



CNIC Steering Committee – Meeting Minutes - Date: July 10, 2006

The CNIC Steering Committee met at the Executive Building in Conference Room B.

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

Governing Board representatives present: Kris Kautz, Mike Marsh.

Others Present: Susan Columbus, Mike Dawson, Ken Disbrow, Kari Ensminger, Raelynn Henson, Keith Kohan, Jerry Korson, Claudia Light, Theresa Masse, Amy McLaughlin, Sarah Miller, Peter Lundberg, Lisa Renner, Mark Reyer, Peter Smith, Peter van den Berg.

Review/Approval of Minutes, Action Items, Standing Items

Motion: Stan McClain moved to approve the June 19 minutes as submitted. Herb Riley seconded. The motion carried.

Action Items from June 5 were reviewed for open items:

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; closed; on the agenda today.

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; closed.

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

Action 5: “Scope of Software Licensing” should be added to the next Steering Committee agenda; pending.

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

Agency Move Scorecard Update

Sarah Miller reported. There was a migration celebration on June 29 at the State Data Center that went very well. In all cases, everything planned to move by June 30 did move. DHS has some newly identified equipment that will be moved this weekend. To date, 628 servers have been moved to the State Data Center (SDC). Sarah has been working with the Department of Corrections. Brian Sipe has been working with Veterans’ Affairs. In both cases all of the “prepare and assess” activities have been completed. All of the additional agencies are beginning their planning processes. There is a biweekly Friday morning meeting for all those agencies who are currently in the planning process for their migrations. There is an additional biweekly Friday customer stabilization meeting on the off Fridays for all agencies who now have equipment running at the SDC.

File and Print Scope Clarification

Sarah Miller reported. There was some confusion on this issue early on because agencies were unsure about the scope of servers that reside in field locations. Sarah Miller distributed a scope clarification document and reviewed it with the committee. Any file and print server in an existing data center will be moved to the SDC. Any file and print server in a building on the Capital Mall will be moved to the SDC. Any file and print server that exists in a remote location, including field offices in the Salem area, will not be moved but will be managed by the SDC. There are still some questions about the definition of “managed by the SDC.”

Human Resources

Jerry Korson reported. The management team has not finalized decisions on the first round of hiring for the SDC. The first wave of announcements has, therefore, not yet gone out. There is no drop-dead date for sending offers, but every effort is being made to inform applicants and current rotational staff of when and where they will be as soon as possible. Jerry continues to provide a full-time staff person at the SDC who is providing information to



the applicants on a regular basis. **Regarding salaries:** Only base salaries will be offered. Persons now receiving lead work pay will not be offered lead work in the initial job offer letter. Depending on the current position level of each candidate, job offers will be demotion, lateral or promotion. Jerry asked the CIOs to aid in affirming this information to their staff. **Comp time and vacation:** Comp time cannot be transferred; agencies must pay off balances. DAS employees will be able to transfer their vacation time balances. Everyone else will be able to transfer up to 160 hours of vacation. When an assessment was done about six months ago, there were very few employees with a lot of accrued vacation time. Offer letters will include information on start dates, transferable vacation, etc.

Everyone needs to understand that there are some applicants who have only applied for one position. In these cases, if they are not offered the position for which they applied, they will not be offered a position in the first round. The agencies will have to decide the next step for those individuals or they will have to wait for the second round of hiring. The expectation is that by the end of this week, the management team will know where each applicant stands. At that point, letters will be drafted.

Some start dates will be before the agency in question actually moves. Payroll for these individuals will begin with the start date. Bill Crowell noted that it would be helpful to know what jobs have not yet been filled in the SDC. The SDC will not know what is required for round two hiring until a couple of weeks after round one offers are made.

Jerry continues to stay in close contact with agency HR shops to share status and process information.

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

Ben Berry distributed his updated Defining CNIC Success document to the committee. He noted all the changes since the last meeting. The Department of Education move has always been scheduled for slightly later than all others. The document will be updated to reflect a completed move date of February 2007 to compensate for this

move. "Consolidation" begins as the 12 agencies are moving in.

Mark Reyer stated that from his perspective the CNIC "project" will be complete once the SDC is responsible for the full scope of services, all inventory is moved and all CIOs agree that their migration is complete. The measure of success for ongoing operations is different than the success of the CNIC project itself. It is important to make this distinction. There was some concern about clearly articulating to the Legislature when the savings will be realized. The committee needs to be on the same page about this so as to communicate the same message. Mark believes he has made a clear distinction between the criteria of the project and the criteria of SDC operations when addressing the JLCIMT and that they seem to understand it.

In the listing of the 12 participating agencies, the committee agreed that there should be a list of agencies opposed to a list of people's names. They further agreed that the words "project" and "operations" need to be used to demonstrate there is a distinction between them.

There was some discussion about whether or not the county representative should continue to participate as the committee transitions into the new role of advisory board. This will be considered as the advisory board charter is developed.

Action 1: Ben will rework the document based on the committee's comments.

CIO Advisory Board Charter

Ben Berry distributed the draft CIO Advisory Board Charter to the committee. This was previously distributed via e-mail. He asked the CIOs for comments, clarifications or questions. One decision that needs to be made is whether or not this group still envisions using a shared services model. The title of this board is also in question. Another possible title could be Customer Advisory Board.

There was some question as to how other customers will be represented on this board. Mark Reyer noted that any customer should be able to work directly with the SDC rather than having to go



through other customers. He does not want to have to tell any one customer that they cannot interface directly with the SDC. In terms of charge back, each customer will need to decide for themselves whether or not it is more advantageous to work directly with the SDC or to continue working through other customers. This poses an interesting issue in terms of the governance of this body and how it can represent all customers effectively.

It was suggested that rather than noting the “purpose” and the “charge,” the charter should note “membership” and the “charge.” “Expand customer base to share costs” will be added as a bullet under “charge.”

Mark shared that any agency initiative that has or could have impact on the SDC should be brought to the board level in some way. This will ensure that the best decision – as it affects all customers – is made. Mike Zanon stated that since there is already a DAS process (IRR) for agencies planning to make investments above a certain dollar amount, perhaps this can be utilized to avoid creating new processes. Mark wants to ensure that customers of the data center have a say in investment decisions that impact the data center and its customers.

There was some discussion about the relationship of the Executive Committee listed on the governance model versus the full Governing Board which is to meet annually.

Ben discussed the “scope of work” section of the charter and noted that these references pertain to all of those things that the board envisions addressing at some point in some way. Security may need to be addressed more specifically. Curt Amo suggested removing the scope of work from the charter and including it in an appended document.

There was some question about the term “advisory” and the actual authority of this board. Some questions pertained to whether or not the board has the authority to make decisions and hold the SDC accountable to them or whether it should truly be advisory in nature. It was noted that the governance model approved by the Governing Board last year gave the CIOs a “review and

advise” role. If CIOs feel this charter should go a different direction, a change in the model needs to be approved by the Governing Board. Whatever the final form, the charter must represent consensus amongst the CIOs and Mark Reyer, SDC Administrator.

Action 2: Ben will rework the charter with the recommended changes.

Lessons Learned Approach

Ken Disbrow distributed a high level lessons learned document for review with the committee. A series of meetings and tasks will be conducted to review lessons learned including group meetings and individual interviews. The CIOs will have input in who should attend these meetings. The focus will be on politics, governance, finance, project management, QA, the schedule, etc. Ken’s job will be to organize the input from these discussions and then present findings. His team will begin with an executive summary and will then produce a more detailed report.

This process will begin in August and will likely conclude in October. It is important not to rush this process. October seems a reasonable timeframe for completion.

The CNIC project’s earlier lessons learned initiative was mentioned. That information may be useful to the current process.

Action 3: Stan McClain will provide a contact to Ken Disbrow to acquire information on a previous lessons learned initiative.

The committee would like to see positive lessons learned as well as negative lessons learned so that this effort does not become focused solely on the negative. Ken confirmed that the intent is not to focus only on the bad and he will ensure that this is very clear in the language that is used. It is important to note that this is not an audit but an opportunity for the views and feelings of the stakeholders to express those things that they learned throughout the project.

Quarterly Quality Assurance Report



Ken Disbrow reported again that this project is at a very low risk state. The high risk issues that were being tracked are nearly gone. One high risk that will remain until the end is associated with the size and complexity of the project. This is normal and cannot be helped. In an earlier assessment, some agencies had concerns about resource availability and scheduling issues as they pertained to internal projects. That risk has since been resolved.

Comments and CIO Assistance

Mark Reyer stated that if any of the agencies that have not yet moved into the SDC would like to move anything in whole or in part earlier than currently scheduled, feel free to contact Mark Reyer or Sarah Miller. There is opportunity for this in the August-October timeframe.

Additional Discussion/Roundtable/Rumor Control

A disaster recovery tool was discussed last week and now there are discussions underway concerning the funding of this tool. If any of the CIOs have an opportunity to review the disaster recovery document, feedback would be greatly appreciated. It is worth noting that this tool has already been selected for the statewide business continuity planning initiative and it is already in place. The cost of the tool was not known.

Dan Adelman reported a rumor that the bandwidth on the Capital Mall is currently much greater than what will be affordable once the agencies are moved into the SDC. Mark stated that work was done to ensure that there will not be any performance degradation during agency migration. No additional costs have been or will be accrued as a result of this work. Al Grapoli is working on a bandwidth utilization report that can be distributed to this committee for further information.

Bill Carpenter shared three areas of concern related to the SDC that have come out of a COBIT audit being done at OHCS:

1. Property was not transferred at the time of the move to the SDC.
2. Disaster recovery is considered an SDC function rather than an agency function.
3. Software licensing solutions are unclear.

Bill will be in contact with Mark to discuss these concerns.

There is not yet any word on a release date for the Secretary of State audit on the CNIC project.

Bill Crowell shared that over the years, DHS has established a vast number of connections to non-state third parties. This was done as customers offered some equipment and technicians in order to have certain services accomplished by DHS. The sense is that this work needs to be transitioned back to those third parties but discussions will need to be had on these topics. Bill has staff working the issue in consultation with Al Grapoli on behalf of the SDC.

**Next Meeting: Monday, July 17, 2006
State Data Center
Large Conference Room
1 to 3 p.m.**