



CNIC Steering Committee – Meeting Minutes - Date: January 23, 2006

The CNIC Steering Committee met at the SDC in the Thomas J. Watson Conference Room.

Committee members or designee present: Dan Adelman, Ben Berry, Bill Carpenter, Bill Crowell, Al Grapoli, Sandy Jefferson, Gary Johnson, John Koreski, Stan McClain, Kathryn Naugle, Jill Petersen, Herb Riley, Baron Rodriguez, Mike Zanon.

Others Present: Rod Bailey, Julie Bozzi, Tanya Crane, Mike Dawson, Kari Ensminger, Raelynn Henson, Dave Howard, Keith Kohan, Jerry Korson, Claudia Light, Theresa Masse, Sarah Miller, Bryan Nealy, Lisa Renner, Mark Reyer.

Review/Approval of Minutes, Action Items, Standing Items

On page two, third paragraph of the HR update, the sentence regarding the workgroup exercise should be changed to read, “Julie Bozzi clarified that the workgroup exercise was not a project deliverable.”

Motion: Bill Crowell moved to approve the January 9 minutes with the change noted above. Bill Carpenter seconded. The motion carried.

Action Items from January 9 were reviewed for open items:

Action 1: All CIO's should send their staffing information responses to DAS by close of business this week; closed. (Revenue continues to send information and Corrections has a few changes to send.)

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. This item will be moved to February.

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. The CIOs understand this request.

They are to send what exists and whether or not any action needs to be taken on them at this time.

HR Update

Jerry Korson reported that generic position descriptions have been sent directly to the list of in-scope staff and are posted on the CNIC Web site. Official recruitments for these positions will be posted as soon as possible. Jerry noted that any changes to the in-scope list must be finalized before recruitment announcements are distributed.

The first round of interviews for two more SDC management positions will be completed this week (Enterprise Servers Manager and Distributed Servers Manager).

As SDC employees are hired, their start dates will be set by their managers on an individual basis. There were some questions about how the staff transition process will work. Mark Reyer clarified that as people get hired and begin their work at the SDC, the transitional/rotational individuals covering that position at the SDC can be released back to their agency immediately. In the case of operations or mainframe staff, the SDC is asking for a 60 day stabilization period (once the equipment is onsite) for knowledge transfer before releasing those individuals back to their agency. Server staff will likely be released after the big three agencies have moved.

There were several questions pertaining to the phasing out of in-scope positions within the agencies. There are specific phase out dates in House Bill 5166 that are tied to lift and drop dates for each agency. These dates have not changed and no foreseeable changes are on the horizon.

Governing Board Meeting Debrief

Stan McClain expressed appreciation for Lindsey Ball's perspectives on the CNIC project. He also thought it was helpful to understand the budget evaluation that needs to happen and timelines and expectations associated with it. It was suggested that before the next in-scope evaluation, this group approach it in cooperation with each agency keeping the goals of the Steering Committee in mind. Lindsey demonstrated an important commitment to the people side of this project during the Governing Board Meeting. This committee



should not lose sight of the assistance it is intended to provide to the Governing Board and to agency employees as they go through their transition.

Bill Crowell shared his perspective of the budget evaluation as a three step process: (1) confirm accuracy of budget as it relates to staff; (2) examine what will we have spent; and (3) transition the budget to the SDC. Dan Adelman noted that the savings equation has two sides – what an agency is responsible for and what it takes to run the SDC. Once totals are understood, there needs to be a clear understanding of what monies cover what.

2006 CNIC Communications

Raelynn Henson presented the 2006 CNIC project communications plan and distributed a matrix of CNIC audiences, message delivery, frequency and level of detail. The 2005 plan structure is being retained with only slight modifications. Raelynn continues to stay in close contact with Julie Bozzi and Mark Reyer regarding their communications needs for the project. They are in agreement that the plan should remain basically the same. There is a link between the project communications and the emerging communications from the SDC management team.

The CNIC listserv and Web site will continue as the main tools for communications with stakeholders. The listserv membership is just under 700 subscribers and the statistics for the Web site indicate a consistent amount of hits. Raelynn reminded the CIOs that they are responsible to maintain constant communication within their own agencies.

Media involvement for the project continues to be coordinated through the DAS Director's Office. If an outward message campaign is developed it will be done collaboratively with public information officers of the CNIC agencies.

Tentative dates for all-hands meetings have been set for the year. CIOs are asked to place these dates on their calendar (first meeting planned for March 2). The agenda for the first meeting will be vetted with the Steering Committee.

It was suggested that Raelynn add the use of survey results as a communications tool in the matrix.

Framework for Disaster Recovery

Ben Berry presented a document for discussion. There was an action item that Ben Berry and Mike Zanon took to consider what this subject will entail. Susan Columbus, Mike and Ben met a few weeks ago and created a framework for this discussion. This will be shared with Mark Reyer and the SDC once the strategy has been agreed upon.

Disaster recovery encompasses many kinds of issues all around technical disruptions in service. The recovery requirement should:

- Be anywhere between 24 and 48 hours to up time
- Meet any federal regulations
- Leverage existing SDC resources whenever possible
- Provide the lowest cost alternative that meets the requirements
- Have the ability to sustain services with ongoing coordination and testing.

Five options were outlined including:

1. Status quo: the SDC is given a plan and has the sole responsibility to execute it (Ben suggests eliminating this option from consideration.)
2. Third party hot-site: the agencies would pay to have a test space and back up space with a third party.
3. State reciprocal agreement: use a decommissioned data center to maintain a back-up facility.
4. Burns Archive Center: this may be considered for a third party recovery site.
5. Vendor mobile recovery facilities: a third party vendor brings a truck to the site.

Ben presented information on what it would take to consider each of these options in terms of cost. The committee can compare these options and agree upon a strategy that best suits the circumstances. Liability insurance is also something that should be considered. Insurance needs and costs will change slightly based on which option is selected. Mark Reyer noted that the SDC will



ultimately choose the option that works best for the center and is most cost effective.

Once applications, recovery times and priorities are indicated on the application inventory spreadsheet for each agency, the SDC will be able to assess needs and begin putting together comprehensive solutions. There will need to be several iterations of the options and the solutions. Given that each agency has already done a business continuity introspection, this information needs to be linked with the application inventories to ensure that Mark has all of the information he needs to begin looking at disaster recovery plans. There is an application inventory spreadsheet and a hardware spreadsheet within each agency right now. Tomorrow the four major agencies are getting together to finalize the application spreadsheet requirements.

Action 1: Bryan Nealy will ensure that priority of recovery is addressed on the Application Inventory Spreadsheet.

Disaster Recovery will be covered in the rates of the SDC. There should not be a need for a POP.

Service Level Management

Ben Berry reported. Within the SDC service level catalog there are several different levels of service. This is a topic that needs to be addressed. Ben Berry distributed a diagram that shows a side by side comparison of his existing service levels. He recommended that each of the other agencies begin doing the same kind of comparison. If other agencies have metrics, they should begin to identify them so that they know what level of service they will require from the SDC.

Mark Reyer reiterated that it is very ineffective to try to manage different levels of service on different platforms for different agencies. A caution was raised that a smaller agency should not be required to pay more for a higher level of service that they may not need. Ultimately, this is up to the Accounting Workgroup to figure out. Recovery management will take into account the order of application recovery independent of agency. This factors more into the server environment. High availability should be a different rate. Equipment and application recovery priorities will be in place. The services catalog will have the base level of

01/23/06 CNIC Steering Committee meeting minutes
Submitted by: Kari Ensminger, CNIC Project Office

services and service levels. Then an account planner from the SDC will sit down with each agency to discuss their specific needs.

Some of this will be detailed out in the agency specific migration plans. There will also be an outline of the service levels with detailed descriptions focused on the transition period before the SDC is in a stabilized operating state. This document of understanding will cover all agencies and will be followed by the creation of actual service level agreements applicable to the SDC in its operational state.

Comments and CIO Assistance

Mark Reyer reported that the JLCIMT was held last week; he gave a CNIC/SDC project update. It was mentioned that the mainframe and storage equipment procurement dates could slip a little as there is an effort to keep RFP's from being too vendor specific. The committee spent some time focused on the reduction of staff and asked if all the savings for the project were coming from this. Mark noted that there is a sizable chunk of savings coming from other areas such as management efficiency, cost avoidance and consolidation. They wanted to know why the agencies had been reassessed for savings. Lindsey Ball clarified that it was a request for information not a reassessment.

Action 2: Raelynn Henson will provide the committee with a copy of the CNIC letter submitted by DAS to the JLCIMT.

Tanya Crane shared that debt service payments will need to be paid in the very near future. It was noted that not all agencies have paid their assessments yet. These need to be paid as soon as possible. Contact DAS for questions.

Sandy Jefferson suggested that quarterly budget reviews become part of the Steering Committee agenda. The committee agreed.

Additional Discussion/Roundtable/Rumor Control

Ben Berry reported a rumor that the relationship with Accenture is changing. Mark Reyer clarified that it is not. There had been some discussion about adding to the Accenture scope of work but that will not happen. Accenture will be assisting the



Approved 2/6/06

project with the first three agency migrations. The Accenture contract is fulfilled as of July 31.

The Change Management Workgroup is going to address the committee soon with results of the cultural survey.

The meeting adjourned at 2:38 p.m.

Next Meeting: Monday, February 6, 2006
State Data Center – Thomas J.
Watson Conference Room
1 to 3 p.m.