

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

To The New Hampshire Department of Health & Human Services

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
July 17, 2003***

Draft Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

July 17, 2003

Health and Welfare Building
Conference Room 112/113
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
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment
Linda Hartson, Exeter Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Annette Barnaby, Health Information Specialist Appointment
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment
Jane Ireland, Rye Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment

GUESTS:

David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS
Melanie Orman, Vital Records, SOS
John O'Neal, Application Development
Steve Wurtz, Supervisor of Registration/Certification, BVR, SOS
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS
Peter Parker, Consultant, InLook Group
Cynthia Swank, InLook Group
Cathy Eccelston, System Developer, OIS
Mark Parris, Project Manager, OIS

Draft Minutes

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Introductions:

Ms. Little called the meeting to order. Seeing some new faces she suggested that those in attendance introduce themselves. She began the introductions herself and committee members and guest followed. Ms. Little explained that the agenda for the meeting appeared to be brief and would begin with minute approval for the May 15, 2003 meeting. The chair asked for a motion and Ms. Hartson agreed. The committee was asked for discussion or corrections. Hearing none, Ms. Little called for a vote. The minutes were accepted as written.

2. Vital Records Business Plan Contract Update:

Dr. Mevers informed the committee that he was very pleased to announce that on July 25, 2003 Governor and council had approved the project that this committee had proposed nearly a full year earlier. The proposal was to develop a business plan for the preservation and management of vital records. To carry that out the contractors, Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank were currently involved in planning how to do that effectively and efficiently. He explained that they would be doing some rather intensive research which is part of the project and return to give the committee six reports which will not only be helpful for the project at hand, but in the long run.

Dr. Mevers added that he was hoping that this would work into what had already been legislatively approved as the local government records program. Which is a much more extensive program. He stressed that the current project's focus is strictly vital records. He then invited Ms. Swank to address the committee. Ms. Swank distributed a handout describing the deliverables of this project. These deliverables based on research, talking with people, lists and making recommendations. The final report will be the business plan, which will involve getting the committees input on their recommendations about priorities and what will work here in New Hampshire.

Ms. Swank explained that she and Mr. Parker would be talking with people from other states and town and city clerks. Dr. Mevers was established as project liaison and they had met with him, Mr. Bolton, Mr. Wurtz, and Mr. Burford the week before. It was expected that they would work very closely with those gentlemen throughout the project. Mr. Bolton had provided them room to work within the business office, which would be helpful. She and Mr. Parker had also attended the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators annual meeting held in Providence, Rhode Island where they renewed acquaintances that they discussed the project with.

They found that there were similar projects underway in both Rhode Island and Vermont involving government records. They had also gone to the Executive committee of the New Hampshire City and Town Clerks Association, explained the project and asked for their cooperation and input. At that time she and Mr. Parker asked the clerks if they thought it might be advantageous for them to attend the clerks annual meeting where they might discuss the project in a roundtable discussion. Ms. Swank explained that it was important to discuss with the clerks, as this could not be a top down project. It would be very helpful for them to have the opportunity to meet with the people that would be applying for the grants. The clerks mentioned that they might be able to discuss the project at the Presidential Roundtable.

Draft Minutes

Ms. Swank was not certain if that was the appropriate forum to discuss the project. Mr. Bergeron replied that it “worked for him.” He added that he had received a call asking him to discuss record retention and but when he received the program for the event, he noted that they had added preservation. He felt that it might be the appropriate time to discuss records preservation. Mr. Parker added “and to listen.” Ms. Swank felt that by that time she and Mr. Parker would have a lot more done in terms of standards, what other states are doing, and the benchmarking survey so they would have draft recommendations that they could discuss.

Ms. Swank informed the committee that she and Mr. Parker had a number of questions for the committee that they could ask right then or they could provide to the committee to allow them to think over before responding. The first one being, it has taken quite a long time to get the project up and running and they needed to know if anything had changed in any way that would affect the project in terms of emphasis or even what the committee really wanted from it. Mr. Bolton explained that the committee had pushed for this project and there had been no major turnover in its membership so he was confident that their goals were the same as when the RFP was drafted. He added that even if and when the business office changed jurisdictions it would not affect the committee, it’s makeup, or its direction.

Ms. Swank then asked how the committee visualized the initiative two years down the road. After some of the recommendations had been put in place. How did they think it would look two or five years from now? Ms. Little explained that she could speak to one area and that was the grant program. What she wanted to see was criteria, a level of how they would grade applications for the grant money. That was a very important issue from her perspective. She felt that the committee had in the past certainly endorsed funding for local records grants but had always been hesitant because they did not have a sufficient application or even criteria to sufficiently grade them if there were more applicants than they could fund in a year.

Ms. Little stated that in the past the committee had discussed having the grant money represent a percentage of the budget as opposed to the set amount of \$50,000 but had never formally decided to do so. That would allow the committee to increase contributions as the fund increased. Ms. Swank asked about the disaster recovery portion of the budget. Ms. Little asked if Ms. Swank was referring to electronic or paper records. Ms. Swank replied “both.” Mr. Bolton replied that he and Dr. Mevers were in the process of looking for an electronic storage standard and that was very important to them. Mr. Armstrong stated that he felt that the committee did not have a strategic view of just what was the problem and how big it was. He felt that they needed to look at the high level views and then they could start with some strategies.

Would it take five years or twenty years to solve the problem? Ms. Hartson replied that she felt that on the local level it required education. Education at both, the clerk’s level and at the community level. Ms. Swank asked at the Executive council how many clerks had participated in the New Hampshire local records education project. A few had, but none applied for the on-site assessment. Mr. Kruger replied that a number of assessments were done following that project led by Dartmouth. He felt Ms. Swank was correct, no town clerks took advantage of it. It had mainly been non-governmental groups. Ms. Hartson stated that years ago when this issue first came up there had been interest and some had applied for grants, but the amount of work involved and the lack of criteria that

Draft Minutes

Ms. Little had alluded to was not set in stone. It was very difficult for those that were involved without direction.

Ms. Swank asked if the committee still had those grant applications. Mr. Bolton replied that he did have a lot of paperwork and would share it with she and Mr. Parker. Ms. Swank asked if the committee had any leads on states that they wished she and Mr. Parker would look at. She explained that in their meeting with Mr. Bolton, Dr. Mevers, Mr. Wurtz and Mr. Burford several states were mentioned and she and Mr. Parker had their favorite states. Ms. Hartson mentioned that Mr. Bergeron would probably be able to speak to that issue. Mr. Bergeron replied that he had several on file that he would be happy to share with Ms. Swank and Mr. Parker. He added that he would definitely talk with Gregory Sanford of Vermont.

Vermont is very similar to New Hampshire with some of the same constraints. Ms. Swank replied that they had spoken with him and he had referred them to a person on records side that does local records. Ms. Little asked what the timeline was for the deliverables. Ms. Swank replied that it would most likely be January because they were unsure how quickly things could get started in the middle of summer with vacations and such. The Society of American Archivists would be meeting in August. So just making the contacts and getting a response from the other states might be a little slower until September. Mr. Bolton added that they had been discussing modifying the contract to change the completion date from October 31, 2003 to March 31, 2004. Ms. Swank stated that they expected the reports from other states to come in fast when they do begin to come back. She was unsure as to how the committee wanted to do the review process in terms of discussing priorities and recommendations. Whether they need to meet with the whole committee or the preservation subcommittee.

Ms. Little asked who was on the subcommittee. Dr. Mevers replied that it was Mr. Armstrong, Ms. Hartson, Mr. Kruger, and Mr. Bolton. Ms. Little felt that it would probably be sufficient for Ms. Swank and Mr. Parker to meet with the subcommittee. Mr. Parker asked how often that committee met. Ms. Little replied that they did not have a set schedule. Ms. Little asked if there was anything else Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank wanted to ask the committee. Mr. Bergeron stated that he was delighted that the project was underway. Ms. Little agreed and thanked Mr. Parker and Ms. Swank.

3. Vital Records Move to Secretary of State:

Mr. Bolton reported that the move was passed in the continuing resolution budget. The Office of Community and Public health, Bureau of Vital Records and the Secretary of State's offices were working on a transition plan to ensure that soup to nuts was modified. The jurisdiction will be transferred once the Director of the Office of Community and Public Health (OCPH) has approved the plan. All the letterhead, stamps, etc. will be changed. He did not feel the change would affect any of the projects or priorities in place. He stated that Mr. O'Neal would explain that further. Ms. Little asked when the actual move would take place. Dr. Mevers replied that there was nowhere for the bureau to move to yet.

The expansion of the current Records and Archives building would hopefully be completed in about one and one half years. The expanded building on Fruit street would not only house Records and Archives and Vital Records. It was Dr. Mevers

Draft Minutes

understanding that it would also house part of HAVA (Help America Vote Act). It was a fairly large expansion. Mr. Bolton explained that the bureau's office space was secure until the move. The telephones and contact information for the bureau was the same. Ms. Little asked for clarification on the continuing resolution. She asked which budget it was based on. Mr. Bergeron replied that it was the Senate budget. Mr. Bolton added that it was based on the legislative budget, House bill 1 and House Bill 2 and trailer bill. Mr. Bergeron stated that it was based on the higher budget. Ms. Little asked what was expected to happen at the end of the three months. Was there more that was needed to help legislation?

Mr. Scanlan replied that he felt the only thing to be done at that point was to be vigilant and continue to ensure that Vital Records stays in the continuing resolution and the final budget. He explained that continuing resolutions could go on for a long time if the Governor and legislature fail to reach an agreement. He felt that all parties concerned needed to keep a close eye on it. Ms. Little stated that she was encouraged by the Governor, who was adamant about the bureau moving to the Secretary of State's office when he spoke at a clerk's election workshop. He essentially promised the clerks that he would see to it that transfer would take place.

Mr. Kruger added that he wanted to keep the reason of having a vital records office in the first place, serving the public, on the table. The level of service in his experience has been very good and he felt it extremely important that during the transition that focus not be lost. Mr. Bolton assured that he would stay on top of that. Ms. Little asked if there were any other comments about the move and there were none.

4. Fund Accountability:

Mr. Wurtz reported that the subcommittee on fund accountability had been formed and the last element of that committee was the financial representative from the Secretary of State. With the transition of our funds to the Secretary of State we now have a new person to follow up with regarding our deposits. The city and town clerks would be informed that their deposit information and monies would no longer go to the Office of Finance and COFA as it had in the past. Ms. Paula Penney from the Secretary of State's office is a member of the fund accountability committee and would now be the recipient of the funds.

The committee consists of two city clerks, two town clerks, a representative from the Department of Revenue, and Ms. Penney. The committee's first meeting will be held August 19, 2003. They will be able to put their heads together and hopefully at the next meeting of this committee he would have some recommendations from them. He added that this could not have happened at a better time for the bureau. With the transition of the bureau and the funds they have the opportunity to begin the relationship with a focus on accountability and the sharing of information. There is a renewed eagerness to automate the process.

Ms. Little asked what the committee was charged with. Mr. Wurtz explained that their original task was to come up with some kind of accountability for the cities or towns. To show that a specific number of marriages, divorces, adoptions, etc. represent a specific amount of money to the town. To ensure that deposits are made on a timely basis and that clerks are accountability regarding the issuance of the safety paper that certificates

Draft Minutes

are printed on. One of the key elements they plan to look at is the automation process. The VRV2000 software has an accounting package in it and they planned to examine that and make it more user-friendly. He added that it was his hope that with the new software that they would have the capability to track a lot of the items automatically. Ms. Little asked when Mr. Wurtz expected the committee to finish up its work. Mr. Wurtz replied that the end date was not yet determined. Since they had not yet gotten into their work he could not say. He said that the four communities selected to join the committee were picked for their size, volume and how they file so that the perspective of both the large and the small community could be taken into consideration. Mr. Parker asked Mr. Wurtz if he meant that VRV had an accounting package.

Mr. Wurtz stated that the 73 communities using VRV have access to the accounting package. Some of them use it but most do not. He said that there is one community that uses it completely. Londonderry is using it and pays their monies according to the system. After the second month the clerk was able to balance using the system. Mr. Wurtz informed the committee that anyone that uses the system knows that balancing with it is a major accomplishment. Mainly because it takes a tremendous amount of effort on the clerk's part to make sure that every penny goes on the system. Deb Patrick from Berlin, Ms. Trish Piecuch from Manchester, Ms. Deb Clark of Charlestown, Ms. Cindy Heon of Deerfield, Ms. Beverly Jewell from the Department of Revenue and Ms. Paula Penny from the Secretary of State. Mr. Bolton added that it is very important to the bureau that it all be automated. He said there would always be disconnects and people like Ms. Jewell might want more information about timely bank deposits, etc., than we can offer, but there will be accountability. Mr. Wurtz asked if anyone had any questions, hearing none he yielded the floor.

5. OIS Update:

Mr. O'Neal reported to the committee that the IT centralization had taken a major step forward the day before in the Fiscal Committee. He explained that there were approximately 300 resources transferred into the Office of Information Technology, which was created along with the budget. There are three phases to the centralization. Phase one will include Health & Human Services, Department of Safety, Environmental Services, and the Department of Transportation and some others are included in phase 1. They made the transition retroactive to July 1, 2003. Mr. O'Neal and Mr. Bailey had been meeting for several weeks regarding the move of Vital Records to the Secretary of State.

He and Mr. Bailey had recently met with Mr. Anderson and Mr. O'Neal stated that he was in attendance at the committee meeting to offer a pledge to the committee, that neither the committee nor Vital Records would see any change in the level or commitment to service on the part of OIS. He added that they still have technical services on board and the tech support and hosting of the software is still planned. It should be a transparent move. He added that if it were not, everyone had his telephone number. Ms. Little replied that she was very pleased with that. Those that had supported the software so well in the past continuing on in that capacity would be great. She stated that she didn't think we could ask for a better solution. She then asked if there would not be any IT interaction with the Secretary of State's IT staff (Mr. Sullivan).

Draft Minutes

Ms. Scanlan replied that he was under the impression that responsibility for the bureau software would remain with those that had been maintaining it all along. They had discussed it with Mr. Sullivan as he is the expert on their internal software and he will be involved only in being up to date on what is happening with the software and to offer advice if it is sought. Mr. O'Neal added that Mr. Sullivan had been over to meet with Mr. Bailey and had stated that he would be happy to be involved somewhat, but had left it to them to run and maintain the software. Mr. O'Neal reiterated that he expected everything to continue as it had. He stated that Mr. Anderson continually reminded them that he was there to improve services to the department. This just goes along with that. Mr. O'Neal reported that the application would be embedded with the department. He explained that it kind of fits into the master plan of centralizing services. He added that they know how to support our software and have about 75 employees to do so. Mr. Armstrong stated that it would now be OIS that would be doing planning for future changes and additions and that it might be a little more forward thinking than the committee or the bureau were used to with DHHS.

Mr. Parris distributed a small handout. He explained that Mr. Bolton had asked him to speak about the web enablement project. He also wanted to discuss the VPN Concentrator and sites they plan to expand to next. Mr. Parris directed the committee's attention to the web enablement section of the handout. He reported that he and his staff continue to work hand in hand with the vendor, CNSI on a daily basis. It was going well in his opinion. The hardware and software that had been ordered to accommodate the changes with web enablement had been delivered and were being installed while Mr. Parris attended this meeting. The contractors and technical staff are meeting at the APS building and getting that software installed and up and running. As a result we would have a good development environment for everyone to work in.

He then discussed the weekly and bi-weekly meetings that are held with the vendor. He reported that at that point they had completed 16% of the project. That is basically on the death module as it will be the first one completed. It was about 38% complete and on schedule. Mr. Parris reported that they had done a great deal of groundwork on the birth module. It was about 15% complete and the marriage module was at 10% complete. CNSI has approximately eight people on-site, but it could be more as Mr. Parris stated that sometimes they double up in their eight allotted cubicles. For the most part there are at least eight people in the building everyday.

He reported that it is a mixture of management, team leaders, database people, and three programmers that are now into the actual construction phase. They are providing OIS staff with great statistics and meetings are very productive. He asked if anyone had any questions before he moved on to the next topic. Ms. Little asked if they had discussed or given any thought to the clerk's complaints about excessive use of the mouse and trying to avoid that in the new software. Mr. Bolton replied he had brought that comment forward during discussions with the vendors.

Mr. Parris added that in the RFP we asked them to basically emulate our current software (VRV2000). He added that there has been one concession that we have gotten in regard to the mouse issue. CNSI has built in a tree structure on the page and it can be navigated with arrow keys rather than the mouse. Beyond that he felt that unless there was major contract modifications, there would still be a lot of mouse use required. He added that one other change is they are working on allowing a clerk to save prior to the last page of the record. In VRV2000 the user must go all the way to the end to save. This will help

Draft Minutes

users when they lose their connection and are in the middle of entering a record. This will at least allow them to save what they have already entered before they reboot.

Ms. Hartson asked Mr. Parris if the testing that is referred to on the handout beginning in October would be testing on a user level. Mr. Parris replied that it would not be users, that there was a 30-day period where they had to test with the federal people. He added that Mr. Bolton could probably explain that better, but they were expecting the federal people to be ready to test then so that is what they are planning and will be ready. They will send data back and forth with them for the electronic death registration and implementation will follow that depending on how it goes.

Mr. O'Neal asked Ms. Hartson if she was concerned because she was scheduled. She replied that no, she was just wondering what order they would be testing in or would they just launch it without user testing. Mr. Parris replied that he had been discussing with Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz putting together a list of possible testers and reserving training rooms etc. because it would come fast.

Mr. Parris moved his attention to the VPN Concentrator. He remarked that the numbers following the installation were astounding. Since The VPN Concentrator went online with 49 clerks and 5 funeral homes it has been really successful. He and Mr. O'Neal stated it would have been a good idea to bring the financial information with them to the meeting, but neither had. Mr. Parris estimated that communication costs had gone from about \$8800 per month to about \$3800. Ms. Little was very anxious to hear those numbers and was pleased to hear of the savings. Mr. Bolton added that the communications costs rose to over \$9000 several times. Mr. Parris said that they were under \$4000 this month. Mr. O'Neal stated that he thought they were actually under \$3000 that month. Ms. Hartson added that her town is on the VPN Concentrator and they have had no issues with it that it has run very smoothly. Mr. Parris reported that when the committee first discussed the VPN Concentrator they assumed that it would pay for itself within two years. In his opinion it was far exceeding expectations.

Mr. Parris then reported that Mr. Allen, the Technical Support Specialist that replaced Mr. Milligan has jumped in with both feet and is trying to sell the system to every site that he goes to and Mr. Bolton has been supportive of his effort. Mr. Parris also mentioned Mr. Banks from OIS who has also been instrumental in the effort. Ms. Little asked Mr. Wurtz about the hardware survey they had received from the bureau. Mr. Wurtz replied that the survey was actually one put out by the vendor, CNSI. It was intended to help them get a handle on the hardware and software being used by the bureaus target audience.

Mr. Wurtz added that even though surveys are still trickling in CNSI has taken the bulk of them and is extracting statistical information from them that they plan to present at a future meeting. Both Ms. Little and Ms. Hartson stated that they would be returning their surveys. Mr. Wurtz replied that he was surprised at the response they got with this survey. Mr. O'Neal stated that he would forward the cost saving information to Mr. Bolton to be distributed to the committee so they could all see the benefit of the VPN Concentrator. Ms. Little thanked him and agreed that would be good to see.

Ms. Hartson reported that she had received a call from someone that told her that during an Executive Clerk Board meeting it had been mentioned that everyone on the VPN Concentrator would be getting new computers. Mr. Bolton replied that there were

Draft Minutes

several issues besides the VPN Concentrator. Mr. Bolton stated that some computers out there would not tolerate the new XP operating system. Ms. Little clarified that not everyone would just get a new computer. Mr. Bolton replied that they had also committed to looking into replacing the computers. There were ongoing discussions surrounding that. Ms. Little asked the average age of the equipment out there. Mr. Wurta and Mr. Bolton both estimated 4-5 years. Mr. Armstrong suggested that if the committee intended to use a browser they want to consider for security purposes, the diskless work stations or smaller footprint systems that will not allow any other software to be introduced. Ms. Little asked if Mr. Armstrong was referring to a "thin client." He said that maybe it was too far in the future to consider.

Mr. Bolton replied that the rollout of birth in January of 2004. He added that in some offices might want to load other programs onto the computer and other state agencies that go into their offices. He said that some clerks might appreciate a small footprint. Mr. Bolton also praised Mr. Allen's zeal for bringing on new users. He takes a computer with him when he visits clerks for other issues and is bringing on as many people as he can. They are no longer just sticking with a list. If they want it, Mr. Allen will bring it.

Mr. Parris reported that it was his and Mr. Allen's opinion that if they plan well and do it geographically they should be able to install and set up all the city and town clerks themselves. That would save some outside contractor money. He added that there was no definite plan in place but it was feasible.

6. Other Business:

Mr. Bolton reported that although he and Mr. Wurtz missed the grand opening of the new Keene records facility but had gone the day before with Dr. Mevers and Mr. Burford. He described the facility as a temperature controlled, grandiose warehouse. He thanked Ms. Little for the tour. She announced that they have surplus space and expertise and are looking for clients.

Mr. Bolton reported that there is a funeral director that is seeking to be connected to the VPN because of some issues he is having with the dial up and he suggested that VRIFAC pay for broadband or a VPN connection for him. Mr. Bolton explained that he had agreed to bring the issue before the committee. He added that he thought the committee had tackled this issue before and had decided to only subsidized non-profit businesses or entities. Ms. Little asked if the five funeral homes already on the VPN Concentrator were paying for their own Internet accounts. Ms. Hartson asked if agreeing to do this would not open a can of worms. Mr. Bolton agreed that it would.

Mr. Bergeron asked if this person was not the only one with issues. Mr. Bolton said that this funeral home did seem to have more issues than others according to Seneca. Ms. Little asked if the committee had not been consistent in its outlay of funds. The committee elected to deny that request. The bureau had initially purchased printers for funeral homes because there was such a disparity in the printers in the field. Mr. Parris added that with the web enabling of the software consistency would continue to be helpful. Mr. Wurtz agreed with Mr. Parris that we could guarantee our success by purchasing printers for users that will print our certificates correctly. Mr. Parris asked how much of the problems this person is experiencing is a result of his phone lines. Mr. Kruger asked how much it would cost. Mr. Parris asked how many records this person

Draft Minutes

does a month. Mr. Bolton replied that he does 30 to 35 per month. Mr. Janosz felt that it was a waste of time to discuss it further. It was not cost effective to provide Internet service to this site for 35 records a year. The committee elected to deny the request. Ms. Little felt that the committee should formalize its position on purchasing equipment or services for users. Mr. Bolton thought that it had been discussed before. Mr. O'Neal suggested the committee look at computers as well. Mr. Parris added that not only had the bureau gone out of their way to help this gentleman, his staff as well had gone above and beyond to assist him. Ms. Swank asked if the bureau was recommending a specific brand of toner for printers. Mr. Wurtz replied that they were not, but they were looking at paper that adheres the print to the paper called Lazerlock. The bureau is using it for short and long form certificates. It is not used on the cards but most people laminate the card when it is purchased.

Mr. Bolton explained that the bureau is doing a contest to design the new heirloom certificate that will be introduced in January 2004. The contest kicked off on July 2, 2003 and will run through September 2, 2003. The judges include, Miss New Hampshire, Mrs. New Hampshire, the New Hampshire Poet Laureate to name a few. The winner will be announced at the Currier Gallery of Art on October 31, 2003. The prize for the winning design will be \$3000.

Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Scanlon about the new voter registration form. He had met with Anthony Stevens from the Secretary of State's office and a gentleman from the Attorney General's office. They will be creating a form that will be downloadable and interactive. Mr. Bergeron felt that after hearing the discussion about printers that they might want to consider printing when designing that form. To make sure that it will print on the printer that the clerk uses for printing certificates. Ms. Hartson added that they must remember that not all clerks are online. Mr. Bergeron replied that forms would be printed out and distributed to those clerks. In his office they hoped to do away with forms all together. Just enter the data online and be done with it. There will be a centralized database where clerks information will go when they enter it. There would be a manual form for non-automated clerks.

Meeting adjourned.