



CNIC Peer Communications Group Meeting Minutes – June 17, 2005

Approved

Attendees: Shawn Dawson, ODOT; Wes Ford, DHS; Dennis Green, Employment; Raelynn Henson, CNIC Project Office; John Hubbard, DOC; Natalya Ishenin, DHCS.
Guests: Laurie Warner and Don Fleming, DAS; Brian Nealy, DHS.
Minutes by Cathy Hoffman, CNIC Project Office

Executive Update

Laurie Warner, Department of Administrative Services (DAS) Acting-Director, and Don Fleming, State CIO, answered questions presented by the Peer Communications Group and engaged in discussion of some of the legislative history and process of the CNIC project.

Dennis brought up the draft security model for discussion because it lists 28 security FTE. It appears this would account for one-third of the data center personnel. Don Fleming said he would request that the figure be reviewed noting it is helpful to remember that this is a draft. With a project the size of CNIC it is important to take the opportunity to look at all the options, be able to talk about them, and distribute draft documents for review and comment.

The CNIC budget has been identified as separate bills in the House and Senate which is different than past legislative sessions. DAS was before the Joint Legislative Committee on Information Management and Technology (JLCIMT) one year ago and went through details. They approved the business plan and the building. The chair of that committee did not get re-elected and members of the current House Information Management and Technology (IMT) Committee were not part of the JLCIMT. This has resulted in a need for further education and information for several members. Meetings have been held with several legislators to address their concerns and the House will be reviewing the CNIC budget on June 23. Laurie and Don indicated they are committed to attend any meetings necessary to present the materials and information needed to help develop understanding of the CNIC project.

Shawn said that most employees “in the know” have legitimate concerns that the CNIC project is being done correctly. Employees have been asking some of the same questions as the legislature. Don and Laurie acknowledged there have been a lot of exchanges between employees and the legislature.

Most of the concern being expressed is not about the data center. It is more in relation to the timing of when it will happen and how much it will cost. But the project is not all about money. Some of the issues revolve around what the data center will enable the state to do and around security. We have used the best estimates we have and we know more today than we did a year ago. We hope everyone understands that a plan is a plan and you adjust it as you reach check points.

In the beginning we weren't down to the details that would involve the technical people at that point. We first developed the high-level business case and then we involved the technical people. It was important to make sure we had a solid business case before diverting more state employees from their regular duties.

There will continue to be people with concerns and it is better for them to say something to us. We have to chart the best course and move forward because we are moving somewhere we've never been before. If an employee has a factual argument, we absolutely want to hear it.

This project will have glitches but rather than point fingers, we are committed to saying how we are going to fix it. This project will position the state for the future. It is important for employees to participate and give good input.



Shawn said that employees do not want their concerns misconstrued. They want to see the project go forward. Some do have concerns with how we will get there. There was discussion of the relationship with contractors and the value of employee input. Don stated that employees need to understand that receiving input doesn't always mean the project will go the way they want.

It was reported that an administrator has been hired for the data center; however no announcement will be made until that person releases the state to do so.

Review and Approve Minutes

The June 3 minutes were reviewed. Shawn asked that the wording around the server equipment be amended. It was pointed out that a decision was not made on a server and that different agencies experience different problems based on the level of features used. It was agreed to amend the minutes to include a more general statement. The group is to approve the revised minutes via e-mail.

John brought up the issue of sharing timely information and noted a rumor that technical work groups are being dissolved. Raelynn shared that recent Steering Committee minutes do not reflect discussions about dissolving technical work groups. Also, everyone needs to understand that information about the CNIC project will be shared at the earliest opportunity, at the time we are allowed to share that information. Sometimes issues are under discussion (or a document is partially distributed as a *draft*). If Peer members are asked for comments in these situations it is best to say "the issue is under discussion and when it is final, a decision will be announced." With regard to any work group activity, be sure to check the QuickPlace status reports of the work groups for accurate information.

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.