



CNIC Steering Committee – Meeting Minutes - Date: January 9, 2006

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, Sandy Jefferson, Jim Long, Stan McClain, Herb Riley, Baron Rodriguez, David Yandell, Mike Zanon.

Others Present: Brad Agadoni, Rod Bailey, Julie Bozzi, Bruce Craig, Tanya Crane, Mike Dawson, Ken Disbrow, Tami Dohrman, Kari Ensminger, Bill Fink, Scott Hayes, Raelynn Henson, Gary Johnson, Keith Kohan, Jerry Korson, Claudia Light, Sarah Miller, Bryan Nealy, Lisa Renner, Mark Reyer, Andrew Strockis, Sarah Waylett, Margaret McDowell.

Review/Approval of Minutes, Action Items, Standing Items

Page two of the December 19 minutes: “concern was expressed with the numbers and documents...will leave the perception that the agencies were wrong in the numbers that they initially reported.” One of the issues related to this statement is that there is not any documentation about how the agencies came to these numbers. Ben Berry met with other CIOs this morning to discuss this issue. He distributed a collection of clarifying points that were discussed during this meeting including:

- Evolving Scope
- Resource Validation
- Bargaining Unit Agreements
- Service Catalog
- Updating the Estimates

There was a suggestion that the original process be defined within this clarification document as it was a process including multiple reviews by several parties. Ben asked the CIOs to adopt these statements for clarity’s sake. Curt recommended that this be presented to the Governing Board on January 19. Bill Fink is still waiting to hear from a few agencies regarding the recent request for staffing information. Baron Rodriguez would like to have a final FTE number to present to the Governing Board.

01/09/06 CNIC Steering Committee meeting minutes
Submitted by: Kari Ensminger, CNIC Project Office

Motion: Stan McClain moved to approve the December 19 minutes including the clarifying points document; Curt Amo seconded. The motion carried. The document, “In-Scope Expenditures and Personnel Information” becomes a part of these minutes.

Action 1: All CIO’s should send their staffing information responses to DAS by close of business this week.

Action Items from November 21 were reviewed for open items:

Action 6: The agency asset transfer decision should be a topic of discussion on a future Steering Committee agenda; will be included on an agenda in January 2006.

Action 7: The PO will do a survey of the ratio of staff to servers; closed.

Action Items from December 5 were reviewed for open items:

Action 1: “SDC Dispatching” will be added to the next Steering Committee agenda; pending, will be added to a January agenda.

Action 2: CIOs will ensure that their non-financial regulatory requirements are sent to the PO by December 19; Julie has heard from only a few CIOs; pending.

Action 3: Claudia Light will confer with the Change Management Workgroup to find out whether or not the members can continue to serve; closed. All members except those from DAS Training are able to continue.

Action 4: Mark Reyer will spend some time analyzing the stabilization periods associated with DAS, DHS, and ODOT and by what point employees will be released back to those agencies; Mark estimates knowledge transfer will take 60-90 days; closed.

Action 9: The Accounting Workgroup will report on 05-07 and 07-09 chargeback models at the next Steering Committee meeting; closed.



Action Items from December 19 were reviewed for open items:

Action 1: CIOs are to submit names of possible technical staff to participate in the F level interviews before the first week of January; closed.

HR Update

Jerry Korson distributed the SDC staffing schedule that was agreed upon with the union. Article Two of the original Letter of Agreement was amended so that all staff do not have to be hired at the same time. There was a question as to whether or not the in scope list will grow. If it does, those added will be able to apply for SDC positions in the first round of hiring. Jerry clarified that the number of positions that will be available at the SDC will not exceed 93 at this time. To exceed that number would require approval from the legislature. If more individuals are added to the in scope list, this does not change the total number of positions being hired at the SDC at this time. Position descriptions will be posted to the CNIC Web site for the following functions:

- Security
- Network
- Operations
- Enterprise Systems Support

In two weeks, the recruitment announcements associated with these position descriptions will be sent to the list of in scope staff. Server position descriptions are anticipated to be released in March or April. In terms of timeline, there are four to five weeks from the time that position descriptions are posted to the time that the associated recruitments close. Bill Fink clarified that there is currently no DAS intent to go to the April Emergency Board to ask for more positions at the SDC.

There was discussion on whether 93 staff is sufficient for the data center. Dan Adelman noted that each technical workgroup was asked to recommend staffing levels for the SDC. Mark Reyer noted that this exercise was done and that workgroup recommendations were for higher levels. Baron Rodriguez noted that he did not remember a Steering Committee discussion about the suitability of the numbers. Julie Bozzi clarified that the workgroup exercise was not a project deliverable. Mark asked the workgroups to do the staffing exercise for his information. The number of 01/09/06 CNIC Steering Committee meeting minutes Submitted by: Kari Ensminger, CNIC Project Office

93 was decided before Mark came onboard. Though Mark feels that 93 is a lean number, he will make the SDC run with 93 people to the existing service levels.

Stan McClain noted that everyone is “together” in this project; SDC successes and failures belong to every agency involved. Stan would rather find a way to add positions to the SDC proactively rather than in response to a failure. Bill Fink talked about making changes once the SDC is up and running based on what is known at that time. The intent would be to return to the legislature at that time. The door for requesting more positions is not closed as of April. It was suggested to update the E-board on the issue in April.

Quarterly QA Review

Ken Disbrow distributed the latest formal QA report. This is the second quarterly report to date. The overall risk of project failure is very low. According to risk and quality standards, only one percent of the risks are high and that is only because of the size of the project. There is the likelihood that there will be more delays due to procurement. This is not unanticipated and can be dealt with. The QA team is watching these dates closely. Ben Berry had some concerns that these kinds of delays could present an overlap in time when the agencies and the SDC are both paying out of pocket. He does not want these delays to mean that the agencies will continue to pay longer than they should as money is also coming out of the SDC. Ben asked if the project is on target in terms of deliverables. Ken said that they are on schedule. From Ken’s perspective it would have been a benefit for QA to have reviewed the business case and some accounting issues, but these areas were not included in the scope of Solutions’ (QA) contract.

Organizational/Individual Change Management – Cultural Assessment

Claudia Light spoke about the upcoming agency cultural assessment (using a survey). The purpose of this assessment is to understand agency values and staff perception of agency culture. This will give CIOs insight into their current organization as well as give insight to the SDC regarding its customers. Survey respondents are asked to answer a series of questions giving answers on an “agree-disagree” scale. The assessment will be conducted in



January. During February-March a plan will be developed to approach the cultural changes that are going on. Claudia reviewed the statements that will be included in the survey and the CIOs were given an opportunity to comment. There was concern that the assessment should contain an appropriate statement so that survey respondents would understand the context; this has already been written and will be included.

SDC Assessment

An Accounting Workgroup handout was distributed. Tami Dohrman, chair of the workgroup, talked about why the assessment was being done. She noted that the SDC is already functioning with bills to pay. The assessment for this biennium is not yet based on usage. Every agency will receive seven quarterly bills. The first bill (for Oct.-Dec. 2005) was sent on December 9. The next bill was sent in late December for the first quarter of 2006.

The total assessment due was divided between three categories:

- Personal services
- S&S
- Capital outlay.

Agency issues should be directed to Kate Coffey at DAS. General fund agencies have worked with DAS BAM and have come to workable solutions. It is understood that this is a transitional approach. Rates will be set for the 07-09 biennium. Each agency's spreadsheet can be reworked if lift dates should change. Amounts for each agency remain the same from quarter to quarter. Each agency will be charged a predictable amount for a predictable time period.

For 05-07 the quarterly bills to each agency will include only the costs associated with the agency's original IT budget. If there are major changes in service levels for any given agency, a discussion will need to be held. There is concern within the committee regarding how to define the process for addressing these issues.

The Accounting Workgroup has been working on cash flow, asset transfers and the 07-09 issues. A subcommittee is working on the rates for 07-09. In the coming weeks discussions will continue on how to handle the physical transfer of assets. The 01/09/06 CNIC Steering Committee meeting minutes Submitted by: Kari Ensminger, CNIC Project Office

workgroup is coming up with recommendations with pros and cons for each. Mark suggests agencies retain ownership of assets and that the SDC operate the assets until it is simpler to transfer.

Project Status Report

Julie Bozzi distributed the existing governance model for the operational state of the data center along with Governing Board minutes that reflect the discussion and approval of the model. She asked that the CIOs review the information and come back to the next meeting with any comments.

The project is on schedule and is 20 percent under budget. (The cash flow problems discussed earlier are specific to the SDC operational budget not the CNIC project budget. The network transition date has changed to January 2006. The new tape library RFP was protested having a two week impact to the schedule. A protest was also just received for the storage RFP. The mainframe RFP is on schedule. AIX servers came in early. Data upgrade servers may arrive in the June/July timeframe. DHS transition planning is underway. The next step is to get the relocation services vendor onsite. Some DAS servers that do not require SAN storage may get moved to the SDC early. All DS3 network switches have been received and the network is no longer operating on a loop. No concerns have come back from the Secretary of State audit. Work continues on all procurements.

Comments and CIO Assistance

Discussion of SDC staffing numbers.

Additional Discussion/Roundtable/Rumor Control

No additional comments.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Next Meeting: Monday, January 23, 2006
DAS West – Conference Room A
1 to 3 p.m.



CNIC Steering Committee
January 9, 2006

In-Scope Expenditures and Personnel Information

Regarding the December 2005 request to update in-scope expenditures and personnel information, the CNIC Steering Committee suggests that adding the following clarifying points to the record will assist the audit purposes for which this information is being gathered.

- **Evolving Scope**: During the 2003/04 timeframe, the scope of the project was in flux. The original business case estimates were based primarily on the collective size of the IT infrastructure for the twelve agencies. In the summer of 2004, there was general agreement on the scope. In the fall of 2004, the scope was revisited to include services “to the wall plate”, an effort referred to as “Stage Zero” which was updated with the “service catalog” – see below.
- **Resource Validation**: With multiple review sessions in the winter/spring of 2004/05, IRMD worked with each agency to validate the workload FTE that was anticipated to move the State Data Center (SDC). Additionally, agencies were asked to estimate the hardware and licensing costs associated with equipment moving to the SDC. Those estimates were reviewed in detail, and were used to develop the 05-07 budget for the SDC. Copies of the original material submitted are available.
- **Bargaining Unit Agreements**: Based on the resource validation (above), position numbers and names were provided to develop the “3A” list (those staff positions whose workload would be transferred to SDC). Individuals whose positions were on the 3A list were notified during 2005 of their application opportunity during the upcoming SDC staff recruitments.
- **Service Catalog**: When the Service Catalog was finalized in the fall of 2005, many details of the specific services to be provided by the SDC were clearly defined. An associated In-Scope Matrix was updated at this time.
- **Updating the Estimates**: In December of 2005, agencies were asked to validate again the resource estimates, based on the finalization of the Service Catalog and based on the actual expenditures during the 03-05 Biennium. In aggregate, this re-validation showed that _____X FTE would need to be added to (or reduced from) the SDC and that the variance between the estimated S&S/capital outlay and the actual expenditures was \$_____Y.