

Enterprise IT Financial Workgroup
Adobe ETLA Discussion - Meeting Minutes
 December 18, 2015
 10:30 AM – 11:30 AM
 Mitchell Bldg. – Room 53

<i>Attendees</i>	
<i>Meeting Chairperson: Jenifer Alger, SITSD</i>	
Name	Affiliation
Tim Bottenfield	DOR
Tawnia Everhard	COR
Sky Foster	AGR
Kreh Germaine	DNRC
Jim Gietzen	OPI
Chris Gleason	DPHHS
Dale Gow	LEG
Cheryl Grey	DOA-SABHRS
Larry Krause	DOC
Terry Lazure	DEQ
Lisa Mader	Supreme Court
Lynne Pizzini	DOA-SITSD
Bradley Runnion	DOA-SITSD
Jennie Stapp	MSL
Dustin Temple	FWP
James Tomas	DOJ
Cindy Trimp	DOR
Sheri Vukasin	DPHHS
<i>Meeting minutes recorded by: Samantha Cooley</i>	

Background

This meeting was called to discuss which allocation method will be used for the Adobe ETLA for FY16 and FY17. Jenifer Alger wanted to give the agencies a chance to discuss a fair method of allocating the cost, given the ETLA is an unexpected expense that agencies, including SITSD, were not planning on, therefore, did not budget for. Options for allocation through the end of the biennium are Active Directory (AD) counts or license counts. Next biennium, the Adobe ETLA will be setup like the Microsoft EA, allocated by AD counts.

Jenifer Alger has the numbers, she has not shared them with the group. There are 19 of 33 agencies that will benefit from using AD, which is the majority.

SITSD has already provided an AD count to Adobe of 13,894, with the option to add another 839 for contractors, with a total AD count of 14,733. The only way we will pay more than the agreement is if FTE numbers increase by more than 5% of the total, which is 737 FTE.

Comments

James Thomas, on behalf of Joe Chapman, stated that DOJ will not make a decision until they are able to see the numbers.

Stuart Fuller sent Jenifer Alger an email stating he is in support of AD. DPHHS plans for more use of Adobe products within their agency and would like to begin moving forward.

Jim Gietzen commented that AD works for OPI.

Kreh Germaine commented that in his experience with Esri, using license counts can be counterproductive to the whole point of having an ELA, it's a disincentive for the agencies to use the product because they don't want to carry the burden of paying for the licenses.

Jennie Stapp commented she is concerned that MSL is experiencing a 100% increase, it would be beneficial if some of the agencies that are "winners" could offset some of the "losers" until they have funds budgeted for the next biennium. Next biennium she is in support of AD licensing.

Dale Gow asked if it was possible to create a hybrid model through the end of the biennium to make it fair for everyone.

Larry Krause suggested one hybrid option is to have an annual true-up. Agencies would pay based upon utilization. If their utilization increases, their payment increases, if their utilization decreases, their payment decreases.

Sheri Vukasin stated that conducting an annual true-up will put a lot of pressure on SITSD, someone will have to calculate the true-up and the hybrid would be putting additional work on them. AD count seems like a fair, equitable way to go.

Lynne Pizzini commented that she is in support of allocating the Adobe ETLA in a consistent fashion. She understands the budget issues that agencies are currently facing, which is why the group is discussing the issue. The trend for enterprise licensing is on the rise, the State wants to ensure they are in compliance with licensing and abiding by the requirements of the licensing agreement.

Time-frame for Implementation

SITSD is currently kicking off the risk assessment, which should take three to four weeks to complete.

Action: Agencies in need of immediate licensing should contact their CRM.

Group Consensus on Allocation Method for Adobe ETLA

The majority of the group felt they could not make a final decision on the Adobe ETLA allocation method until they examine the numbers, comparing the cost of license counts to AD counts by agency.

Action: Jenifer Alger will send the allocation method numbers, by AD count and license count, to the Enterprise IT Financial Workgroup.

Action: Review the numbers sent by Jenifer and respond with your agency's preference and/or comments via email.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 10:56 am.

Meeting Minutes draft submitted by: Samantha Cooley

Date of submission: February 2, 2016

DRAFT