



## CNIC Steering Committee – Meeting Minutes

Date: April 25, 2005

---

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

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

Others present: Kari Ensminger, Sarah Gates, Raelynn Henson, Cathy Hoffman, Julie Mallord, and Theresa Masse.

### 1. Review / Approval of Minutes

Stan McClain noted that Dean Willard and Mike Freese had come to his agency to have a discussion with “senior technical staff” not “senior management.”

Motion: Stan made a motion to approve the minutes. John Koreski seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Action items: The updated business case will be presented at a hearing on May 15 or 17. It will be stressed that the business case will be moving to and rebuilt in the budget process. This is an ongoing action item and will be moved to pending items.

Joe Wahl sent an updated state data center (SDC) director pie chart to Cheryl detailing the high and medium level traits needed for this position.

It was said that Julie would reaffirm the decision-making model in the Steering Committee charter. Julie said that Raelynn sent out the technical charter and stated that this is the only information on hand to date. Raelynn noted that the only reference to decision making uses the word “collaborate.” It makes no reference to decision-making models.

Action: Julie will update the charter to include the decision-making model. Curt Amo’s comments will also be added.

The Project Office (PO) is following up on federal funds for emergency preparedness. This is an

ongoing task. It was noted that this may be a homeland security issue.

The iSeries architecture changes have been made and this will be discussed further into the agenda.

Extravagant gifts: Julie investigated this issue. She sent a reminder of policy to the PO. One vendor had done a presentation and the work group asked for copy of it. It was put on a memory card and given to the Project Manager. This is in line with the policy but was perceived as receipt of an overpriced gift.

### 2. Discuss/Approve Architecture Recommendations of the Storage Work Group

Curt Amo noted that data classification was the only open item but that it does not affect the architecture recommendation. Baron Rodriguez said that, as previously discussed with Mike Freese and Julie Mallord, he is not authorized to approve this recommendation as is. The recommendation must include ODE’s federal requirements in order to be considered for approval. Mike asked if noting that these requirements would have to be addressed in the detailed design phase would satisfy Baron’s concerns. It was discussed that all of the architecture documents should state that all recommendations comply with state and federal regulatory requirements. Baron explained that if the right language was added, he would be able to vote.

Action: Bill Crowell stated that all recommendations of architecture must be subject to further determination that they are consistent with all applicable regulatory requirements. Julie will follow up with the PO.

Motion: John Koreski made a motion to accept the Storage work group recommendation with the added provision as stated by Bill and with the added language that was sent by Baron to Julie and Mike. Curt clarified that all agencies should be able to add their requirements. Gary Johnson said that he could not unilaterally agree but agreed that the approach was reasonable. Bill seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

A discussion was held on how to deal with the various regulatory requirements of the agencies. Curt noted that a framework or approach should be



drafted for discussion purposes at steering committee and that the committee should decide how to handle these things as a whole. Discussion indicated that planned approach or workgroup handling of this issue would be better than having each agency work independently to get waivers, or changes made to support the approved architectures. Dean suggested that this should be on the Governing Board agenda.

Action: Dean will investigate lessons learned on this topic and recommend an approach, framework on how to work through these types of regulatory requirement issues.

Decision: A process for ensuring that all regulatory requirements can either be accommodated by the SDC or modified to support the SDC will be worked on at an upcoming Steering Committee meeting.

### **3. Discussion of Architecture Work to Date of the Security Work Group**

The single perimeter is currently being implemented in a five stage process. John wanted to know if the team has been using the ISO standard as a basic roadmap. This has been adopted by the CIO Council and could be helpful. Julie noted that this is very important to the work group and that they also understand that there is a difference between the ISO series and an enterprise perception. The ISO roadmap has been the driver with a connection to Cobit. The security architecture has a target end date of June 15. Dean clarified that groups are working under the assumption that the target architecture will be a multi-zoned architecture. The idea is to meet all requirements with a single infrastructure. Bill wants to make sure that agency specific requirements are being discussed and met in the most efficient way possible. John noted that a lot of time and thought has gone into this within each agency. There needs to be a clear understanding of how different levels of protection will be maintained.

Action: Julie will take this discussion back to the PO. Please send any further questions/comments to Julie.

### **4. Discuss/Approve Architecture Recommendations of the I-Series Mainframe Work Group**

The requested work has been done and incorporated into the document. Herb, Stan and John were the main players around this recommended change. The work group clarified the recommended change. They are satisfied with the change that was made and are happy with version 12.

Motion: Stan made the motion to approve the I-series mainframe architecture document, version 12. John seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

### **5. Disaster Recovery Planning Discussion**

A disaster recovery strategy is needed and should not be dependent on the enterprise BCP program currently being implemented. Mike noted that this issue is currently in contract negotiations between Accenture and the state and that it could not yet be discussed.

Decision: Disaster recovery should be put back on the Steering Committee agenda once the Accenture contract is in place.

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

Bill will kick off this meeting with notes from a historical perspective. Project Manager's are building slides for the presentation that will follow. Then, Julie will present an overview of Stage Two noting major milestones and information on expectations. The meeting will close with another CIO Q&A panel session. Raelynn is asking all CIO's to participate and distributed a sign up sheet during the meeting. Peer communications will submit some advanced questions to get the Q&A going. They will be distributed to everyone at the door. The CIO's should be introduced before the panel discussion begins. The Power Point presentation will be part of the advanced packet that goes out on Friday. Announcements for the meeting have been distributed several times. PM's are also discussing it in their work group meetings this week. A sign-in sheet will be distributed in each row in order to track attendance.



There was good response to the state data center tours opportunity.

### **7. Detail Design – Resource Conflicts**

It has been noted in the project status report that the amount of time from each resource was not totally utilized in Stage One and that it will need to be in Stage Two. Individuals are stating that they do not have the time to meet this need. Some changes to the work groups will help with this. Lots of critical tasks and milestones are coming up in this phase. This is an issue. Curt suggested that backfills may need to be taken to the HR committee. Bill stated that the CIO's can make this a priority and reassign people as needed. Ben wants to send a consistent message about making this a priority. Mike suggested that the PO should discuss how to deal with double fill and LD association. The number of resources and time needed for changing ownership during the consolidation was also discussed.

Action: The PO will provide and update the tasks that require agency action so that the CIO's can help ensure that their staff is working these items as highest priority.

### **8. Impact of CIOC and CNIC Steering Committee decisions on each other; i.e. archive, data classifications, etc.**

The Steering Committee needs to be sure to elevate items dealing with enterprise standards to the CIO Council. A note should always be included identifying the item as informational or as a decision.

### **9. Sample Agency Message/Tour Brochure/Rumor Document Approval**

Raelynn distributed as sample message for CIO's to use when appropriate. The Peer Communications work group would like to offload the backlog of inquiries to Julie so that the peer communications person can become a single point of contact. Raelynn asked the CIO's to send this sample, or some form thereof, to their staff as appropriate. Inquiries are coming from a variety of sources and seem random in nature (there are no identified trends). The request is to have a Peer Communications rep field some of these questions.

Action: Raelynn will distribute the sample message electronically.

The SDC tour brochure was distributed as an FYI. This will go out to all those touring the facility on Wednesday.

A rumors document was distributed and Raelynn asked the CIO's to review it.

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

Curt wanted to note that some agencies business partners are expressing concerns about how things will change once in the SDC.

Stan has seen a draft of Claudia Light's plan for personnel dealing with change. She will be here next week, Monday, May 2 to present this to the committee.

The SDC director search is down to ten candidates. One state employee is included. Monday, May 2, this group should discuss how to handle the presentation interviews, perhaps picking three topics. Mike is hopeful that there will only be five candidates at the time of this presentation.

Meeting adjourned: 2:35 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** Monday, May 2, 2005  
DAS West – Conference Room A  
1 to 3 p.m.