing the culture is a slow process; we have had silo systems for so long. The silo boundaries need to be bridged. There is also concern around a central agency controlling the enterprise. The CIOC has been here for four years and have been discussing the enterprise since we started. Financing the enterprise is a key concern; it is easier for individual agencies to receive funding. A problem has been too many failures or unsuccessful projects. There are still skeptics even within the State Data Center (SDC), everyone is eager to demonstrate that we can be successful. The SDC is the key and it is critical that this be successful. Everyone is waiting to see the outcome of the SDC.

The SDC will be successful, Lindsay feels very confident that it will not fail. There will be truth in observation. Unfortunately with all of the adjustments made to SDC plans along the way has caused the business side lose faith in the IT side.

The next challenge is what the next enterprise project be? This will be a challenge since these will have to be perfect. We need to start the next enterprise project. While everyone watches the success of the SDC the CIO's need to be prepared for our next enterprise project; with an implementation plan, cost analysis, etc. Pick one enterprise we'll win with.

**ACTION:** Lindsay's challenge is to decide on the next enterprise solution. Lindsay says we are ready to take the next challenge.

We as CIO's are ready to give you the enterprise technology, but we have to know what the enterprise business side needs are. If there is a way to become more efficient in state government then we need to do that. We will have credibility back when the SDC succeeds.

A body of people needs to be created to decide on these projects with the business side, legislatures and IT, i.e., a governance structure. Each agency has different priorities the overarching structure (governance group) needs to make enterprise decisions (i.e., some agencies aren't concerned with GIS, some E-forms, etc). There needs to be permanent direction, not the ever changing one we currently have. Lindsay feels that ultimately someone has to be held accountable, instead of a governance structure being held accountable. If we don't have a governance structure then who is held accountable at the enterprise level?

Who is the counterpart that we can interact with, if not the Directors? We as an IT group are meeting together to come up with a solution, we need to know who is doing this on the business side? We can not do this one agency at a time; this needs to be a statewide movement to consolidate. This group has held this conversation multiple times, we are prepared to supply technology, but to who and what technology do they need? Business has to drive IT not visa versa. We struggle with the fact that if we were a private sector we would have a board to approve funding for projects; with the state we have to go to our director then the legislature, we don't have the communication to accomplish this. There needs to be a good business connection with the legislature; there is no business relationship.

Lindsay asked why agencies spend millions on IT contracting; do we need to do that? Can we do some projects internally? Have we over spent on contracting so that we wasted opportunity to do other things. Have we self evaluated ourselves to be on the competitive edge of technology. What are we doing in a way of successful IT planning in agencies; do we have replacements for ourselves and our teams as they retire or move on?

**Action:** Next Enterprise project lined up with a plan so we are ready to go and able to receive

funding.

Debrief:

Stan would like to thank everyone for the conversation with Lindsay. We need to do a thorough analysis of what everyone doesn't want to happen again (referring to the SDC). We need to do a post-mortem on what happened with the SDC. Mike agrees but this will be a point of information only. SOS will be releasing their report on the SDC and what happened, this should be released in the next month. SDC has to be a success, but whose defining what success is? What does Lindsay want to be a success: the deliverables, cost savings and to whom the legislatures, agencies, the public? A successful project needs to be defined.

When Stan and Mike met with Lindsay, Mike was encouraged by Lindsay being interested in the enterprise and moving forward, rather than stalling because of the SDC. Whenever large IT projects succeed it is normally initiated at the governor's level, not at the CIO level. The linkage between the director and governor is not very strong and the communications needs to be regained. The governance board needs to be created to deal with the projects and the linkage between the governor's office and the executive staff. Make the chair the accountable party.

Let's take this opportunity to move forward and save money with our next enterprise project. We can satisfy one business need and we can learn from the process; let's look at things that have been developed jointly and see how it was done. There needs to be two responsible parties: one CIO and one Business leader.

**Action:** CIO Management Council will draft a list of enterprise projects and bring it back to the CIO Council on the 30<sup>th</sup>.

### 3. Enterprise IRM Strategy Update Discussion

We need to execute the enterprise strategy and the update will follow. We need a group/committee that represents both the business side and the IT side. The number one goal in the Enterprise IRM Strategy (EIRMS) conflicts with what Lindsay has said. We need to verify that we are all on the same page. There needs to be a permanent group/committee to decide on projects, rather than the ever changing decision makers. We will look to the EIRMS to give Lindsay an enterprise project; this way we are completing/executing our strategy.

### 4. Roundtable

Bill Carpenter reported that Housing moved to the State Data Center over the weekend, the move went well with only one cable too short. The Secretary of State office will be doing a COBIT audit on Housing.

David Yandell reported that the Oregon State Police (OSP) is very understaffed in the IT department; with 1100 employees OSP has 10 IT staff. David was directed to speak to Catherine Webber for IT staffing numbers across the state. David requested to have a group of CIO's sit down with OSP to help with the IT organization. Dennis Wells will send performance measure information to David.

Dan Adelman reported that DCBS is moving from the Novell environment to the active directory, DCBS has also upgrading their Citrix environment. Citrix has been implemented across the agency's desktop.

Jim Roys asked where are we with E-forms and the SABER group. DEQ received a License 2000 maintenance agreement bill and would like to know if this should now be an enterprise

license.

Stan McClain answered that Revenue is now doing a pilot project on E-forms with SABER and Adobe. The pilot should be done quickly. Stan reported that he and Mike Zanon have sent an e-mail to the Washington CIO's and will be developing a relationship with our counterparts, we will keep you updated. Both Curt Amo and Curt Pederson were nominated for IT Executive of the Year at the CIO Summit, Curt Pederson won the award.

Sandy Jefferson from Forestry thanked the CIO's for the useful feedback she received from the requested e-mail.

Jeff Marecic reported that the PERS COBIT training RFP is still with the State Procurement Office.

Mike Zanon reported that the review of IRMD is now complete. Mike is unable to share any information from that review until he meets with Lindsay, Kris and Bill. When the decisions are made as in who, what, when and how to implement the decisions then Mike will fill us in. The State CIO recruitment will be opened after Lindsay has made decisions on the new IRMD model.

Curt Amo requested and the CIO's all agree that before a full steam "new IRMD" implementation is brought forward, Lindsay should meet with the CIO partners.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:07