

***VITAL RECORDS IMPROVEMENT FUND  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE***

*To The New Hampshire Department of Health & Human Services*

***-MINUTES-***

***Thursday  
May 15, 2003***

# Draft Minutes

## **-MINUTES-**

### **Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting**

May 15, 2003

Health and Welfare Building  
Conference Room 110/111  
6 Hazen Drive  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

#### ***COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:***

Patty Little, City Clerk Appointment  
William Armstrong, IT Manager, DITM Appointment  
William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar  
Tom Janosz, Funeral Director Appointment  
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment  
Annette Barnaby, Health Information Specialist Appointment  
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment

#### ***COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:***

David Kruger, Public Member Appointment  
Jane Ireland, Rye Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment  
Linda Hartson, Exeter Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment  
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment

#### ***GUESTS:***

Mark Andrew, Administrator, Division of Epidemiology and Vital Statistics, OCPH  
Rick Bailey, Office of Information Systems, DHHS  
Melanie Orman, Vital Records  
Betty Ramspott, N.H. City & Clerks Assoc., Sunapee Executive Board President  
Lynda Mower, N.H. City & Town Clerks Association, Campton  
Steve Wurtz, Supervisor of Registration/Certification, BVR, DEVS  
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records  
Tammy Borkowski, Project Manager, Web Enablement, CNSI

# Draft Minutes

## Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

### **1. Introductions:**

Ms. Little called the meeting to order. She announced that with those in attendance they did not have a quorum, but would begin anyway. Ms. Little then asked Mr. Bolton to introduce the newest member of the committee. Mr. Bolton explained that Ms. Annette Barnaby would be replacing Ms. Seskes as the Health Information staff member assigned by the New Hampshire Hospital Association. Ms. Little suggested that members of the committee introduce themselves to Ms. Barnaby and asked Ms. Ramspott if she would like to begin.

Ms. Betty Ramspott explained that she was the President of the New Hampshire City and Town Clerks Association and was in attendance representing them. The committee members and guests then introduced themselves to Ms. Barnaby and Ms. Ramspott. Ms. Little announced that approval of the minutes would be put off until more voting members arrived. She asked that the committee move on to the third item on the agenda: Fund Accountability.

### **2. Fund Accountability:**

Mr. Wurtz explained that fund accountability had become a hot topic in recent months. There had been several issues over the last few months that had brought about an unusual scrutiny of the clerks responsibility to file records as well as the monies that go with them. One clerk was removed peacefully and another went through a hearing process and was removed. Monies were unaccounted for and documents went un-filed. Mr. Wurtz felt that part of the problem is that there is no connection between money sent to the Treasury by the clerks and the bureau. It takes a great deal of effort for the bureau to even know that there is an issue with accounting. If a clerk sends five records to the bureau per month and three checks per month to the treasury there is no link to report missing money.

In discussions with the Office of Finance and the Department of Revenue, the issue is further complicated by the responsibility of the clerk by statute in the reporting of monies. A representative from the Department of Revenue attended the clerk regional meeting Mr. Wurtz attended the day before and explained that there are a lot of statutory requirements that conflict with each other as to who is supposed to do what and when. He explained that it wasn't really an issue for the bureau but just adds to the confusion as to who and what has to be deposited.

Mr. Wurtz then recommended that a subcommittee be formed from the Office of Finance, Department of Revenue, City & Town Clerks Association, the Department of Treasury and the bureau, to look into the situation and suggest solutions to end the inefficiencies in filing. Ms. Little felt that his idea had merit. Mr. Wurtz added that those that have VRV2000 already have a system in place and with the next generation of the software all users will have access to it. He stated that the bureau would look into that area of the software with the vendor to see if it could be improved. Mr. Wurtz envisioned the subcommittee working on a temporary solution for those clerks not on the VRV2000 system and possibly with the help of the Department of Revenue, reviewing the statutes to see if there were any changes necessary. The bureau does not want to see

## Draft Minutes

any other clerks in trouble, nor do they want to be the ones to have to testify against them. He felt that everyone could learn from mistakes in the past.

Ms. Little seeking to clarify asked Mr. Wurtz if he was just asking for authorization to form the subcommittee and to request that they report back to the full committee in July. She did not feel there needed to be a vote to form the committee and that the issue is an important one that needs to be addressed. It was her opinion that solving the problem would not only be a benefit to the fund but to the membership as well. Ms. Ramspott asked if there was anything in the current rules that spoke to this issue. Mr. Wurtz replied that administratively the bureau really has little or no power. It is not an auditing agency so it does not see the money. The penalties that are outlined in the statutes are weak at best. What they had assumed was clear was not so clear upon inspection.

Mr. Wurtz suggested that some changes could be made either through administrative rules or maybe through legislation. At the clerk's meeting he heard the representative from the Department of Revenue explain that they had found several of the statutes conflicted with each other. Mr. Wurtz felt the rules need to be very clear so that there are no problems in the future. Mr. Bolton stated that he felt there really needed to be a time limit. Ms. Ramspott agreed with him. She explained that coming from a small town she could understand because in the past when she had a new deputy it was her responsibility to deposit the funds and transmit the data to the bureau and it was allowed to slip. Ms. Ramspott found that the clerk hadn't done it for six months and reported that it is easy for a small town to miss because it is not high on their priority list. She felt that maybe it should be required that clerks mail each payment as they receive them to prevent anything slipping through the cracks.

Mr. Bolton agreed that her idea might be the only way to go. Ms. Ramspott added that for larger cities and towns that is not an issue because they have a much larger volume. Mr. Bolton agreed but added that smaller towns that do not have a bank would not want to make a daily trip five miles to the nearest bank and might consider it a hardship. She stated that the Executive board after seeing mentions in the paper about the issue, discussed it and wondered why they didn't know anything about it. She went on to add that reading the papers in recent months show that it wasn't just six months, but almost over a decade of nothing happening in one case. It caused them to wonder why it was not being done and why had no one had noticed, "where, was the glitch?"

She explained that the clerk executive board could understand the clerk knowing what they were doing and getting away with it, but why was it that no one at the end was questioning? Mr. Wurtz replied that after the occurrences over the last year they had dissected the situation to find out the cause. What they found was that the breakdown was right in the towns. The local treasuries and auditors that audited the clerk's books had failed to find the discrepancies. He explained that for the bureau there are two types of funds, VRIFAC and domestic violence funds. He felt that the agency that was on the receiving end of those funds was just grateful for the money it was receiving and never checked to ensure that they received all they should have.

Ms. Ramspott stated that her town had just been audited and they went over everything but the vital records documentation. They asked about dog registrations but did not ask one question about vital records. Mr. Wurtz replied that with the current climate he was surprised that they did not ask her about vital records. From what he has heard the auditing community is now very interested in vital records. Ms. Ramspott added that her

## Draft Minutes

community is a wedding community in the summer time and business is usually brisk. She waited to see if they were going to ask and was shocked when they didn't. Ms. Ramspott asked if there wasn't any sort of tracking system. Mr. Wurtz asked if she was referring to the colored form that the clerks send in with their payments. She responded that it was. He replied that those forms are deposited the day they are received and are not used for record keeping. Mr. Wurtz explained that there is no formal reporting system, but that they could get better reporting from the treasury. Ms. Ramspott asked if that didn't mean that there could be other towns that have never sent anything in, adding that she was not trying to assign blame.

Ms. Ramspott agreed that smaller town clerks needed to be better organized to prevent oversights from happening, but that it is very easy when there aren't a lot of transactions to shove a check in a drawer and forget about it. There should be a mechanism in place to prevent it from happening. Mr. Wurtz replied that many people had lost sleep over it in the last six months. It was his hope that the subcommittee would come up with some way to minimize this type of situation. There was a great deal of testimony given about the responsibility of those elected officials that were sworn to their duties. That being said, he felt there needed to be a set of checks and balances in place. The fact that this issue is very current and the auditors that audited Ms. Ramspott's books did not even check was very shocking to him.

There is legislation currently being considered that would specifically instruct the town to deposit money into a town account and distribute it accordingly. He asked the committee incredulously who would have thought the clerk would be depositing the money into their personal account and distributing the money from their own checkbook. It seemed ridiculous that after all these years legislation would have to be passed specifically instructing that clerks must deposit money into the city or town account only. Ms. Ramspott, Ms. Little and Ms. Mower all agreed that HB 211 would be helpful, but felt there needed to be more accountability.

Ms. Ramspott stated that she was very disappointed in her auditors. Ms. Little added that passage of the legislation would bring new stakeholders into the mix, the selectmen and treasurers, who probably don't even know the responsibilities. Mr. Wurtz reported that there had been several calls in the past few months asking if a clerk sent in payments, but the treasury did not forward it, would they be liable. He said that he had explained that as long as they had fulfilled their obligation they had nothing to worry about. That there was accountability there and eventually someone would be held accountable.

Ms. Ramspott informed the committee that she had informed her staff that she wanted to mail the checks into the treasury so that she could ensure that it was done in a timely manner and maintain documentation in case of future questions. She felt that it might be a good idea to offer that as a suggested procedure for clerks. Because the clerks are elected officials it would probably have to be a suggested procedure. All agreed that for larger cities and towns the volume would probably make it difficult for the clerk to see all the checks, but the suggestion could be made to smaller cities/towns. Mr. Wurtz added that he assumed that the larger towns would have "money in/money out" as a line item on their balance sheet at the end of the year, but even that had become "unclear".

Mr. Armstrong clarified that all payments were being made on paper. Mr. Bolton, Ms. Little, Ms. Mower and Ms. Ramspott replied that they were. He then asked if there were any plans to go electric in the future. Ms. Little asked if that would be a possibility with

## Draft Minutes

the web enablement of VRV2000. Mr. Armstrong assumed that the clerks were able to accept credit card payments. Ms. Little replied that they did not have that capability yet. Mr. Armstrong asked if they were legally allowed to accept them. Ms. Little explained that they were. Mr. Wurtz stated that he thought they could accept credit card payments for the Department of Safety. Ms. Ramspott felt that even if electronic payments were undertaken in the future there would still be a need for backup documentation to show auditors.

### **3. CNSI Update:**

Mr. Bolton introduced Ms. Borkowski, Project Manager from CNSI, the vendor selected to web enable VRV2000 and explained that she had prepared a presentation for the committee. Ms. Borkowski explained that project kicked off on March 21, 2003 and she was in attendance to apprise the committee of their progress six weeks in. She wanted to begin with a corporate overview of CNSI.

CNSI has been in business a little over nine years and had a little over forty-seven million dollars in revenue last year. Ten million of that was in New England. They are very active in the region with offices in Merrimack, Augusta and Boston. CNSI is a relatively small company, with 470 employees. They employ the CMM, a process model out of the Software Engineering Institute at Carnegie-Mellon. CNSI is level II assessed, which means that all of their development processes are repeatable across projects and that is what they are bringing to the state, tried and true methodologies. They have had a great deal of experience with healthcare projects and state/HIPPA requirements. They are a software development company that is Microsoft and Oracle certified. The application they are developing is .NET.

They began the project with a great deal of information provided in the RFP. CNSI staff, have been familiarizing themselves with the current VRV2000 client server to see if its functionality transfers over to the web. That in addition to many design and Joint Application Development (JAD) sessions they attended with staff from OIS and the bureau has been very helpful. In most cases VRV2000 has been working very well. She stated that clerks appeared to be very happy with it and CNSI hoped to leverage that with the experience they bring to the table. There are certain system limitations that they planned to address by web enabling it.

Ms. Borkowski advised the committee that one of the most notable goals achieved by web enabling VRV2000 would be a large savings in communication costs. It will also allow for faster and more complete code deployment. There will no longer be a need to burn and mail disks to users. Each time a user logs on they will encounter the most up to date software and will have a centralized help desk. There will no longer be a huge "spaghetti code" program. When a change is made in the new program it will occur everywhere in the program it is relevant so there will not be issues with changes adversely affecting other areas.

Ms. Borkowski explained that because there is a certain comfort level with the current look and feel of VRV2000 they intend to keep NHVRIN (New Hampshire Vital Records Information Network) as close as possible. This will allow all those currently using VRV2000 to transition to NHVRIN without a great deal of disruption to their routine. One of the new aspects will be the integration of OVS, the Social Security

## Draft Minutes

Administration's link to verify social security numbers and to enter the electronic fact of death report. Another aspect will be the addition of administration functions. She added that it would be a secure infrastructure. The only data users will be allowed to see will be data they are authorized to see. The system will be scaleable to allow a greater number of users to sign on at the same time and for the automated system to enter the final rollout to all sub-registrars. There will be multiple web servers that will allow for easy additions to the user base because the system will be very easily expanded. The new system will also be HIPAA and state regulation compliant.

Ms. Borkowski pointed out that some of the key differentiators of the new solution. One is that NHVRIN will be customer focused and that goes back to their (CNSI) CMM methodologies. Another is the JAD sessions that include state staff and CNSI staff now, but in the future will include physicians and other end users. CNSI is concerned that they address ever all of the different types of user requirements. She added that the state and CNSI both approached the development issue similarly in terms of analysis, design, coding and order in which the activities are done.

Ms. Borkowski then described the rules engine. It is housed in the middle tier of the design and gives the bureau the ability to change many things quite easily. She gave an example of changing the cost of a certificate. The bureau could do that itself and not have the additional expense of hiring someone else to write code for it. She explained that the development period would be eighteen months with an additional warranty period of approximately four months. They plan to complete the project in January of 2005. There are five functional modules and for each module they would be doing the software development process in its entirety.

CNSI is using the RAD approach, which means that for each module they will be doing analysis; design; construction; testing; implementation, and deployment phase. In other words they will go through the process five times. Because, all of the modules are similar they will be able to build upon the previous module for each successive one. All of the modules will run on one server platform with multiple servers. The technical design; server documentation; backup and recovery plans that will be done for each module will be very similar. They expect to be able to pick up speed as they go along and replicate information in the modules.

Ms. Borkowski explained that CNSI staff had completed analysis of the death module and had received approval from Mr. Bolton and OIS to continue with the detailed design of the death module at a preliminary design review meeting the week prior. She considered that the first big milestone of the project. Ms. Borkowski added that they had begun analysis on the birth module. They would be holding a preliminary design review meeting on the birth module at the end of the month.

While Ms. Borkowski distributed hard copies of her Powerpoint presentation Mr. Armstrong asked who reviews the proposed design. Mr. Bolton replied that right now it was himself, Mr. Parris and his staff and the supervisory staff from the bureau. He added that at that time the group was only looking at requirements based on the initial software and they did plan to bring in users at a later date. Ms. Little asked if those would be "JAD" sessions. Ms. Borkowski replied that they would be very similar. She added that because the audience would be less technical CNSI would bring it to a more layman type discussion. They would review the screens and functionality.

## Draft Minutes

Ms. Little asked if the bureau had held on to all past comments and issues raised by clerks about the software. She referenced clerk unhappiness with having to use the mouse. Mr. Bolton replied that he believed that the mouse issue was the one his staff had heard the most about. Any complaints or suggestions bureau staff received in the past, were included in Change Requests (CRs) and CNSI has access to the CR database. Ms. Borkowski stated that her team would be incorporating all comments.

Ms. Borkowski directed the attention of those in attendance to presentation and began to take them through it. She described the NHVRIN architecture as three sections. The top level is the user interface, the middle section, which is where all the data manipulation happens and the bottom level, which is the data storage level. The high level goals that CNSI is building into the system are one login per user per session. That is generally done for security purposes. We do not want them in multiple times with data being changed in multiple ways. That will be enforced on a system level.

Ms. Little asked what Ms. Borkowski meant by one login per session per user. Ms. Borkowski replied that if a user logged in at one computer and then tried to log in again on another workstation, while the first one was still running the system would not allow it. Ms. Little thanked her for explaining she had briefly thought that a user would have to login each time he/she attempted to work on NHVRIN. Ms. Borkowski added that it would only prevent users from logging on from several different computers simultaneously and suggested that the committee might need to talk about mandatory time outs. That would only affect those users that logon and just leave the system idle for long periods of time.

The system will be login and password protected for security. Their access will be determined by their role. What they need to do within the system. Depending on their role they will be able to access all the screens that are necessary for their functions. There will be the SSA interface that will verify social security numbers in real time. Ms. Little asked who would see that information. Mr. Bolton and Ms. Borkowski both replied that funeral directors and certifiers would get that screen. The only time the clerks would have anything to do with that screen was is they were doing the initial input of the death certificate.

Ms. Borkowski continued describing the additional state interfaces that will verify the language used and try to come up with a common data set. The business rules engine would also be housed in that middle tier helping to process the logic of the system. There will also be a report and query engine as another key feature in that layer. Ms. Little asked if users would be asked to update their passwords on a regular basis. Ms. Borkowski replied that they would. That those rules would be written into the program to prompt the user when it is time to change. Ms. Ramspott asked if that would be on an individual basis or the entire office. Ms. Borkowski replied that it would be on an individual basis and would probably be set up for ninety-day cycles.

Ms. Borkowski reported that she really liked the tiered design and the logical architecture. The idea behind it is that you still have the front end and back end and are separating data both from presentation and data access layer. It allows for the flexibility in the code changes Ms. Borkowski reminded the committee she had spoken of earlier. They can happen independent of how the data is presented or stored.

## Draft Minutes

Ms. Borkowski reported that users will see a familiar screen with NHVRIN, but they will be rendered in HTML (Hyper Text Markup Language) and Java script. There will be validations being performed in the front end to ensure the user is entering the proper information in the proper format. Users will be provided access to functional menus according to their role and privilege in the system. She reported that CNSI would be using the "standard 508" which is guidance to ensure accessibility of a site. She explained that of the measures is that the site would not use red or green to ensure access to color blind persons, provide consistent tagging syntax of images and video on the page to help those using screen readers. Ms. Borkowski reported that those capabilities were not required in the RFP but that CNSI is including it in all their current contracts, as it will soon be the norm.

Ms. Borkowski asked the committee to direct its attention to the middle tier where the business and functional rules will be carried out for all modules. The role sets will govern things such as administration and authorization. It will look to see what a users role is defined as and will pass it to the front end to pick up the rules for that role. It will then pass them back to the front end and allow them access according to those rules. The back end is where the DRA, specific module tables, as well as any temporary database tables are located.

That database is basically already in existence here at the state in the 9I database. At this point CNSI has no plans to change that. The data is there and they will just access it with the new system. She mentioned again that the look and feel of the software will not change dramatically. The way that CNSI is able to make the change to a web environment without completely changing the VRV2000 screens is with a tool called "Web Control." The new product will comply with all state mandates and innovative requirements listed in the RFP.

Ms. Borkowski then discussed security. She reiterated her earlier statements about login and password security. More behind the scenes will be the data transmission security and that will be something that is handled on the server side but will affect communication between the client, the browser, and the web server. It will encrypt all that data so there would be no chance of anyone sniffing it and getting someone's password or social security number. In terms of the schedule, Ms. Borkowski reported that her team hoped to deploy the death module in September of 2003 to meet some Social Security Administration requirements. At that time it would need to be tested with the SSA interface.

The birth module will be completed by December 2003 as required by the state. Marriage, divorce and fetal death will be phased in over time. CNSI has already performed analysis on death and have begun their analysis on birth. When that is complete they will move to marriage and move through the software development life cycle (VSDLC). They will do that for each of the modules until they finish up in September of 2004 when they will move into the warrantee period. At that point they will finish up all their documentation and provide it to the state in January 2005.

Ms. Borkowski informed the committee that the .Net technology is powerful and will give the state a future proof system. The knowledge transfer between CNSI and state staff will be extensive. It will allow state staff to maintain and update the program on its own. The English language rules engine is also a powerful tool in that it is moving the ability to modify the functionality parameters for that into the middle tier and giving

## Draft Minutes

access to the data end lists. That will allow people in the business office the ability to update rules as they change. The similar look and feel will reduce the amount of training that will be needed when it is rolled out. The only major difference will be in the way that they access the system. They will be using the Internet instead of their current fat client application on their desktop.

Ms. Little asked Ms. Borkowski if she could discuss the accounting part of the software. She expressed that she was unsure of the reliability of the current system and asked if the new program would be a little more robust when it comes to accountability. Mr. Bolton replied that it was his intent to have the new system keep track of certificates/licenses issued and funds collected. He went on to explain that corrections have to be made at the end of the day in the business office just to balance the books because of system quirks. Ms. Little asked if there would be a JAD session for that aspect of the program. Mr. Bolton and Ms. Borkowski agreed that it would.

Ms. Borkowski replied that in terms of reporting, all the information would be there in the back end and they could customize them any way the users wanted them to. Mr. Bergeron asked if information was currently being collected on voided certificates. Mr. Bolton replied that as the user voids the document control number (DCN) it is captured. Ms. Ramspott asked if the bureau accounts for the certificates (voids) when the clerks return them. Mr. Bolton replied that they did not account for each and every piece of paper, but they were planning to move in that direction.

Mr. Bergeron stated that had been his initial question. They had a staff member in Nashua that had issued a certificate and had not rung in the cash, but they did not have the void history to ascertain whether it was a one-time mistake or not. Mr. Wurtz stated that there is a process in the system to log voids and the reports that can be generated at the end of the day could minimize that problem. They could run a transaction report that would show the DCN issued. He added that the current accounting part of VRV2000 does work, but it does require a lot of effort to make it work. The bureau is aware that the accounting software is kind of clumsy and therefore does not enforce the accounting side at present. Mr. Wurtz likened it to twelve people all using the same checkbook and only one of them trying to balance it. It will be improved upon in the new incarnation.

Ms. Barnaby asked if this would have any impact on birth registrars in the hospitals. Mr. Bailey replied that it would only to the extent that currently when there is an update released it is important for the birth registrars know who their IT person is so they can coordinate new releases with them. From receiving it to installing it from the CD onto a machine with the correct operating system. Mr. Bailey reiterated what Ms. Borkowski said about the major difference being only in how the user accesses the software. As long as the hospital birth registrar has access to the Internet there will be no problem.

Mr. Wurtz explained an added advantage of moving the software to the web, instant updates. In the past when a new version was released and then a week later an error found the bureau had to wait up to six months before they could send out a new version with a fix on it. This system will allow problems to be discovered and fixed virtually with no disruption to users who may not have even noticed an issue in the first place. Ms. Borkowski asked if there were any further questions. Hearing none, she thanked the committee and took her seat.

## Draft Minutes

### **4. OIS Update:**

Mr. Bailey reported that the OIS staff was on vacation but he would be happy to answer any questions. Mr. Bergeron replied that he had a question but was unsure whether it was really an OIS question. His office had recently received all new printers (HP1200), and has experienced difficulties with one of the computers locking up whenever you try to print. His IT people thought it was because they were still running Windows 95 and it cannot handle the new printer software. He wondered if 95 was still out there and if anyone else was encountering problems with their computers locking up. Mr. Wurtz replied that Windows 95 is in all the offices because that is the operating system that they use for VRV2000. Mr. Bailey asked if they had called in the problem. Mr. Wurtz stated that they had been pretty reliable printers both in the bureau and out in the field. He asked Mr. Bergeron if his staff had installed the correct software for the printer.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he would have to ask Eric if it was installed properly. Mr. Wurtz stated he was unsure whether Eric had completed all the installations or had handed it over to Mr. Bergeron's IT staff. Ms. Ramspott asked if the operating system would ever be upgraded. Mr. Bolton replied that once it goes to the web the operating system would no longer present any problems. Mr. Armstrong added that the user would just need to have minimum browser requirements. Ms. Borkowski replied that they would need to have Internet Explorer 6 (IE). Ms. Little asked if Mr. Bolton knew what versions were out in the field now. Mr. Bolton replied that the users should all have IE 5, but could easily download IE 6 from the Internet.

### **5. Filenet Solution:**

Mr. Bolton replied that they had been looking at a Filenet solution to archive the Oracle database so they would have a solution that was acceptable to the New Hampshire Records & Archives group. Right now all the bureau has is electronic media storage of current birth records. There are no more paper copies so the need is somewhat urgent. Mr. Bailey stated that document management is one of the areas the Governors office is concerned about across the state. Mr. Anderson, the new Chief Information Officer has been spending a great deal of time with legislators trying to figure out how the organization is going to look in the future. There are broad needs and broad solutions and many solutions to look at.

For one, the state archives are running out of space. The Filenet solution is sitting out there as a piece of the puzzle. Mr. Bailey stated that he has purposely been sitting on the Filenet paperwork until the state gets a little further along in its planning. He explained that he wanted to be sure whatever the state ended up with would fit with it. The state currently has embarked on a few Filenet initiatives, none of which is in production yet. They expect the first to be Administrative Services and expect it going into production this summer. He added that the progress has not stopped it has just slowed. Ms. Little asked what the timeline was on the final solution.

Mr. Bailey replied that they should know if the state would staff up a Filenet resource probably in the following three to four weeks. He assumed everyone knew that the Governor wanted to centralized all IT to a centralized architecture, both resources and equipment. That initiative is in HB2 which also included the budget, and that does not ever just fly through. He did not think this area was one that would be controversial, but

## Draft Minutes

because it was attached to the budget it could be held until the last minute. Ms. Little asked if the committee would know by the next meeting. He replied that in July we would know something, either the state would have a budget or it would be operating under a continuing resolution and we would know nothing. Mr. Armstrong asked if he might correct one thing that Mr. Bailey said. He reported that Environmental Services was in production. Not with the same product that Vital Records is looking at, but is part of the Filenet line. He asked Mr. Bailey if the project was officially on hold until July. Mr. Bailey replied that there would be an update in July.

### Vital Records Preservation Contract:

Mr. Bolton advised that he had placed this item on the agenda hoping that he would have an answer as to whether or not this item had been placed on the Governor and Council agenda for May 21, 2003. He had discovered though, that it would have needed to be on the agenda two weeks prior. He asked if anyone else knew anything about the InLook contract. Mr. Andrew stated that the Commissioner was planning to meet with the Governor's staff and getting that back on the council agenda was on his agenda. Ms. Little asked Mr. Andrew if they were shooting for the next meeting. Mr. Andrew replied yes, that several DHHS items were moved from the agenda and they are trying to get them back on.

Mr. Bergeron stated that the longer the state waits the less likely InLook would be available to do the work. Mr. Bolton added "or at all." Mr. Bolton explained that Mr. Parker told him that he has been putting off some other jobs and cannot wait forever. Ms. Little agreed and informed the committee that the clerks have some contacts in the Governor's office and will continue to press the InLook contract.

### Other Business:

Mr. Bergeron announced that the Society of American Archivists, The Council of State and Historical Records Coordinators and the National Association of Government Archivists and Records Administrators are preparing a joint statement on the sale of public records on Ebay. It is going to eventually be expanded but at that time they wanted issue a policy statement raising their concerns citing laws and offering proposals for resolutions or solutions to the problem. There have been two representatives from each of those associations appointed to the drafting committee. He suggested that anyone that might like to comment on the issue to contact him or Dr. Mevers and they can forward the information to the appropriate person(s).

Mr. Bergeron added that there have been issues in the past. There were some supposed old vital records that popped up on Ebay one day. He had heard that they ended up being handwritten copies of the record. Ms. Little asked if their stance was that Ebay should not accept public records auctions at all. Mr. Bergeron replied that her idea might be one way that they choose to go, but they have to be careful. They do not want to force the sale of public and possibly historic records underground.

## **6. Approval of Minutes:**

Ms. Little had one correction to the minutes. She had one correction on page 6. She asked that Mr. Anderson's correct title be used. Ms. Hartson made the motion to accept

## Draft Minutes

the minutes as amended. Mr. Bolton seconded and the committee voted to accept the minutes as corrected.

Meeting adjourned.