

Attendees:

Agency:	Board Representative:	CIO or Representative:
DAS	Laurie Warner	Don Fleming
DCBS	Cory Streisinger	Dan Adelman
Corrections	Max Williams	John Koreski
Education	Vickie Fleming	Doug Kosty
Employment		Curt Amo
Forestry	Clark Seely	Dan Christensen
Housing & Community Services	Bob Repine	Bill Carpenter
Human Services	Gary Weeks	Bill Crowell
State Police		Dave Komanecky
Revenue	Elizabeth Harchenko	Stan McClain
ODOT	Mike Marsh	Sandy Jefferson
Veterans' Affairs	Paula Brown	Herb Riley

Project Staff: Mike Freese, Keith Kohan, Mark Matson.

Accenture: Jovan Ruiz, Julienne VanDerZiel, Rick Webb, Rock Bonecutter.

Others: Debbie Bryant, Paul Cleary, Bill Fink, Bill Foster, Raelynn Henson, Daron Hill, Cheryl Knottingham, Jerry Korson, Theresa Masse, Cora Parker, Dallas Weyand.

1. Opening Comments

Laurie Warner brought the meeting to order.

Cory Streisinger asked for clarification on a statement in the August 30 minutes, page one, section 2 – Program Manager’s Report, second paragraph: *Stan McClain inquired as to when the discussion regarding scope expansion will be held. Mike [Freese] indicated the scope has been reset to Accenture’s original inventory. Final scope will be defined during the agency-specific planning process.* Cory asked for confirmation that this statement was made at the meeting. Mike Freese confirmed that the minutes were accurate and this was the statement he made.

Motion: Mike Marsh moved to approve the August 30, 2004 meeting minutes; several seconds were received. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Program Manager’s Report – Mike Freese

In order to accomplish the governor’s direction to be more aggressive in finding savings for the state, Mike Freese explained that there are two options for consideration: execute the project more quickly to “move the goal posts closer” and produce savings earlier, or; expand the scope to include additional computing and networking infrastructure which would increase savings. The only option that is based on data is to reset the scope back to the original inventory. Mike reminded the board he had made this statement in previous governing board meetings and apologized that he had not been clearer.

Elizabeth Harchenko stated her understanding of the governor’s direction was to continue to look for ways to make better savings, not to reset the scope. Elizabeth suggested that as the board moved forward with implementation they would have

opportunity to increase what is in scope. In this way, the board would not need to roll back to the original inventory numbers that several agencies have concerns with. Elizabeth also asked for a clear definition as to what is meant by a “data center.”

Mike Freese emphasized that if the scope is set too narrowly in the business case, the project methodology provides no opportunity to look for additional savings.

Don Fleming explained that the current phase of the project would produce a detailed implementation plan. This phase does not seek to change the business case but rather looks to produce it.

Bill Crowell said that when the CIO’s worked through the process to further identify scope, it was problematic that some services were in scope and some were out. DHS took the approach that the agency would not have a data center (no facility, no equipment and no staff); with that framework, scope is very clear. He encouraged all the agencies to not hold things back; the goal is to have one consolidated data center for the state (not 13 instead of the current 12).

John Koreski voiced concern that it appears Corrections will not have any staff left to support IT functions that are out of scope. This stems from fractional FTE issues (some functions in, some out of scope). Herb Riley and Dan Adelman echoed this concern.

Cory Streisinger commented that her understanding from the meeting with the governor was the board would look at what is in or out of scope agency by agency, not to roll back to the original numbers of the inventory. In this way the scope might be different for each agency.

Don Fleming stated that going agency by agency again will repeat the original work and would require additional time and finances which will delay the process.

Max Williams shared his concern that if what is in scope does not meet the savings originally stated, the entire project will be considered a failure.

Mike Freese reiterated the purpose of the business case is to set a target or parameter. Now is the time to address the issue of when technical staff will get engaged in the process and to determine what is in scope. Once past this next phase we cannot go back and pull things into scope.

Curt Amo offered that it may be the “future opportunities” (identified in the business case) that give the state improved savings and efficiencies rather than savings now. Once the consolidated data center is operational, the state can be more aggressive in moving toward other consolidation opportunities.

Stan McClain said the group should stop trying to define scope; rather, it should be left open for each agency to analyze. Until then, “the scope is undetermined.”

Cory Streisinger noted there would be human resource issues if scope was not defined. She advocated the earlier scope definition (prepared by the Technology Committee) “subject to change.” Bill Crowell disagreed with this approach saying the end result would be 13 data centers.

Mike Freese shared an idea for staff selection that would allow any IT staff person in the 12 participating agencies to apply for data center positions, not restricting applicants to those affected by consolidation.

Laurie Warner concluded it was clear these issues would not reach conclusion at this meeting and requested the Technology Committee resolve the scope issue and define what a data center is and bring a recommendation back to the governing board.

Dallas Weyand asked how this would affect the project's time line as these delays may necessitate changes in his report to the legislature. Mike Freese stated that these action items would not affect the project's time line.

Bob Repine sought to ensure there was an appropriate mechanism for CIOs to come to agreement on issues.

Elizabeth Harchenko asked the board for clarification regarding what decisions are left to the governing board and to each committee and the project team. She shared her concern that this project is creating a cultural change and recommended reaffirmation of conclusions in governing board meetings along with a more formal motion process.

Motion: Elizabeth moved that the Technology Committee review the definition of scope for a consolidated data center coming to agreement on what makes sense from a business perspective, and bring it to the governing board in a descriptive format (i.e., not exclusively numeric).

There was discussion regarding the appropriateness of the approach proposed in the motion, and the motion was later withdrawn.

Gary Weeks suggested that each agency go back to their technical staff to evaluate what makes sense from the agency's perspective regarding scope. Each agency should add to the business case with this exercise. The governing board could then see what similarities exist and work from there. Gary was concerned that this process be accomplished in a timely manner.

John Koreski said we need to organize technical staff to assist in coming to a conclusion or recommendation for the consolidation project plan. He believes scope cannot be finalized without the involvement of technical staff.

Cory Streisinger said that the minimum scope would be that which is outlined by the business case. Each agency must then "be aggressive."

Dan Adelman and John Koreski said that this approach makes sense. Dan suggested having agencies start from the premise "we are shutting down all agency data centers" and see what is left.

Mike Marsh agreed that this suggested approach would achieve the goal faster, but was concerned that the final product be well defined (that a common analysis be completed).

Stan McClain said that CIOs should define standards and criteria for this process including "looking at other opportunities." He also supported the agency identification approach.

Motion: Gary Weeks moved that the CIOs work out defining an appropriate scope from the perspective that no agency will have a data center; this is to be done within two weeks; the recommendation should outline both “in scope” and “out of scope.” Mike Marsh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Gary Weeks asked about the process for sharing concerns with the draft implementation plan. Mike Freese said comments can be sent to him directly or be shared with the agency CIO who will bring the concerns to the next meeting of the Technology Committee.

3. Accenture Presentation

Accenture summarized the process of consolidation from phase 1 through the actual implementation which is completed in phase 3. We are currently preparing to begin phase 2. Rock Bonecutter explained that as each agency looked at what is in scope it was with a silo approach. Now it is time to look at the whole picture in an aggregate way.

Rick Webb summarized that this is the hard part of the process as it is a cultural change for many. Rick cautioned that if the board over-analyzes at this point it will be very difficult to meet the objective. He assured the board that they do not need to have all the details figured out to move forward as these details will be answered during the process.

Julienne VanDerZiel emphasized that from Accenture’s experience, the Oregon business case is extremely conservative and very achievable. She also noted that not everything in the new data center has to be “common.” Unique things can be moved to the center; they can be run from the new center just like they are today from agencies.

4. Committee Reports

Due to the time, Laurie Warner asked if there were any critical updates from the other committees and there were none.

5. Other Issues

Don Fleming reported the JLCIMT presentation would focus on the facility aspect of the project.

Mike Freese reported that the Technology Committee will begin to design a job description for the data center manager for the Board’s approval, with the goal of hiring as soon as possible.

Next Meeting

Monday, October 11, 2004
3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
DAS West ~ Conference Room A

Submitted by: Cheryl Knottingham, DAS IRMD Administration.