

## **CNIC Technology Committee – Meeting Minutes**

Date: September 28, 2004

---

The CNIC Technology Committee met at DAS West in Conference Room B.

Committee members present: Dan Adelman, Curt Amo, Peter Byrne, Bill Carpenter, Dan Christensen, Bill Crowell, Mike Freese, Gary Johnson, Keith Kohan, John Koreski, Mark Matson, Stan McClain, Ken Magee, Baron Rodriguez and Marc Williams.

Others present: Rick Webb, Dean Willard and Cheryl Knottingham.

Mike Freese called the meeting to order at 1 p.m.

### **1. Strategic Planning Interview Process Dry Run Debrief**

Sean McSpaden and Scott Riorden gave an update on their discoveries during the practice interview with Cindy Becker. Bill Crowell and Mike Freese also shared insight in the process. In summary there are several key points for the CIOs to keep in mind during their interview with directors:

- Plan on the full 1 ½ hours to go through the 4 questions.
- As a lead in to question 1, summarize what was gleaned from agency budget documents. The agency can fill in any gaps.
- Explain up front the concept of the meeting and how it will benefit the agency and the enterprise as a whole – describe the value proposition to the agency – what’s in it for them.
- Keep the interview at the business level and not the technical level.
- Let the interview flow, do not be rigid in the covering the questions in order.
- Bring focus on what the strategic IT plan is to accomplish and do not just focus on the plan itself.
- Remember that the director is responsible first for the running of the agency and facilitating statewide initiatives is a secondary consideration. They are mainly concerned about how this process and resulting plan will affect their agency’s ability to accomplish its mission.

Sean McSpaden closed by reminding the committee the goal for this interview process is to gather a collaborative result.

### **2. Review and Approval of Minutes**

**Motion:** Curt Amo made a motion to accept the minutes from the Sept. 21, 2004 meeting; the motion was seconded by Dan Adelman. The motion passed unanimously.

John Koreski reviewed the decision to have minutes taken at each committee meeting. The members agreed this was their desire going forward.

### **3. Review / Approval of Draft Documents**

#### **CNIC Technology Committee Principles document**

John Koreski asked for clarification on item C, which states that CIOs must become experts on the project and the process to properly provide the necessary leadership to the agencies.

Mike Freese explained this as the necessary commitment the members of this group must have as they will need a thorough understanding of the consolidation process.

Curt Amo asked how the committee intended to use these principles; are they to be adopted in spirit only or used as bylaws?

Dan Adelman asked that an addition be made to show the project must support the participating agencies' business needs.

**Action:** It was agreed that a business preamble be added to all draft documents being reviewed today.

Bill Crowell recommended deleting G on page 3 until formal relationship to the governance board and formal duties and responsibilities are established. Bill also asked for clarification on item K on page 2.

Mike Freese reported that Accenture added K per his request. This chart shows the process of approach when issues are presented and it is intended as a model only.

**Motion:** Curt Amo made the motion to adopt the Operating Principles document to include the recommended changes. The document will be used as guidelines the committee can incorporate in future decisions. Bill Crowell seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

#### Scope Determination Principles document

John Koreski asked for clarification as to the purpose for this document. Mike Freese stated the purpose is to give the technical folks a basis by which to align each agency.

Curt Amo asked that a reference and description of the "Stage Zero" process be added.

**Action:** A description of the Stage Zero process will be added between items C and D. There were several comments regarding the need to be vigilant of any changes to scope that will have an effect on the cost and timeline for the project.

John Koreski stated that the committee is now defining the means to get at the details of implementation. This committee needs to set the parameters and make sure staff are ready to address the issues.

Rick Webb stated the importance of not moving the scope during phase 2. Bill Crowell suggested editing item C to edit the word "box." After discussion the committee agreed to use the term "desk top" to make the statement clearer. The committee also agreed that these principles will apply throughout the entire project.

**Motion:** Bill Crowell made a motion to adopt the scope document to include the approved changes; Stan McClain seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

### CNIC Project Management Expectations document

The relationship between the CNIC Technology Committee, PMO and the governance board needs to be defined. As a result of the discussion pertaining to this issue several actions were decided upon with group approval: 1) All major concerns will be referred to the CIO Council for review; 2) This committee needs to produce a charter and formal list of members.

**Motion:** Bill Carpenter made the motion to ask the CIOC to address the management issues at their next meeting and return a formal recommendation to the CNIC Technology Committee; Dan Adelman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**Action:** John Koreski and Curt Amo agreed to look at getting the issue of determining the role of the Technology Committee on the agenda for the next CIOC meeting.

### Governance Framework – draft for discussion

Rick Webb stated that this document addresses the governance framework for the CNIC project by outlining roles and responsibilities of the key stakeholders. The Governance Model Subcommittee, reporting to the Governing Board, has been charged with the responsibility to recommend an operational governance framework for the future management of the shared services data center. To have an effective governance framework for both the CNIC project and the ultimate operational shared services organization is critical to the state of Oregon.

Several concerns were voiced regarding this document. Mike Freese noted it had excluded the State CIO from having a role. There was considerable discussion on several aspects of the governance structure shown in the chart on page 2. Curt Amo recommended the document be re-drafted.

**Action:** Document will be re-drafted, and presented for review at the next Technology Committee meeting on October 5, 2004.

## **4. Workgroup Coordination**

### Shared Services Standards

Mark Matson presented this document and explained it will show information gathered by all agencies to help complete a picture of what software and equipment standards should be in the data center.

Keith Kohan pointed out that for the present, this document would help in making purchases with the future standard in mind.

Several members expressed their concern that this seemed to show the data center would dictate what software and equipment each agency would be allowed to use. Mike Freese explained that this document will help target the desired architecture so changes can be made in context of where we want to go on an enterprise level. Mike assured the members that the data center will not impose a standard on an agency but that the business requirements for the agency will drive the standard. Dan Adelman asked that the statewide architecture completed several years ago be utilized.

**Action:** Committee requests a full view of methodology for the project plan.

**Action:** Mark Matson will complete the schedule for technical teams by week's end. Stan McClain expressed his concern that it appeared agencies had been left off of certain shared services committees. Mark Matson assured everyone that any members who want to be involved in a committee would be welcome.

Due to the lack of time the facilities update was tabled until the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

**Next Meeting:**       Tuesday, Oct. 5  
                          1 to 2 p.m.  
                          DAS West – Conference Room A