



CNIC Steering Committee – Meeting Minutes - Date: June 20, 2005

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

Committee members or designee present: Dan Adelman, Kathryn Naugle, Ben Berry, Dan Christensen, Dennis Wells, John Koreski, Rodger Clausen, Stan McClain, Jeff Marecic, Bruce Craig, Gary Johnson.

Others Present: Sarah Gates, Raelynn Henson, Keith Kohan, Dean Willard, Bill Fink, Ken Disbrow, Pat Middelburg, Tanya Crane, Sue Wilson, Barbara Jensen, Jerry Korson, Lisa Renner, Brian Sipe, Sarah Waylett, Adam Topkis.

1. Review/Approval of Minutes, Action Items, Standing Items

Motion: Stan McClain moved to approve the June 13 Steering Committee minutes as presented. John Koreski seconded and the motion carried.

The June 13 action items were reviewed:

Action 1: Done. Interested CIOs have contacted Sarah for one-on-one budget meetings.

Action 2: In process. The ITAM team is working on a recommendation for the Steering Committee when ready (no firm date set).

Action 3: Defer this item to the July 11 agenda. There are concerns with regard to state data center staffing because the budget is based on a fixed number of FTEs carrying into the 05-07. The Project Office will prepare a process for soliciting work group comments on a conceptual staffing model given their detailed design recommendations. The process and model will be presented to the Steering Committee prior to its distribution to the work groups.

There was discussion regarding ensuring work groups have the opportunity for input on this part of the process. With regard to staffing models, industry standards, and detailed design, the new data center director will be involved in the decisions.

Action 4: In process. Deliverables tracking will be added to future status documents.

Action 5: Done. Status reports are posted to QuickPlace and the link will be added to the CNIC Web portal (documents section).

Action 6: Done. Don Fleming and Laurie Warner attend the last Peer Communications meeting and participated in a conversation on DAS efforts to get information to the Legislature. They heard from staff on various issues and were cautioned to not misread employee concern over the project – that concerns are based on a desire for the project to be done right and for the data center to be successful.

Action 7: Done. Raelynn Henson developed and distributed the talking points via e-mail.

Follow-up to decision point for potential Cross Communication work group: A charter has not been received. Staff will double check Julie Mallord's e-mail in her absence. Pat Middelburg will follow up.

Stan McClain stated he was expecting an e-mail with regard to reporting agency employee hours spent on CNIC activities, work groups, etc. (not including backfill for agency work). Ben Berry reported he gave Julie a copy of a spreadsheet used for tracking as a sample. Pat stated more input was needed to take into consideration that some agencies track on a daily basis and some do not. It is not the intent to have this process be unduly burdensome for agencies. Pat reported she will bring back a process description at the next meeting.

2. Service Management

Steve Schafer presented the service catalog recommendation discussion document. A decision is not requested at this point. Steve noted a dissenting opinion which was covered in the presentation. The Project Office will help facilitate resolution. If that is not successful, the topic will return to Steering Committee on July 11.

3. WAN Circuit Consolidation



Pat Middleburg and Brian Sipe presented the issue of customer bandwidth needs, specifically agencies that want to pay for a dedicated circuit (larger bandwidth) regardless of data that indicates bandwidth needs are much less. This is an issue because it goes against the mission of the project to reduce costs.

A discussion on service level commitments ensued. If an agency wants to incur extra cost for additional bandwidth, what is the Steering Committee's response? It was noted that the concern of the agency should be a consideration. Brian noted that the research done by the work group and Qwest on bandwidth utilization over a three month period includes the nightly backup and spike periods. Agencies requested that seasonal spikes also be included in the research.

John Koreski stated that the business should be defining the "what" and the service defining the "how." As long as the business definitions are satisfied and take everything into account, the data center needs to make the decision.

Dean stated there may need to be a process in the service management area to address requests for exceptions. Discussion included the need to know which agencies are involved and the overarching concern that delivery of service bandwidth should be based on service level requirements. It was stated that exceptions should not become the norm but stay the exception and should include a good business case.

Stan McClain referred to past minutes (May 9) that address the project plan to include the suggestion that any policy or scope level issues be brought to the Steering Committee. He stated that the agreed upon process should be followed.

Action 1: Pat Middleburg is to research the exception process and present a refresher at the next meeting.

4. Accounting WG approval of chargeback model

Tami Dohrman reviewed the proposed chargeback model framework for the data center. She

explained that the work group is recommending a step-down framework and the establishment of an internal service fund. The internal service fund is similar to what some agencies already use and would allow agencies to be billed. If the recommendation is approved, existing budget information will be put into the model to begin work on the cost allocation model. Two of the principles are: to charge the benefiting place the correct cost, and the model will not cost more than the benefit received. The Work Group is considering revising rates annually rather than every biennia.

Concern was expressed with the concept of adjusting the rates every year*. It was explained that there is a better chance to recover costs. Before the decision is made, the work group will be talking with LFO and BAM to find the best way to truly recover costs. The budget does allow room for adjustments. Before it is implemented, the impact to all players will be considered. We need to explore how to change the way we set rates in order to have flexibility in a rapidly changing market.

A question about other funding choices was posed. The state financial system cannot allocate from one agency to another and not all agencies use it. The work group looked at other options but there are constraints and they are not the accepted business practices.

Motion: Stan McClain moved to approve the step-down framework and the establishment of an internal service fund. Dan Adelman seconded and the motion carried.

*Clarification: The motion above does not include approval of annual rate changes.

5. SDC Staffing Plan Roles and Responsibilities

Barbara Jensen and Jerry Korson presented the Human Resources Strategy for the state data center staffing plan. Jerry is re-convening the CNIC HR Work Group which will consist of the human resource manager in each of the 12 agencies. They are scheduled to meet Thursday, June 23.



The high-level timeline for recruitment was presented. A more detailed timeline will be presented at the next meeting. The intent is to work with the state data center director. [Note: An official announcement has not been made as to when he will start. That announcement is expected soon.]

The human resource managers will be asked to identify names of affected personnel as they will be the first to be encouraged to apply. A question was asked about management positions identified as in-scope. Some agencies identified managerial positions as part of the affected positions. It was reported that recruitment for management positions will be open to any state employee. The remaining non-management positions fall under the Letter of Agreement and individuals in-scope would be in the first pool of applicants.

Action 2: Ben Berry requested the Steering Committee receive notice when the recruitments are being posted and it was agreed that would happen.

A question was posed regarding an organizational chart or staffing model for the data center. The data center director ultimately has this responsibility. The plan is to draft a functional organization chart that the data center director will shape into the new organization. He is aware that it is coming to him fairly quickly and he will need to work through it.

The recommended hiring schedule was reviewed. All affected staff will be encouraged to apply for the posted positions. Every job will have minimum requirements and it is expected that the higher classification levels will be filled first. An individual could apply for several jobs.

Clarification on transitioning was requested. Transitioning is when the building is opened and the first phase-in begins. If sufficient staff have not been identified, interim staff may be sent to work at the data center to get it operational. This is one transitional option. There will also be some individuals selected early but they will stay in their agency until a later time.

As an aid to development of draft position descriptions for the center, position descriptions have been collected from the three large agencies.

Three things needed from the CIOs are:

1. Encourage affected staff to apply. This is our data center and we want our employees to apply.
2. Maintain objectivity in the process. The state will develop the most objective process possible and will be using quality assurance evaluators to assess how we're doing.
3. Carry forward a consistent message on what is being done in the Human Resources Work Group.

In response to a question regarding position descriptions being developed before the detailed design stage is done, it was pointed out that as much preliminary work as possible needs to get done. As we get through the process of getting management in place, the detailed design will be done and we will know enough about services, etc. that we can begin the process of establishing other positions.

Motion: John Koreski moved and Stan McClain seconded to approve the state data center staffing plan roles and responsibilities. The motion carried.

The charter for the Human Resources Work Group is drafted and will be presented to the Steering Committee for approval early in July. The draft will be reviewed by the work group on Thursday.

6. Vendor Technology Briefings

Dean Willard spoke on the issue of vendor presentations. Work groups are hesitant to have vendor presentations within the work groups. A potential method could be to hold a separate vendor forum rather than have vendors approach work groups. The goal of such a vendor presentation would be to gain insight on what is possible. If a vendor is not part of the architecture design, they would not provide a presentation.

Perhaps it is best to wait until the data center management team is in place. A recurring open dialogue with technology vendors helps to identify future potential ways to drive down the costs.



Action 3: Defer the issue of vendor presentations until the state data center director is on board.

7. All Hands Meeting in August

Raelynn Henson reported that the tentative date is August 11. The proposed agenda includes a message from the new data center director, recruitment processes, wrap-up of the detailed design stage, preview of Stage Three, and an announcement of tour opportunities. The timing was discussed and it was pointed out that several CIOs would be out of town for the OAGITM conference. John Koreski volunteered to serve as lead for agenda development and MC of the meeting.

Action 4: Raelynn will check alternate dates. CIOs will calendar this meeting once the date is settled and promote it within their agencies.

8. Round table

Stan McClain reported that there is concern that it is rumored some agencies are asking their staff to submit resumes. This might have tied into the position description acquisition addressed in agenda item 5. It might be helpful to collect position descriptions from all 12 agencies.

Action 5: Raelynn Henson will handle the rumor rebuttal. Barbara Jensen will collect the positions descriptions and will be calling on the Steering Committee to assist with this.

Dean addressed a rumor of a plan in the project office to circumvent the Letter of Agreement. He stated there is not now nor has there ever been any plan to circumvent the Letter of Agreement.

Stan McClain stated an important role the Steering Committee can fill to insulate the data center director from the politics of the project allowing him to be focused on the operational side of the project.

Kathryn Naugle requested a forum be set up for the data center director to meet with employees (individual meetings at the agency location).

It was also stated that it is important to encourage people to apply for the center jobs, to think about their long-term careers, and not let animosity toward the state's decision to change the IT business model affect their careers.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Next Meeting: Monday, June 27, 2005
DAS West – Conference Room A
1 to 3 p.m.