

## **CNIC Steering Committee – Meeting Minutes**

Date: October 26, 2004

---

DAS West in Conference Room A.  
3:00 to 4:30 p.m.

Members/delegates present: Dan Adelman, Curt Amo, Ben Berry, Bruce Craig, Bill Crowell, Mike Freese, Gary Johnson, Dick Kahler, John Koreski, Ken Magee, Jill Petersen, David Yandell.

Others present: Peter Byrne, Raelynn Henson, Cheryl Knottingham, Keith Kohan, Theresa Masse, Mark Matson, and Dean Willard.

John Koreski brought the meeting to order.

### **1. Review / Approval of Minutes**

Ben Berry made a motion to accept the minutes from the October 12, 2004 meeting and Dave Yandell seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#### Review of action items:

White paper on facility size – Peter Byrne stated the work on this should be completed and a report presented to the committee no later than two weeks from today.

Definition of “affected” – Mike Freese reported that the PMO has not had the opportunity to meet with Sue Wilson yet but hopes to within the next two weeks.

Accenture to sign off on building plan – Dean Willard stated they are looking at this and will have their report for the committee by no later than two weeks from today.

### **2. Special JLCIMT**

Mike Freese explained the special JLCIMT hearing was requested by Rep. Gallegos as a result of emails to legislators from state employees. The hearing is set up to clear the air and to get all concerns on the table and to verify the process and describe where we are now. Laurie Warner has asked several agency heads to testify and SEIU may have representation at the hearing to voice concerns. John Koreski asked if this hearing is meant to come to any specific conclusions. Mike Freese stated the purpose is to address publicly any concerns for the record for legislators who may not have the latest information. No formal report is expected.

Ben Berry asked if the committee will receive a summary of the outcome. Mike stated that the hearing will be recorded and available.

### **3. Human Services Update**

Mike Freese spoke on behalf of Sue Wilson who was not able to attend. Formal notice has been given to the unions that the state intends to proceed with CNIC. This begins a time period in which the unions must respond if they intend to demand to bargain.

**Action:** Ask Sue Wilson to attend the next committee meeting to address what is or is not bargainable.

#### **4. Project Plan**

John Koreski asked the committee not to get down to minute detail but to take a broader view from a conceptual perspective as the project plan is reviewed. John stated he did not see the scope principles in the document and believes they should be. Ben Berry agreed and asked that this be an action item.

**Action:** Add the scope principle and explain the Stage Zero process in the project plan. Mike Freese stated he would make sure all the guiding principles are included.

John Koreski said he had difficulty lining section three up with sections further on in the document. After a discussion it was decided to provide a clear description explaining the purpose of each section.

Dan Adelman asked for clarification to the meaning of the reference on page 10 to strengthen the PMO. Mike Freese said the change made to the role of the PMO to provide more effectual support resulted from the interviews with agency heads and their concern for a stronger hands-on approach.

There was concern expressed over the chart on page 14 due to the times indicated. Mike explained that this is the initial straw model and it will change as the project goes forward. Curt Amo suggested the milestones should be along the lines of hiring the data center manager, security model, network model and so on. Dan Adelman stated that short term milestones would be helpful.

**Action:** Add a statement on page 14 that the dates are proposed.

**Action:** Add a piece in the beginning to explain the document is not etched in stone but subject to future additions/refinement.

Ben Berry asked if Accenture has a role in the project that includes oversight. Mike Freese stated that a third party project oversight and QA vendor will be hired for the entire project. When asked what the estimated time to have the contractor on board is, Mike reported that the statement of work is about done and agreed this needs to happen as soon as possible.

Jill Petersen requested a change on the bottom of page 17, to remove the bullet stating, "agencies that will participate in Phase II are all agencies under direct control of the governor." The committee agreed with this change.

John Koreski asked about the management of deliverables and if the Steering Committee will have a role in this process. Dean Willard explained that at the beginning of each stage there is a kickoff and explanation of deliverables. Mike Freese suggested that the committee take the approach of deciding the deliverables at the beginning of each stage. Curt Amo suggested the committee develop principles the deliverables should be measured by.

**Action:** Re-write the plan to be in line with methodology: Scope; Architecture; Design; Implementing the design; Implementation

Ben Berry asked for clarification between sections 4.10 and 7.2. Mike explained that 4.10 is operational and 7.2 refers to project metrics.

Due to the lack of time, John Koreski asked that the committee continue the review of the project plan at the next meeting scheduled for November 2. During the week, the committee is asked to review the QA statement of work and to continue to review the project plan and communicate input via e-mail to the PMO.

There was a general consensus to approve the Architectural Design Phase on page 11. A motion to approve was made by Curt Amo and seconded by Bill Crowell. The motion passed unanimously.

Dan Adelman would like to see the technical teams chartered with a defined project scope for them. Ben Berry agreed the teams need a formal charter to set them up for success. This would include clear definitions of deliverables that they could then bring back to the committee.

Curt Amo made a motion that the Steering Committee endorse the concepts in 3.1 and ask the PMO to identify an approach to implement requirements for various architectural models (deliverables, chartering technical groups, dates/timeline) and return to the Steering Committee for review and approval. Bill Crowell seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Bill Crowell shared concerns he has from the DHS perspective:

- Classifications for main frame operators with different ratings such as IS2 and IS3. Curt Amo stated that having the staffing model first would help solve the problem. Bill agreed that timing is an issue and that there should be no hiring before redefining classifications.
- How does an agency draw from the funds set aside to backfill agency positions? Mike Freese explained that the Steering Committee would need to write a proposal and present it to the governing board for approval.
- Where is the responsibility matrix in the project plan? Mark Matson stated it was left out of the most recent e-mail to reduce the volume of pages.

### **Other**

The committee requested the weekly meetings be moved to a later time of day. After the next meeting scheduled for Nov 2 from 1 to 2, the meetings will be held every Tuesday from 3 to 4:30.

**Next Meeting:** Tuesday, November 2, 2004  
1 to 2 p.m.  
Forestry – Tillamook Room