



CNIC Steering Committee – Meeting Minutes - Date: June 5, 2006

The CNIC Steering Committee met at the State Data Center in the Thomas J. Watson Conference Room.

Committee members or designee present: Dan Adelman, Curt Amo, Ben Berry, Bill Carpenter, Bill Crowell, Sandy Jefferson, Gary Johnson, John Koreski, John Margaronis, Stan McClain, Herb Riley, Baron Rodriguez, David Yandell, Mike Zanon.

Governing Board representatives present: Kris Kautz, Mike Marsh.

Others Present: Rob Bailey, Julie Bozzi, James Brand, Ken Disbrow, Mike Dawson, Kari Ensminger, Raelynn Henson, Dave Howard, Barbara Jensen, Jerry Korson, Claudia Light, Sarah Miller, Lisa Renner, Mark Reyer, Jeff Smith, Margaret Taylor.

Review/Approval of Minutes, Action Items, Standing Items

The ODOT and DAS mainframe migration this past weekend went very well.

Motion: Baron Rodriguez moved to approve the May 22 minutes as submitted. Dan Adelman seconded. The motion carried.

Action Items from May 8 were reviewed for open items:

Action 5: Theresa will send any “future opportunities” discussion candidates to Stan McClain; closed.

Action Items from May 22 were reviewed for open items:

Action 1: Mark Reyer and Bill Crowell will work on some open source application benchmarking tool suggestions and will report back to the Steering Committee; there is a June 19 open source meeting scheduled; ongoing.

Action 2: Julie Bozzi will take discussion of the DHS applications at the hospital offline; related to the AS400 item in the last meeting; closed.

Action 3: Raelynn Henson will post the scope exclusions document online; closed.

Action 4: Mike Zanon will work on the language of this portion of the document to see that it meets the policies and expectations pertaining to responsible parties; closed.

Action 5: CIOs should send any budget thoughts or comments to Scott Harra by the end of business tomorrow; closed. Stan McClain noted the letter that came from Elizabeth Harchenko last week.

Quality Assurance, Quarterly Review

Ken Disbrow reported. There are currently no high rated risks. Any risks that are found are attended to and resolved quickly. Ben Berry asked about deliverables associated with the Quality Assurance contract. It was noted that these deliverables are being tracked. The QA contract expires early 2007. Everything is currently on schedule and going well.

Agency Move Scorecard Update

Sarah Miller reported. There are now 431 servers located at the SDC. The ODOT and DAS mainframe data migration was completed successfully this past weekend. As of noon yesterday, production was up and running on the new mainframe with all going well. The connectivity issue (3745) that caused rollback for the DHS and OED mainframe migration is being addressed. One solution is being tested with a potential second solution. There has been some mainframe licensing concern from the CIOs. A project team is working on this issue and a lead has been assigned to see it through.

The transition agreement template has been updated and is currently in review by DAS contract staff. Meetings with the pertinent CIOs are scheduled later this week to review. June 15 is the target date by which the SDC hopes to have transition agreements signed. A formal service level agreement template is being developed.



Collecting hardware and software inventories for the remaining agencies is extremely important. This impacts provisioning, hiring, etc. Move coordinators have been assigned to all agencies. There is currently a multi-agency migration planning meeting each Tuesday for the agencies currently in the migration process. A similar weekly meeting will begin soon to support the other agencies that are beginning migration planning.

The iSeries group is working on the iSeries relocations. These moves will likely be handled as a contract amendment with the existing vendor.

Scorecard: Status of deliverables will be updated as the agency move coordinators notify Sarah.

Defining CNIC Success - What does it look like and how is it measured?

Ben Berry reported that a short description of the document was requested; two paragraphs have been added to the first page to accommodate that request. Ben asked the committee members to review the revised version and offer feedback.

Comments:

- A clearer definition of the end of the project is needed.
- Some discussion about the purpose of this document took place. It should reflect the original scope.
- The schedule and financial components of CNIC run through June 2007. This is according to the COP. Julie Bozzi suggested that it is possible for the project to end sooner but that this date reflects the official schedule.
- It was suggested that the end of the project could be identified as the time at which the proper governing model is put in place.
- Once the 12 agencies are moved in, the consolidation begins. Therefore, simply moving all 12 agencies into the SDC cannot mark the end of the CNIC project. Only after consolidation is complete is the CNIC project at an end.
- One possible solution to defining the end of the project could be to use phases.
- Some caution should be used in determining the end date as there are

specific criteria that must be used in measuring success as set forth at the beginning of the project. This is also why the definition of success itself must be approached carefully.

- Several of the identified success factors relate to operations.

The committee agreed that defining success of the CNIC project and the success of SDC operations as two separate entities is the right approach. Mark Reyer cautioned that measuring the success of SDC operations may not be black and white. Ben will make it clear that the success of SDC operations will be a measure of ongoing operations.

Action 1: Ben Berry will add language to this document around defining success of the CNIC project and success of SDC operations as two different things.

There was a request to add "cost" to the second page. The copy distributed in this meeting is more up to date than the one e-mailed last week.

Page two correction, "expected duration": server moves will go through December 2006.

The Governing Board previously noted that in July (after migration of the large agencies) a discussion would be held regarding the governance model. It was suggested that a few members of this Steering Committee and the Governing Board get together to review Max Williams' subcommittee's materials and come up with a recommendation before July.

DECISION: Baron Rodriguez will chair an SDC Advisory Board definition subcommittee. He will put together a charter to present to the Steering Committee. Bill Crowell, Stan McClain, Curt Amo, Mike Zanon, Ben Berry, Mark Reyer and Kris Kautz agreed to participate.

Action 2: Ben Berry will ask the Governing Board for any guidance they wish to offer before Steering Committee proceeds.

Action 3: Dan Adelman will send Ben some language around success as it pertains to funds



spent by customers before and after the migration and consolidation.

Prepare for CNIC Governing Board Meeting

Ben Berry distributed a draft agenda for the June 12 Governing Board meeting.

The committee agreed that they would prefer to discuss licensing in the Steering Committee meeting before it goes on to the Governing Board. There was some discussion about specific licenses that are coming due. Jim Long has gone through all agencies to determine what software is actually being used. None of the CA software can be removed from the list. Stan suggested stating at Governing Board that there are concerns that are being reviewed with a note that the Steering Committee will report its findings as soon as possible. One of the current issues is that Mark does not have any knowledge of the software licenses that were and were not included in agency budgets. Barry Nathan is currently working to collect this information. The CIOs noted that this information was provided to DAS in the December review.

Action 4: Julie Bozzi will request of the CIOs the software licensing budget information that was included in their CNIC budgets.

Three questions were posed:

1. Which software is in or out of scope?
2. Can licenses be transferred to the SDC?
3. Are the vendors doing their part and who is tracking that?

Action 5: "Scope of Software Licensing" should be added to the next Steering Committee agenda.

Mark Reyer will give a high level update on this issue to the Governing Board with the note that the Finance Committee will be working with the agencies specifically to gain information on specific software licensing.

The next quarterly QA report goes to the Governing Board in July.

It was suggested that this committee get together specifically to address lessons learned. Curt Amo

remembered the validity of an effective governing board being called into question and felt this may be a valuable discussion to have in the near future. Kris agreed that presenting lessons learned to the Governing Board is a good idea. Perhaps the answer is to have a meeting with representatives of all stakeholders at the table and to have the QA vendor facilitate the discussion. The value in beginning this review now is to be better prepared for future enterprise efforts before they begin.

Action 6: The QA vendor will put together an approach and proposed schedule for developing a lessons learned document.

Action 7: "Lessons Learned" should be added to the next Steering Committee agenda.

Human Resources

Jerry Korson reported. The recruiting process is in full swing. Interviews for SDC positions are being done in four groups. They are all scheduled to be completed by June 13. Many people have already been interviewed and more will interview in the coming weeks. The team is already developing plans for the next steps. A meeting was held with the union to answer questions and update them on the current process. There had been some contention as to whether one IS4 position in Operations had been posted long enough. In response Jerry reposted the recruitment and resent it to the entire in-scope list.

Comments and CIO Assistance

Mark Reyer reported that the disaster recovery plan from ODOT has been received by the Project Office. After a meeting with SunGard, the vendor indicated that the agency contracts to recover had not been updated in two years. The contract has not been updated to include new, removed or modified hardware that is currently in use today. SunGard's opinion was that the current recovery contracts would need updating to sufficiently recover the agencies intended apps and data. They also indicated that they currently have contracts with only DHS/OED, DAS and DHS. There needs to be a point person in each agency regularly creating, reviewing and updating agency DR plans. Mike Zanon wanted to make it clear that once the enterprise business continuity plans are in



place, (the effort led by Susan Columbus), someone within each agency will need to be responsible to maintain the individual agency plans. The SDC will be responsible for pricing and testing the agencies' disaster recovery plans. However, it will be up to each agency to identify the criticality of each application, data and the acceptable downtime in their DR plans. Mike Zanon noted that some of this information should be put in their business continuity plans. This will be an issue of timing. The BCP initiative is taking place from now until the end of the year. If this information is not available until the end of the year, Mark will not be able to address vendors with his needs until some time after that. If this body does nothing, disaster recovery plans will be in place by the end of the year according to the BCP initiative timeline.

There is some confusion about who owns the disaster recovery research and reconciliation process. What Mark needs is a list of the applications, data and the servers on which they are located and the criticality of each one including recovery time requirements. Once Mark has this information for each agency, he can work with SunGard to reconcile this issue.

There was some clarification that a disaster recovery plan is not limited to the SDC or even to IT but includes many other aspects of recovery. This is why these plans must remain in the ownership of the agencies.

One individual needs to be identified as the task leader on this effort.

Action 8: Bill Crowell, Ben Berry and Mike Zanon will assign some resources to follow the disaster recovery discovery process.

Mark Reyer would like to discuss scope as it pertains to all agency requests. His opinion is that any change in scope must be approved by the Steering Committee. He would like to see this manifest in a more formal request process. It may also be important to identify priorities of scope and agree upon them as a committee.

Action 9: Julie Bozzi will create a template for scope requests and will define a process to present to the Steering Committee.

Mark reiterated how well the mainframe data migrations went last weekend. Additionally, everything that is running on the raised floor is running well and there have been only a few issues that were addressed right away. He has never seen a migration go as well as this.

Additional Discussion/Roundtable/Rumor Control

Stan McClain thanked Ben for all his work on the document to define the success of the project.

Next Meeting: Monday, June 19, 2006
State Data Center
Conference Room 104
1 to 3 p.m.