



IT Infrastructure Committee

DRAFT Minutes

Thursday, July 17, 2008

Chesterfield Enterprise Solutions Center (CESC)
11751 Meadowville Lane
Chester, Virginia 23836

Attendance

Members Present:

Mr. Leonard M. Pomata, Chair
Dr. Mary Guy Miller
Mr. Scott Pattison

Mr. Hiram R. Johnson
Mr. James F. McGuirk II

Others Present:

Mr. Lemuel Stewart, Jr., CIO VITA
Mr. Walter Kucharski
Auditor of Public Accounts
Mr. Doug McVicar,
Northrop Grumman Corporation

Mr. John Westrick

Mr. Fred Duball, VITA

Welcome and Call to Order

IT Infrastructure Committee Chairman Mr. Len Pomata called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. Mr. Fred Duball called roll and confirmed a quorum.

Approval of the Minutes

Chairman Pomata introduced the draft minutes from the April 17, 2008, meeting and asked for a motion to approve the minutes as presented.

Mr. Hiram Johnson made a motion to approve the minutes as presented; Dr. Mary Guy Miller seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

IT Infrastructure Partnership Briefing

Chairman Pomata asked Mr. Duball and Mr. Doug McVicar to provide an update on the IT Infrastructure Partnership. Mr. Duball summarized that the update would cover the areas of service delivery, transformation, integrated master schedule (IMS), managed services status, partnership financials and Auditor of Public Accounts (APA) findings and actions.

Service Delivery

Speaking to the presentation material, Mr. Duball reported that the Service Delivery legacy service level measures, centrally and field, were ok with no specific elements to highlight since all measures were either Green or Blue. As before, the field metrics collection and data are not as mature as we have wanted them to be because of the eventual shift to the contract SLA's.

He then moved to the Interim SLA Metrics and noted that the new SLA's are coming on line. The boxes highlighted in blue on left in the second column are the subset of the SLA's which have been designated as performance credit eligible or those for which performance penalties would apply if missed. At the end of July they will be measured and if they are complete and green - we will move forward; if not a penalty will be applied to that service level area. To highlight, Mr. Duball used service requests for internal applications SLA as designated performance credit eligible. Chairman Pomata asked if the SLA's that are performance credit eligible will revolve on a month or quarterly basis to be measured or paid if penalized. Mr. Duball replied yes, that all SLA's that come on line are continuously measured but those that can be designated as performance credit eligible can change and/or rotate. There is a detailed formula that talks about what SLA's will be penalized. However, in this period we are assessing penalties against eight and we can change those as we move forward. He added that every SLA is required to be achieved and penalties can be assessed over a period of time. Even with the Help Desk and End User SLA's in interim reporting, there was one that was not met and we will track it. In the Mainframe Server SLA's we have several that can have penalties. The partnership will use the detail on these reports to create another dashboard to show the percentage in a roll-up fashion and drill-down such as measuring site availability.

Continuing, Mr. Duball reported that there were two significant incidents on the mainframe. The first was with Virginia Information Technologies Agency (VITA) which occurred on July 2, 2008. This outage did affect other customers within the Commonwealth that were unable to access the mainframe for two hours and nineteen minutes. Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) was unable to process licenses and registration transactions for 23 minutes due to a problem with a front end processor. We rolled back connectivity to a back up processor. The second incident was with the Virginia Department of Social Services (DSS) which occurred on June 10, 2008. The outage was for 58.5 hours due to a firewall change that was made and this caused connectivity issues and the agency had to work around the clock so no check deposits were lost and they were able to convert to a manual process. We reviewed and prepared RCA's to ensure this is under control and would not happen again.

With regard to the RFS process Mr. McVicar reported that we have made progress over the last quarter. We have over 30 people working the RFS process. We have a dedicated team designing metric reporting tools and analyzing data to identify additional process improvements. We have also set October 1, 2008, to meet the defined performance metrics targets for the RFS project delivery. He included that we have active customers participating in certain areas of the RFS process to ensure that we properly set and meet customer expectations. Our plan and status has been shared with both the Partnership Advisory Committee (PAC) and the Agency Information Technology Resource (AITR) forums.

Continuing, Mr. McVicar reported that since May 1st we have reduced the RFS queue from 203 requests to 174. We are now managing 29 new RFS requests and these are included in the front-end total. He noted that the volume is unpredictable and we have had a significant amount of customer cancellations. Many of these are cancelled late in the process and we have invested a significant amount of time and effort on them. Mr. Johnson wanted to know how you organize the service request. Mr. McVicar replied that we organize by type - for instance telecommunications, new servers, office moves, etc. Mr. Duball interjected that of course an office move involves a lot of complex components. Mr. McVicar then noted that one third of the RFS's are cancelled and we are looking at the root cause of cancellations. He added that one of the areas we are looking at to reduce cancellations is to offer and provide a ROM (Rough Order of Magnitude) early in the process. He added that this will help set expectations early in the process for potential costs of the solutions. Chairman Pomata asked with regards to the workload, you say you have 30 people - are they reaching out to the customers to help predict the workload. Mr. McVicar replied that NGC relies on the VITA CAM's (Customer Account Managers) to be the front end of this process. We have strategic plans in place and if they are comprehensive this will help give

us a heads up and if not the RFS's can end up in the queue unorganized. Chairman Pomata then asked why the 30 people can not be placed in the field. Mr. Duball replied that they need to be able to perform the proposal development work. Chairman Pomata noted that he would leave this as a question; however, he is sure that NGC has thousands of people and he can not understand why they cannot send five people to reach out. Mr. McVicar noted that the challenge is meeting the metrics going forward. Mr. James F. McGuirk noted that you used a couple of examples such as office moves and new opportunities. Is it fair to say that an RFS is new work for NGC. Mr. McVicar replied yes. Mr. McGuirk then asked is the RFS limited strictly to agencies or are you able to reach out to local government. Mr. McVicar replied that we have very few if any maybe a hand full of entities from outside. Mr. McGuirk then asked if NGC's primary channel has been two-fold the CAM and the strategic planning for forecasting or a look ahead. Mr. McVicar replied yes, they are the front end of the process. Mr. Lemuel Stewart, CIO, VITA noted that this process and the communication to agencies is something that we have been working on for awhile now. We have been training people on central, integrated customer account management and their job in this process. We have taken 92 agencies and 1,500 locations that had staff at location that did all of this and brought it to a central location – this has become an internal new game and needs to be resolved.

Moving on, Mr. McVicar reported that with regards to P2P we continue to have challenges but we have made some progress. We continue to analyze the root cause and we have taken corrective actions. He added that we had a one time change in the accounting systems that caused delays and we have broken through on this. Mr. McVicar then reported that standard items have improved and are not in tolerance given the objective here is 20 days. He then informed all in attendance that the chart on page eight of the presentation is broken down by type of items.

Transformation

Mr. Duball reported that with regards to transformation accomplishments we have 22,000 desktops refreshed and network transformed to MPLS in 800 sites. We continue to do a lot of work in the mainframe space. With the Security area we have commenced penetration testing at selected agencies. There are many service levels coming online as we speak. Mr. Duball then announced that we are working with DGS to leverage existing eVA processes to stand up the service catalog.

With regard to the Milestone Summary, Mr. Duball reported that things in the pending column are the items that were not completed. We are holding payments associated until completion is accepted. Milestone #64 has a new date of August 30, 2008. Mr. Duball noted that the caution here is - as we near transformation completion, diminishing slack may introduce additional risk as we approach June 2009.

Continuing, on to the Dashboard, Mr. Duball reported that the chart listed on page 23 of the presentation is a view as to where we are at this point. There is a lot of activity and there is no surprise of the colors. Chairman Pomata asked with regards to Disaster Recovery (DR) what is the scope of this? Mr. Duball replied anyone on SunGard is on this now and that includes Virginia Department of Social Services (DSS) and Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). Chairman Pomata then asked what agencies are not on the list. Mr. Stewart noted that not all applications and systems in the Commonwealth are covered by DR. This is the individual agency decision. They 1) did not have the money or 2) it depends on how they view DR. This includes the physical building and there is risk assessment being worked on and what we are doing is educating agencies that there is a DR capacity in Virginia and it needs to be accounted for in their business continuity plan. However, right now it's hit or miss. He noted that we currently have 18 agencies with DR, most of them are the large agencies and DMV is one of the agencies. Mr. Johnson asked if there was an inventory of critical applications in the Commonwealth. Mr. Stewart replied that it will be. Mr. Johnson then asked what influence do we have to get people or agencies

to get a DR. Mr. Stewart replied regulatory none; however, we influence by educating them on the importance of a DR plan. Mr. McGuirk asked if there is a publication that lists who has DR and who does not have DR. Mr. Stewart replied that there is a detailed list at each agency. Mr. Duball noted that there is a COOP plan that outlines the details of DR. He then turned the floor over to Mrs. Peggy Ward, VITA, Commonwealth Security and Risk Management, to explain to the Committee.

Mrs. Ward noted that there is an Executive Order passed under Governor Warner to have a Continuity of Operation Plan (COOP). They hired a consult to review the Plan and we did not get a good grade. They asked that the Plan be turned in last year. Beck Consulting did a review of our COOP Plan at the Secretariat level. The challenge is that the COOP Plan has not been released to anyone and we have asked that it be released to the Partnership so that they could get an idea as to where the gaps are. Mrs. Ward included that in 2005 we asked each agency to submit their DR plans. These plans are in an array of different qualities. We have a sense of essential systems but we do not have a Plan for the Commonwealth – it is a cost for this and the critical systems are covered. Mr. McGuirk asked with the DR plans that you collected from each agency is there a list as to who has a Plan and who does not. Ms. Ward replied yes. We are trying to reach out to each agency one on one and case by case to those that do not have a Plan. Mr. Walter Kucharski, Auditor of Public Accounts, noted that we have identified 35 of the 90 agencies. One third of the clients do not have the funds to do DR and relevant to the published list these lists are developed by agencies or Secretariats and are not available. Chairman Pomata asked was it our responsibility to backup DR for those that are approved. Mr. Duball replied that whomever was on SunGard and we stood up new hardware – as part of the transformation when you get the new email systems you already have DR.

Integrated Master Schedule (IMS)

Mr. McVicar reported that in the past this has been tower based. We brought in a new team in March and they worked to get this new schedule up and running. Mr. McVicar noted that slide 27 of the presentation depicts the various reports and tools at our disposal to manage at an agency level. Mr. Johnson wanted to know what was AM. Mr. McVicar responded Asset Management. With regard to the agency sequencing, Mr. McVicar noted that we have a schedule for each agency with detailed planning and we intend do this with an agency deployment manager. We have improvements in each tower to work independently with each agency.

With regard to the Agency Transformation Dashboard we can identify where the agencies stand from week to week. There's a certain percentage complete for each agency for transformation. Chairman Pomata asked if the IMS is a totally approved or accepted process as an absolute tool to run the program. Mr. McVicar replied that the tool in place is meant to have the concept that depending on us running and completing each one. Chairman Pomata suggested that at some point we replace the Dashboard with the IMS information. Mr. McVicar noted that the management change we are making will be effective July 28 and each manager will be responsible to work with a VITA counterpart to sit with the agency and nail down detail dates and get comments. He included that this may take us through the months of August and September to get all the agencies complete. Chairman Pomata asked does this mean that we will not have a plan until October. Mr. McVicar replied that we are not standing still. Every agency will get a different level of detail and we are executing against many of the plans. Chairman Pomata then asked if you laid dates in this process will you agree to those dates if they accept. Mr. McVicar replied that this is not a high risk plan but it is aggressive. Chairman Pomata noted that he is trying to sense that we still have work to do on this tool to look at the problem. Mr. McVicar replied yes.

Managed Services Status

With regards to Risk and Issues Mr. Duball reported that with the split operational environment there will still be outages and difficulty managing in the old environment. He added that IP readdressing keeps us in the old environment. Customer satisfaction is measured frequently in P2P and RFS and we continue to try and make the service obligations that we have committed to. With regard to growth initiatives there are still new projects that come in and we try to be responsive to them.

Partnership Financials

Mr. Duball reported that \$230.5 million reflects full payment by VITA to NGIT on slide 38 of the presentation. VITA was able to make full payment in year two and this was late June during the Commonwealth budget schedule. Mr. Duball noted that year three tends to have that same outlook.

APA Findings & Actions

Mr. Duball reported with regards to the APA audit findings and actions with Finding 1 - we have a new target date of March 09 to complete all of the activity. We had a slip due to over estimating the ability of field staff to perform both current service delivery activities and new process development and training. He added that we expect to come to the deadline earlier than the March 09 date. Mr. Duball then informed all in attendance that we will resolve this issue by bringing in additional resources to supplement field staff activity. Continuing, he reported that with Finding 2 - data collection - we completed those that we said that we could and the DCD's will improve as we move forward. With regards to Finding 3 - things are coming through the pipeline that we are not aware of and we will be sitting with the APA shortly to see how we did on this one. Last and not least Finding 4 - will have to meet off-line to let the APA look at artifacts and docs to improve this one going forward. Chairman Pomata asked Mr. Kucharski if we were making progress on these Findings. Mr. Kucharski replied yes.

Other Business

Chairman Pomata asked if there were any questions from Committee members. There were none.

Chairman Pomata then asked if there were any questions from non-Committee members. There were none.

Chairman Pomata asked if there was any other business new or old for discussion. There was none.

Public Comment

Chairman Pomata asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

Adjourn

Chairman Pomata asked for a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Johnson made a motion to adjourn the meeting; Mr. John Westrick seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 11:15a.m.