ITTP Project Manager Meeting Minutes
08/17/06

Attendees: Aaron Melgares, Marion Bashista, Naomi Gunther, Dave Klein, Ann Berry-Kline.

New Action Items
* The team is to send Ann names of people on their project teams for the next ITTP Working Meeting.
* Naomi, Linda and Ann will meet to work out how to gain feedback about configuration and routing issues after September 1 in order to improve the current processes as service provider roles evolve.
* Project Managers are to send Ann items to be completed for September 1st and a status.
* Ann to follow up with Janine about Change Management’s next steps.
* Ann to follow up with Bruce and/or Heather about ITR, Phase 3 next steps.

Open Action Items
* The team will go through the ITTP risk log to make updates and clarifications.
* Ann will talk to Mark about PMGs role in big projects such as AD or Asset Management. – Differed until after 8/23
* Christi will get a web page made for Application Solutions program. Web site for Applications Solutions underway; will have pointers to Applications Solutions; portfolio consolidation web page. This is pending final definitions of services.
* Marion will talk to Mark about the criteria for project to be a part of ITTP and…when is the end of consolidation? – Differed until after 8/23

ReadyTalk
Aaron had wanted to try out Readytalk which is an audio and web conferencing service. There is a cost for the audio portion however the web conferencing portion is free to UCSC employees. The ITTP Project Managers are located in multiple locations (3 locations for today’s meeting). Today, we tried the web conferencing portion of the service in addition to our normal teleconferencing. Ann and Naomi were having safari problems upon initiation. IE worked better for Naomi. Ann tried Firefox and had minor problems probably because I didn’t have the most recent update.

Once initiated, we were able to post in PowerPoint format the agenda, Sept. 1 Key Deliverables and the Dependency Diagram to everyone’s computers. Aaron was able to project the Desktop Support Project web pages and Dave’s Server and Storage Consolidation Report as well. There are advantages of this tool however it takes some getting used to. We’ll continue to try it out. Here is the link if you want to check it out for your web conferencing needs: http://its.ucsc.edu/service_catalog/telephone.php - ReadyTalk Teleconference Calling Web Conferencing.

Project Status (Specify Sept 1 Deliverables; if applicable)
   ▪ Support Center Consolidation, Phase II
Naomi reported that training is in progress for IT Request. The training continues to evolve as feedback is integrated. Lots to do yet in order to configure the tool and understand how a ticket gets properly assigned and routed. Linda and Naomi have talked to all of the support providers but 2. They have started to work on processes for how tickets get routed between CRM service providers where multiple groups can perform the same service. Naomi, Linda and Ann will meet to work out how to gain feedback about configuration and routing issues after September 1 in order to improve the current processes as service provider roles evolve. Linda and Bill will prepare a presentation for next weeks ITSMG.

- **Service Catalog**
  Aaron reported that there is one more important deliverable of the service catalog project and that is to define how service changes are determined, documented, reviewed and added to the web pages. Aaron is meeting with the IT Service Managers next week to work on this.

- **Application Solution**
  Mel is working with Christi to define the entire Application Solutions Program charter. One of the projects will be the consolidation of departmental applications that is within the scope of ITTP.

- **Information Worker**
  Ann reported that there is some movement with this project. Dave Kliger, Larry and Mark have met with a consultant, Dave Maddox, to work on a funding model. Dave M. is working on a proposal now.

- **Desktop Support**
  Aaron reported that the project is making progress in defining scope for phases that will potentially last for up to 2 years. The first phase is necessary to complete on September 1st. This phase includes understanding how the desktop technicians are organized, who are the initial contacts and how tickets are (appropriately) routed.

- **Staff Transition**
  Ann stated that gap analysis has been completed by the DLs. Only 3 more transition plans need to be completed for staff members. The Transitional Service Agreement templates were completed and sent to IT Services for future nurturing. 1 TSA (Humanities) has been signed. 3 TSAs (BAS, UNEX, and SA) are in review. 6 TSAs (Arts, SocSci, SOE, Library, PBSci, Chancellors Office/UR are being written. There are multiple communications that need to be drafted, reviewed and sent out over the next couple of weeks.

The team talked about how the TSAs are really service agreements and not SLAs. This is our time to look at our baseline, learn how to understand service demand in order to appropriately set and measure service levels. Ann thought that this also ties into Aarons work with the IT Service managers about how to gather service changes in order to update the service web pages.
Server and Storage Consolidation
Dave reported that he gave a presentation to SMT about the close of phase 1. There are some questions remaining from SMT but that overall, he thinks phase 1 is closed. The next phase is called the “Dog Food” phase where we (ITS) deploy the vm service in the data center. The phase after that will be to develop strategies for the high-risk servers. The last phase will be to roll out the service to customers. Larry is concerned that we need to have our communications and funding model in place before we deploy to customers. We need to give them appropriate lead-time.

Phase 2 is 3 weeks behind however this time might be absorbed since there are 2 week lead times for purchasing hardware.

Change Management Board
Ann reported that Change Management, phase 1 closing. The process and roles and responsibilities have been designed. Several deliverables were not met and will be discussed in the closure documents. A CAB has not been created nor has a tool been chosen to house RFC information. These will need to be absorbed into the next phase. Ann was unsure of the timing of the next phase (implementation) and will work with Janine on that.

ITR, Phase 2
Aaron reported that the document is ready and waiting to go to SMT for discussion. Phase 3 of the project will be to look at the data that was collected in phase 2 and work on recommendations based on the data. Ann will follow-up with Bruce and/or Heather as to the timing, scope and deliverables of phase 3.