



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

**Date: April 18, 2005**

---

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

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

Others present: Kari Ensminger, Sarah Gates, Raelynn Henson, Cathy Hoffman, Keith Kohan, Peter Lundberg, Julie Mallord, Mark Matson, Joe Wahl and Dean Willard.

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

Stan McClain requested the following changes to the April 11 minutes:

- John Koreski's name be added to Section 1, paragraph 4, as a participant in the Whitehouse meeting.
- Stan McClain asked to revise section 7 regarding the IRS audit to read as follows: Stan will send the IRS safeguard and security information to the other affected agencies.

Motion: Bill Crowell made the motion to approve the minutes from the April 11 Steering Committee meeting. Dan Adelman seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

### **Action Items**

The updated business case will be presented to the Steering Committee as soon as it is ready. It will then be rebuilt as it goes through the budget process.

The agenda order was rearranged.

### **10. Results of Leadership Survey**

Joe Wahl distributed a handout of the survey results and reviewed it with the committee. Not one area of the graphical presentation was thought to be critical. Curt Amo noted that the pie chart could be misleading.

Action: Joe will incorporate medium- and high-level characteristics into the pie chart for a well rounded and more accurate representation of the desired traits.

### **2. Committee's Decision-Making Model for Architecture Representation**

Ben Berry requested that the members use this discussion to decide how they wanted to make decisions as a group noting that the need to reach consensus had already been discussed. Each member spoke about his/her feelings around a consensus model. Mike Freese asked the group to define what a dissenting opinion is. Curt Amo proposed moving forward with the consensus model noting that differences of opinion could exist as long as those members with dissenting opinions could agree to disagree and support the group's decision. Jill Peterson wanted to build into the process a way to note the reasons when consensus could not be met. John Koreski brought up the Steering Committee charter stating that he thought the consensus model was the stated choice.

Action: Julie Mallord will reaffirm the decision-making model in the charter.

### **3. The Impact the Architecture Recommendations have on SDC Staffing Levels**

John Koreski suggested that this be addressed after all of the work group presentations have been heard. There was some discussion around cost avoidance. Mike Freese confirmed that it has been built into the business case and noted that savings will not be realized until the 07-09 biennium.

Curt suggested that there are three main ideas to keep in mind: cost, schedule and quality. He suggested that quality will continue to become more and more important. Stan questioned if primary goals and outcomes should be documented to ensure they align with the decisions being made. He thought Julie might have some of this already documented and that this would be helpful in bringing clarity to the group.

### **4. Business Case Implications of the Architecture Recommendations**

The impact of the architecture decisions on the business case was brought up in the mainframe

discussion. The choices being made about the architectures will greatly influence operational efficiencies and cost structure. Decisions must be made from an enterprise level. This group should begin by agreeing on a menu of technology for the state data center. A commitment to long-term targets has been built into the business case but those targets should be decided now. Mike Freese further noted that several investments will have to be made before, during and after the move. These investments should be based on future targets. Though it is not necessary to take action where the future targets are concerned, it is necessary to have a common understanding of the standardizations that will take place.

##### **5. Discuss/Approve Architecture Recommendations of the Network Work Group**

Julie Mallord confirmed that the principles have been added to this document and will become part of all the architecture documents.

Motion: Stan McClain made the motion that the network architecture recommendation be adopted as recommended. John Koreski seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Bill Crowell went on to say that emergency preparedness should be worked into the detailed design phase. Federal funding may be available to support this.

Action: The Project Office will follow up on federal funds that may be available for ensuring emergency preparedness.

##### **6. Discuss/Approve Architecture Recommendations of the Server Work Group**

Curt Amo raised a question pertaining to the difficulty of moving from Red Hat to Sousa. Dean Willard noted that the server work group understands some of the challenges implicated in their recommendations. They are comfortable working through these challenges in the detailed design.

Motion: Bill Crowell made the motion that the server architecture recommendation be approved. Baron Rodriguez seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

##### **7. Discuss/Approve Architecture Recommendations of the i-Series Mainframe Work Group**

John Koreski asked that conditions be added to the recommendation concerning the source and availability of funding for a new I-Series machine.

Herb Riley noted his concern that the recommendation required a pre-data center migration of ODVA to the DOC machine. He cited resource constraints and requested clarification be added to the document.

Stan McClain proposed that the conditions be included in the recommendation and that the committee wait to vote on it next week.

Action: The Project Office will see that the changes are made and will bring the i-Series recommendation back next week.

##### **8. Discuss/Approve Architecture Recommendations of the z-Series Mainframe Work Group**

In response to last week's action item, a comparative cost analysis was distributed. Mark Matson reviewed the document with the committee. He then noted that the numbers represented were all relative and would change, but the differences between them were accurate.

The group came to the understanding that all capacity requirements were being met within the recommendation. They went on to discuss Sysplex and whether there was a business case to support the recommendation.

Motion: Bill Crowell made the motion to approve a single processor and defer the Sysplex decision to the data center management team (in consultation with the CIO Advisory Board). Jeff Marecic seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

##### **9. Agenda for All Hands Meeting May 5th**

Raelynn Henson suggested that due to lack of time, she bring an update on the planning for All Hands next Steering Committee meeting.

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

Stan McClain shared with the group that he had invited Dean Willard and Mike Freese to come and

talk with Revenue's senior IT staff. He noted that the conversation went very well and was extremely useful for everyone involved. Stan made the recommendation that other CIO's consider doing the same thing.

Rumor control: Stan noted a rumor of extravagant gifts being distributed by vendors during presentations to work groups.

Action: Julie Mallord will investigate.

Meeting adjourned: 2:53 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** Monday, April 25, 2005  
DAS West – Conference Room A  
1 to 3 p.m.