

## CNIC Steering Committee – Meeting Minutes

Date: April 4, 2005

---

The CNIC Steering Committee met at DAS West in Conference Room A.

Committee members or designee present: Dan Adelman, Curt Amo, Ben Berry, Dan Christensen, Bill Crowell, Mike Freese, Gary Johnson, Stan McClain, Jill Peterson, Herb Riley, and Baron Rodriguez.

Others present: Sarah Gates, Raelynn Henson, Margaret Kane, Cheryl Knottingham, Keith Kohan, Theresa Masse, Mark Matson, Joe Wahl and Dean Willard.

### 1. Review / Approval of Minutes

Baron Rodriguez reported that he thought his motion in Section 5 of the March 28 minutes regarding work groups had been withdrawn.

Ben Berry requested a revision in the Project Scope section to better explain the exclusion statement as follows: Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) includes specific servers; ITS specific end-point devices such as Road and Weather Information System (RWIS) units, traffic cameras, Variable Message Signs and Ramp Meters; Traffic Management Operations Center equipment in Portland; four Transportation Operations Centers equipment and those LANs/WANs/WLANs carrying only ITS information.

Motion: John Koreski made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 28 CNIC Steering Committee meeting with the requested edits. Stan McClain seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Action: Ben Berry, John Koreski and Stan McClain will attend the Whitehouse meeting on Friday, April 8 at 9 a.m. as their schedules allow.

### 2. Interim Single Perimeter Management

Mike Freese said that DAS IRMD Data and Video Services has a vacancy. He suggested the members consider a job rotation for a staff person within one of the 12 agencies. The specific assignment would be network engineer for the single perimeter project for approximately 12 months. Because of the nature of

the assignment, an informal application process could be used; interested staff could submit a letter of interest with their qualifications. Stan McClain suggested interested employees talk with their manager prior to submitting a letter of interest.

Action: Mike Freese will e-mail more information about the job and the process to the Steering Committee.

### 3. Current vs. Future Infrastructure Model Discussion

Mike distributed the Current vs. Future Infrastructure Model document noting it was the same document presented to the CIO Management Team. He suggested the committee use the document to provide context for CNIC and potential follow-on initiatives. Stan McClain agreed and stated CNIC should be viewed not as an “end all” but as a mechanism for change. He also wanted to ensure a substantiated business case and CIO Council and Governing Board involvement for future initiatives. Dan Adelman stated that use of “CNIC” in the title sounds like this is only affecting the 12 agencies and suggested using the term enterprise instead.

Jill Petersen asked that more clarity be added so that the initiatives in the document are not perceived as a “done deal.” Ben Berry requested changing the format from bullets to include an explanation for each item.

Curt Amo suggested the document is a great way to report on future possibilities and should be taken to the CIO Council. The CIO Council has responsibility for launching future initiatives. Sarah Gates said the format of the document makes it ideal for presenting information to the legislature, as it is clear and concise.

Action: Mike Freese will add a narrative explanation.

Action: Curt Amo and Stan McClain will take the document to the CIO Council.

### 4. Project Scope – revision review

Mike Freese and Dean Willard presented a review of the discussion at the March 28 Steering Committee meeting to clarify questions that were raised by committee members. Mike emphasized that the discussion was driven by a need to provide more

context to work groups. This is a key to the groups making recommendations that will carry the state into the future (for an extensible, scalable architecture). Dean stated that the Project Office is attempting to provide clarity, not make a scope change.

There were several comments regarding DBA:

- CNIC is the beginning of a shared services business model for the state.
- Accenture recommends that for a long-term approach, DBA (both physical and logical) is in scope. Neither the technology nor skill set is unique.
- Even though the state data center provides this service, there may be instances where certain things are retained at the agency level.
- Ben Berry suggested Dean have a conversation with each of the CIOs to clarify their needs and intentions around DBA.

Other comments:

- The goal of the state data center is to provide more not less services for the state. Example: the server work group will make a recommendation to standardize on three platforms. This provides a buffet for agencies to choose from according to their requirements.
- John Koreski is concerned about what happens to staff working in an area of a “future initiative.” There is an issue with excluding these staff from initial hiring rounds.
- Vision/strategy is defined in scope and sets other issues as follow-up but still encourages work groups to think about where we want to go in the future.
- Currently the work groups are asked to set up a view three years in the future. If they make recommendations that we are missing an opportunity in the CNIC project, Steering Committee will take that recommendation under consideration.
- From a project management perspective you must make choices. This is the purpose of defining scope. Even if we knew today the next follow-on initiative, choices would still be made about how to accomplish the CNIC project first.

- It is true that the menu of things we are looking at will change but the majority of the future initiatives will likely remain the same.
- Architecture is more than technology; it is also a business model.

The Project Office is asking the Steering Committee to make a forward moving statement that will encourage the work groups to keep a long-term vision in mind. Planning is also needed for the people that are affected by future initiatives.

Action: Mike Freese will draft a process for addressing shared services.

Scope clarification document – item review: Items two and four will be combined and brought back for review at the April 11 Steering Committee meeting.

Item 3 – The Project Office is finishing logical and physical separation of duties for MS-SQL and will bring to the committee for review when completed.

#### **5. Data Center Manager Recruitment Process**

Joe Wahl brought an update of the process. They currently have 15 initial applications that look very hopeful with 20 more that may be viable as well. There were a total of 120 applications received about half of which met the minimum qualifications.

Mike Freese stated that they would like the interview panel to include an agency director, several volunteers from the Steering Committee and a couple technical staff. The committee asked Mike to select the technical staff needed from a larger agency.

Action: Project Office will choose dates for the interviews and Mike will send an e-mail to Steering about volunteering for the interview panel.

There was also discussion about not holding back the staff hiring process waiting for the director recruitment to be complete before doing basic things like writing position descriptions.

Action: Project Office will draft the management layer of the org chart for the SDC and give it to the labor relations group and use for budget purposes. This is ahead of the existing timeline for development of the

chart (due at the end of detailed design), but the committee wants it moved up.

#### **6. Agenda for April 11 Governing Board Meeting**

After discussion the Steering Committee recommended that the April 11 Governing Board meeting be cancelled for lack of action items. A written update will be provided to the board in lieu of meeting.

#### **7. Request for CNIC backfill approval for Dept. of Revenue**

Stan McClain stated that this request was a test of the process implemented by the Steering Committee. The first part of the process is for Project Office review. The PO has determined that the request meets the requirements. Discussion and vote will be deferred to April 11.

#### **8. Additional Discussion/Roundtable/Rumor Control**

- Raelynn Henson indicated that Security team members had given approval to have some construction photos uploaded to the new CNIC portal since access is restricted to state employees.
- The Project Office is making preliminary preparations for the upcoming all hands meeting on May 5 (9 to 11 a.m. at the Employment Department auditorium). Components of the meeting will include the outcomes/decisions of Stage One, work group reports, and an overview of what work groups can expect in Stage Two.
- Bill Crowell asked for a tool to document information and prepare for moving applications. Dean Willard will provide. Ben asked for a presentation to the whole group on this topic at an appropriate time.
- Curt Amo asked if disaster recovery was a component of the current effort. Dean said no but DR is under review.
- Dan Adelman requested that committee members be given sufficient time to review advance materials for the upcoming architecture recommendation meetings.
- Mike Freese followed up on a previous meeting topic – marketing the CNIC project. Mike recently attended a conference for chief technology officers and found that although

there is great consolidation interest and activity around the nation, no one is approaching governance like Oregon. The Atkinson School (Willamette University) has expressed interest in conducting a case study on CNIC. Mike will follow up on this.

- It will be important to take the CNIC message to the governor and legislators in order to receive authorization for IT reinvestment.

**Next Meeting:** Monday, April 11, 2005  
DAS West – Conference Room A  
1 to 3 p.m.