

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

To The New Hampshire Department of State

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
July 26, 2007***

Approved Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

July 26, 2007

Archives Building
Conference Room
71 South Fruit Street
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar
Nelson Allan, Public Member Appointment
Jill Hadaway, Bow Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Patricia Little, Keene City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Carol Johnson, Manchester Deputy City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist
David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS Appointment
Peter Croteau, OIT, OIT Appointment
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Kimberly Johnson, Henniker Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
David Pollard, Funeral Director Association Appointment
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment
Debbie Augustine, NH Hospital Association Appointment
Dr. David Laflamme, DHHS Appointment
Vacant, Local City Public Health Agency Representative, DHHS Appointment

GUESTS:

Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS
Jackie Goonan, OIT
Bill Bryer, OIT
Steve Wurtz, Vital Records, SOS
Chris Bentzler, OIT

Approved Minutes

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Meeting Called to Order:

Ms. Hadaway called the meeting to order at 10:07 a.m.

2. Proxy Discussion:

Ms. Hadaway explained to the committee that at the previous meeting some guests had signed in as proxy votes. She could not recall if that issue had ever come before the committee in previous meetings. She stated that she had always assumed that the committee operated under Roberts Rules of Order so she looked into that. Under Roberts Rules of Order proxy votes are not allowed. She felt it was important that the committee come to a consensus as to how they wanted to handle proxy votes in the future. Did they want to allow proxy votes?

Ms. Hadaway felt it was important to discuss the matter to get committee members' opinions on whether it was an acceptable practice or not. She was asked if she was speaking strictly for voting purposes. Ms. Hadaway replied that she was. She explained that anyone attending a meeting could speak on a subject. Mr. Allan replied that the statutes are generally pretty clear if it is an appointed person or a delegate. He felt that that would be the equivalent of a proxy. Ms. Hadaway explained that in the past if the voting member could not attend the meeting they were never allowed to have someone else come in their place to vote.

Mr. Hall stated that usually the legislation will say "so and so" or designee. If it says designee do we know what it says in the actual legislation? Ms. Hadaway replied that she did not and deferred to Mr. Bolton. Mr. Bolton replied that he thought that the legislation states that the appointment is for a group, office, or person, or their designee. Mr. Hall agreed. He explained that his position is a designee for the Commissioner of Health & Human Services and he did not think that he had the ability to designate someone else to come in and vote for him. On the other hand he felt that if the legislation just says the executive of some organization or their designee then he did not know.

Ms. Little replied that it was her understanding that it was always at the initial appointment. It is either going to be the Commissioner or their designee. If it is a designee it should be the initial designee throughout the appointment. It is not a sort of tag team where people take turns participating. She felt that that was really the issue. There needs to be some sort of consistency in the membership. Ms. Hadaway stated that this was the reason she had raised the issue. To make a decision as to whether the person that had been designated a voting member for a specified period of time was the only one allowed to vote, or if they could designate someone else.

Ms. Little replied that she felt it was rather unfair to the other members of the committee to have someone decide to send someone in their place to vote while another member unable to attend was not aware they had that option or did not think to do it. She felt it made the process much more fair to not allow proxy votes. Mr. Allan asked Ms. Little if that was a motion. Ms. Little replied that she moved that the VRIFAC not allow proxy voting at committee meetings. Mr. Allan seconded Ms. Little's motion. Ms. Hadaway asked the committee for a vote on Ms. Little's motion. Ms. C. Johnson abstained as she

Approved Minutes

had not been in attendance for the entire discussion. The rest of the voting members voted unanimously to approve Ms. Little's motion.

3. Approval of Minutes:

Ms. Hadaway asked committee members if they had any discussion or corrections to the minutes from the previous meeting's minutes. Ms. C. Johnson replied that she had several. She pointed out on the first page she was referred to as a "Town Clerk Appointment" when she is actually a City Clerk Appointment and there is a distinction in the statute so she wanted that reflected in the minutes. The next item was on page 26 about halfway down the page there was a sentence that starts "Ms. Johnson, Ms. Hadaway, and Ms. Gaouette" and she did not believe that it was she. She thought it might have been someone else jumping in, but it was not she.

Ms. Orman explained that it was Ms. Kimberly Johnson that was being referred to in the minutes. Ms. C. Johnson asked that for future meeting minutes there should be some distinction made between Ms. K. Johnson and herself. Ms. Orman replied that she would take care of that in future meetings. Ms. Hadaway asked for further corrections. Mr. Scanlan pointed out that Dr. Teschner was not listed as being in attendance and he had attended that meeting. It was also noted that Mr. Anthony Stevens had been at that meeting and he was not listed as a guest.

Ms. Hadaway pointed out that in minutes several times she noticed a "Mr. Anthony" referenced. Mr. Bolton explained that it should have been Mr. Stevens. Ms. Orman added that she was using new voice recognition software and it often had difficulty with names, but that she would make those corrections. The committee then voted and the minutes were approved with corrections.

4. RFP Subcommittee Report:

Ms. Hadaway reminded the committee that at the last meeting they had appointed a subcommittee to look at the MRI proposal and to consider what they would like to see covered in any RFP that is issued concerning NHVRIN. She explained that the members of the subcommittee were: Mr. Bolton, Ms. Little, Mr. Allan, Mr. Hall, and Dr. Teschner. Mr. Bolton reported that the subcommittee had met once since the last meeting. At that meeting they reviewed some questions they were going to put forward to a generic contract they would include in the RFP process.

The subcommittee reviewed the questions and Mr. Bolton made some modifications to the questions and added them to a larger document that is effectively an RFP. He circulated that document among members of the subcommittee, received additional comments and because of time constraints had not yet been able to circulate the amended document to members to get it finalized. The committee decided to wrap those comments up into a relatively final document to bring to the committee to get some kind of consensus on going forward.

Mr. Bolton distributed copies of the document to committee members. He explained that it contained two sets of comments that were basically in the revision line of the document that was distributed. Mr. Bolton added that the revision did not take into account the typographical errors Mr. Hall pointed out, but Mr. Bolton advised that he would be happy

Approved Minutes

to hear about any errors detected. He explained that this document was designed to look at cost versus benefit of the support that we receive. He asked, committee members to take a moment to review the document so that they might discuss it.

Ms. Hadaway stated that there were several comments that she had read that she agreed with. One of them was the fact that we need to have information on the costs for OIT to present to whatever company that ends up doing the analysis. She did not feel that we should have to pay them to do this sort of research. She believed that the committee had already agreed that this was information that was very important to supply to the vendor that is selected.

Mr. Bolton replied that on the fourth page of the document under task one a whole section had been deleted on that very issue. That issue was basically wrapped up into another part of the paragraph in the background introduction. It explained that the overall cost would include number of full-time employees, rates, and breakdown of costs. Mr. Allan asked if the service level agreement between the Secretary of State's office and the office of information technology was on some sort of date control or revision control?

Mr. Bolton replied that the Service Level Agreement (SLA) is a document that was completed about three years prior and it was originally intended to be revisited on an annual basis. It has not been revisited, but the document still stands. He felt it would be a good reference for any vendor that is analyzing the service OIT provides. Ms. Hadaway asked if there are any additional comments. Ms. Little stated that she noticed that Mr. Bolton had removed the discussion about future improvements and other planned enhancements to the software. She recalled that both Dr. Teschner and Mr. Hall did not feel that the original verbiage was clear. But she did not feel that they wanted to see them removed from the document entirely. She also did not feel it was clear, but felt that it would be helpful. She asked, his reasoning in removing it.

Mr. Bolton replied that he really felt it more important to focus on the cost benefit analysis aspect. He asked Mr. Hall if he agreed. Mr. Hall replied in the affirmative. He felt there were other decisions to be made about proceeding with any of those based on budgetary issues. Those decisions have not been made as far as Mr. Hall knew. Mr. Allan asked if future plans for improvement to the application was not vital information for those reviewing the service we receive? They could determine whether OIT was in a position to support future enhancements.

Mr. Bolton replied that initially he had thought so. He thought it would be a good idea to inform the vendor of where he hoped for the application to go in the future. Since none of that has been clarified and solidified. He did not feel it should be included. It might just end up being a "red herring" for the contractor. Mr. Croteau stated that we were asking the vendor to look at shared costs with an eye towards reducing them, but were we asking them to also look at direct costs relative to the number of programmers and the backlog? Mr. Bolton replied that we were.

Mr. Croteau asked if it were true that we were asking the vendor to determine if the current staffing level was adequate or overstaffed. He stated that he was asking that because he did not see it in the document specifically. Mr. Bolton replied that it might not be a specific task, but it would certainly be part of the findings in a cost benefit analysis. They would probably determine whether or not the cost of the staff was a benefit or not. Mr. Bolton added that was why he felt it was important to include the

Approved Minutes

service level agreement in the RFP. Mr. Croteau asked if that would also include analysis about the complexity of the application and the backlog of change requests. Mr. Bolton replied in the affirmative. Mr. Croteau added that he had an additional question and directed committee members attention to the bottom of page 2.

He stated that in this section we list some of the current costs and wondered if that was something that we should do? Approximate costs, and range of what it was costing, he did not know if that was something that we wanted to reveal or if he felt that after studying the numbers closely enough they would know this information anyway. Mr. Bolton replied that they would be supplied these numbers up front as they would need to know this information. Ms. Hadaway added that the committee would need all this information from OIT to provide to the vendors. Mr. Croteau replied that OIT would provide that information.

Mr. Allan stated that he would like to see man-hours or person-hours. More information, so the committee might be better able to determine if they were getting bang for their buck. Mr. Bolton replied that OIT already provides us information on full-time employees. Mr. Allan stated that he would have no idea what the \$47,000 under full-time employees meant at this point. In particular, he would not know if the spread was on the heavy side or not. Mr. Bolton replied that that information would probably be what we would get at the end of this analysis. The point of this contract would be to look at, in comparison with other projects statewide or nationally. If the number of full-time employees is either too high or too low they will let us know.

Ms. Little stated that she must have forgotten to hit her send button, because she had written comments, but did not see them included in this document. One of the things that she wanted to say was that she was not sure that within this document we should be asking the vendor to comment on the functional needs of our end-users. How would they know whether the application is meeting the needs of the end user? She explained, that was listed under task 1, item 1C.

Mr. Hall replied that this was something that he had commented on as well. He felt that if we were going to do that it could be done separately. We would need to decide which end-users to talk to and how to survey them. It is another sort of mini project. He did feel it could be done fairly efficiently through a web-based survey using survey monkey or one of those websites. Thinking of how a contractor would approach that is sort of a separate mini project if you will. Could we ask the contractor to do that or could we just sort of get it done?

Mr. Bolton replied that what we could do would be, just get rid of C. Mr. Hall felt it was important to do this. He did not think the vendor should be tasked with doing this. Ms. Little and Ms. Hadaway agreed. This was something that we could do and not pay someone to do it for us. Ms. Little reported as she had one additional comment that she did not send in her e-mail. She suggested that two RFPs go out. One that would be sort of the audit with a financial focus and the second would talk about where we are going in terms of technology. She felt that would have a lot of bearing on what our costs are. Web enabling NHVRIN despite its apparent shortcomings, was a conscious decision to make the transition easier for users.

Ms. Little was unsure as to whether this was the right decision or wrong decision but felt we were coming to the end of the life span of this version of NHVRIN and she would like

Approved Minutes

to think that we were looking forward toward what kind of architecture we are going to have in the next application. She explained that that is why she would like to see the two items separated. Ms. Little stated that she would like to see the financial RFP go out first. And once it is completed, begin work on the second RFP about where we are going in the future.

Mr. Allan explained that he had a comment along those same lines. In the deliverables, document there is no recommendation that they provide a presentation to us. He asked if that was something that we just expected that we would receive anyway. Mr. Bolton replied that the committee could define what kind of deliverables they require. Mr. Allan stated that we certainly need the documentation, and it would be nice to have a presentation as well. Ms. C. Johnson asked if anyone had thought of defining what we mean by maintenance in the purpose?

Maintenance can mean a lot of different things to different people. She just wanted to make sure that we make it clear to the vendor. She reminded the committee that there was some discussion in the budget subcommittee report about maintaining only what we have until we can do some evaluation. She wanted to be sure that everyone was on the same page in terms of what we mean by maintenance. Mr. Bolton replied that if we assume that what we have is locked in and budgeted for the next year or two the assumption would be that maintenance would be the full gamut of bug fixes, enhancements, and change requests.

They would be looking at what we are currently provided. Instead of just locking it into bug fixes only. Ms. C. Johnson replied that that was part of her concern. She understood that the committee wanted to do an apples to apples comparison in terms of whether we were getting the best value for our dollar, but in that process we have to be realistic about where we were at our last discussion. In that last discussion she felt it was pretty clear that the subcommittee warned the main committee that maybe they needed to slow down and take a look at expenses before making any big expenditures.

If somebody is coming into it thinking that you want to do everything that is currently being done to the system, on the basis that this system isn't going to change at all. Ms. C. Johnson did not know if that was a good idea. Ms. Hadaway replied that this was what the committee needed to decide. What we have now, what we are paying for it, whether we are getting value for our dollar, and if we need to make some changes. Once we have that information, we can look at it and while considering the future, compare how we reconcile what we have with what we want and how we will pay for it. Do we stay with what we have because it's really a good deal or do we scrap that and go with something else entirely? We won't know that until we figure out exactly where we are now.

Ms. Little suggested that the committee discuss maintenance. She asked if she understood correctly that we meant everything that is currently being done is covered under the term maintenance. Ms. Hadaway agreed that that was correct. Mr. Croteau asked if they were planning on including everything like Mr. Bentzler's service in the RFP? Mr. Bolton replied that yes, they did want that information. Because when you get down to the nuts and bolts, everything is wrapped up into this invoice. Ms. Little asked if we needed to be clearer about maintenance in the RFP.

Mr. Croteau replied that he would. Mr. Hall added that there were really two ways you could define maintenance. One is the way that you just described it, and the other is all

Approved Minutes

bug fixes, and everything that is still in development. Maintenance is what we have now and we need to maintain it. Use the screens we have now and the reports we have now. That is maintenance. Everything else is development stuff. That is a much more restrictive way of defining maintenance, than Mr. Bolton used in this document. He felt that maybe that needed to be clarified further in the document. Ms. C. Johnson stated that there was even a third definition of maintenance. The maintenance they had just been discussing involved sending people out to hook up equipment. That was another extended piece of it and that concerned her.

Ms. C. Johnson wasn't sure that it was clear in the document Mr. Bolton distributed, just how we define maintenance. If we are giving them a purpose such as maintaining a system, she felt that we needed to make the intent clearer. She explained that she could be wrong because she did not work in that industry. Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Croteau to provide a definition of maintenance for the RFP. Mr. Croteau replied that he would identify the categories in system development maintenance. Distinguish whether that means enhancements or just bug fixes and operational maintenance. Operational maintenance was another thing. People manning the batch jobs that run at night. There is the actual maintenance of the software such as Oracle and Microsoft that you pay annual maintenance for.

Mr. Bolton expressed that he had attempted to try to cover them globally by stating operational and functional maintenance. He added that it was also included in the Service Level Agreement. Ms. C. Johnson asked if the definition of maintenance was not included in the contract between the Secretary of State and OIT. Mr. Croteau replied that that was what Mr. Bolton had been talking about. Ms. Orman suggested that they use "as described in the Service Level Agreement" to define maintenance. Mr. Bolton and Ms. Hadaway agreed since a copy of the Service Level Agreement was already being included in the RFP.

Ms. Little asked about a timeline for the project. Mr. Bolton replied that there was a timeline built into the RFP. He stated that theoretically if the RFP was released the next day, they could target October 1 for the awarding of the contract. Ms. Little stated she remembered Dr. Teschner inquiring about whether a vendor conference would be scheduled. Mr. Bolton replied that he felt that this was going to be a primarily NH project involving New Hampshire vendors and a vendors conference would be relatively easy to set up.

Ms. Hadaway asked if she had a motion to accept Mr. Bolton's report and to give him authority to move forward with the release of the RFP. Ms. Little made that motion, and Mr. Allan seconded. He confirmed that the report was being accepted with the corrections mentioned. Ms. Hadaway replied that he was correct. The committee then unanimously approved Mr. Bolton going forward with the RFP. Ms. Little asked if all voting members could identify themselves. Ms. Hadaway asked for all voting members to raise their hands. She then asked Mr. Bolton, if there was some way we could identify committee members at these meetings. Ms. Orman asked if she was referring to table tents with the committee members name on them. Ms. Hadaway replied anything that would identify committee members to those in attendance. She explained that it would be very helpful to her during meetings to know when we had lost the quorum.

5. **NHVRIN Update:**

Approved Minutes

Ms. Goonan greeted the committee and said they could do one of two things. There was the standard report that she provides that shows OIT activities since the last meeting such as change requests and planning or she also had the fiscal year '07 budget information. She also explained that she'd prepared information regarding costs. There were a lot of questions in the meeting minutes about how OIT calculates and allocates costs. So she pulled data down from the agency intranet to show examples. She left it up to the committee to decide what they would prefer she speak about. Ms. Hadaway asked which she would be most comfortable presenting first. Ms. Goonan replied that since the budget seemed to be foremost in everyone's mind, the budget would be a good place to start.

Ms. Goonan reported that even after the last meeting, she still was not 100% clear on what information the committee wanted regarding the budgeting and billing. She explained that she brought just about everything she could think of and advised members that if they saw something of interest to stop her. She explained that what the committee was seeing was the data pulled down for the Secretary of State for March '07. All the information was out there on the state intranet for those that were interested and had access.

Ms. Goonan explained that all she had done was filtered out the Secretary of State information. She stated that the presentation on the screen was all the line items that go into the monthly budget. Ms. Goonan explained that what she had done was took the month of May and added some subtotals by job number. She pointed out that these were the essential sections or areas of the invoice that you can group together logically and see how things are allocated for each item. For example, the CIO office is a shared operating expense. Ms. Goonan pointed out that that expense is allocated by bi-annual PC counts or when they are not available headcounts of the agency. The total allocated to the Secretary of State for the month of May was 1.15% and that was how much we paid for that item.

Ms. Hadaway asked Ms. Goonan, if she had the actual formulas the committee had asked for at the last meeting or if she could bring them. Ms. Goonan replied that there are two different ways to look at the formulas. She explained that the presentation on the screen showed all the formulas used by OIT in its billing. OIT calls them a method and there are over a hundred methods. When a job number is created, it takes into account the method designated by OIT. They allocate by PC count, billed positions, and daily time reports, to name a few. Ms. Goonan opened another page of her presentation and it showed all the different allocation methods that OIT uses in detail.

Ms. Goonan stated that at the last meeting there was a lot of discussion about PC counts in reference to the Secretary of State billing and budget from OIT. Her presentation showed 155 PCs registered for The Secretary of State. That happens to be 1.41% of the PCs in the state. Mr. Scanlan asked if those PCs represented the city and town clerk users. Ms. Goonan replied that they did. They did not reflect the vital records staff PCs. This is just what the towns are using. Mr. Bentzler added that every quarter, he was asked by OIT to report how many computers were in the field. Mr. Hall asked what he meant by "the state has," that the state has title to or the state

Ms. C. Johnson asked if that number did not include city or town owned PCs being used in the field. Mr. Bentzler agreed that it did not. Ms. Goonan added that there were

Approved Minutes

probably 500 computers out there being used, but they were not being counted in the budget. Mr. Hall felt this was an important issue. There may be two similar communities out there, one using state-owned computers and the other using their own, they may have similar usage, but only one is being billed. He felt this was an important issue that was hidden in all of this. Mr. Bolton stated that we have been aware of the PC count for some time and a simple solution to this might be to surplus those 155 PCs and greatly reduce our allocated OIT costs. Mr. Hall said the Ms. Goonan's presentation was very helpful as it will help the committee understand just how the costs are divided up.

We now know that the Secretary of State makes up 1.41% of the PCs in the state. But Mr. Hall felt it was more important to know the dollar amount attached to that figure. This office may only account for \$100,000. So we would only have 1.41% of that \$100,000 which would not be a lot of money. Mr. Hall felt the question would be how many dollars are being allocated from each formula and what is the basis of that formula? To further simplify the question he stated that what he would like to see was the dollar amount for each one of those formulas. What each percentage stood for in dollars.

Ms. Goonan replied that using the example we were just looking at, the CIO office for the month of May came out to \$370. Mr. Hall thanked her and directed her attention to line 349, where there was \$4386 allocated. That line was also allocated on the basis of the PC count. What is the sum of the total amount allocated on the basis of the PCs, which would be all of those lines that use that method? That way you know how much of the burden is being allocated that way. Ms. Goonan replied that they were now talking about method 017. So she would have to do was subtotal the data by the method code. Mr. Hall agreed, stating that that way they could see which method was having the biggest impact on the budget.

Ms. Goonan stated that if the committee would like to discuss something else she could work on that while they did so. Mr. Scanlan stated that if we were to eliminate the 155 computers out in the field we would see substantial state savings. He felt it might be a good idea for the committee to consider just giving these towns a specified sum of money to purchase computers and maybe a little bit for maintenance. Mr. Bolton agreed, adding that we wouldn't even need a contractor to tell us that. He stated that in looking at the budget PC counts accounted for approximately \$200,000-\$300,000 annually.

Ms. Little asked Ms. Goonan, if she had a view that showed allocated and direct costs for the NHVRIN application all in one. Ms. Goonan replied that she did have one but had not saved it on to the drive she was using for the presentation. Mr. Hall pointed out that one of the tabs in her report had direct costs on it. Ms. Goonan replied that that was all it showed. It did not have both items on one view. She explained that the intranet provides detail on direct costs but the indirect costs are summarized in the form of a PDF. Mr. Hall said that we could do it if we subtract the 183,000 in direct costs from the total amount. The difference would be the allocated amount.

Ms. Goonan distributed budget information to the committee. She explained that the total budget for FY 07 was on page 5 of the document at the very top. It was \$531,204. Ms. Little said that she would like to see FY07 on the same page with FY 08 and 09. Ms. Goonan replied that the problem was that she did not load all that documentation onto her laptop for the meeting. She suggested that members look at page 4, where the budget was shown for all items. Mr. Hall explained that unfortunately that page displayed both direct and shared costs and they were not broken out. Normally is you submit a proposal

Approved Minutes

to the state or to the feds as an independent contractor you put all the information in, but direct costs are displayed in the main body of the document and the indirect costs are listed at the very bottom.

What happened here was that all the direct and indirect costs were distributed throughout the lines. There was no way from that table to tell how much was a direct cost and how much was a shared cost. Ms. Goonan agreed that the average person have difficulty determining which was a direct and which was a shared cost. Mr. Hall explained that what he was trying to get at was something that would show the direct costs and shared costs separately and how much of the costs are allocated by each formula. He felt it was a pretty simple request.

Ms. C. Johnson stated that when the budget subcommittee received documentation for all OIT they did receive it broken down into what was direct and what was shared costs, broken down by line item. That helped them tremendously in finding some of the discrepancies they were trying to find. The subcommittee had found that information very helpful. Ms. Goonan replied that she might be able to find that document, but she did not think it was still on the agency intranet. Ms. Hadaway told Mr. Goonan that this was the type of documentation that the committee would need to provide to the vendor that is selected to do the analysis of the NHVRIN support. They will need to have that sort of breakdown of expenses.

Ms. Goonan asked if Ms. Hadaway was referring to the 2007 budget or 2008. Ms. Hadaway replied that she thought it would be a good idea to have both broken down. Ms. Goonan asked if Ms. Hadaway was requesting that she break this information down for the committee. Ms. Hadaway asked if this was possible and Ms. Goonan replied that it was. She stated that she would be happy to assist in the process but would like some help in gathering that information from people that do that sort of thing daily at OIT. Ms. Hadaway asked committee members if there were any additional questions for Ms. Goonan. Hearing none, she asked Ms. Goonan if she would like to go over the other information she had distributed.

Ms. Goonan reported that her team had just completed a major quarterly release for the NHVRIN application. That release included the out-of-state death module and other changes to NHVRIN. She explained that in the next quarter they would be working on the out-of-state birth module as well as deploying NHVRINweb, which is the public access to vital records data for queries. The largest release would take place in December. That is when they will deploy the modules for civil unions and their dissolution. They would also implement, modify and make any necessary changes to support the certification of death by ARNPs.

This change is to HB345. It will enable us to notify physicians, medical examiners, etc. that a record is available for them to certify. They will be notified via fax or email. Those systems are partially in place in NHVRIN but they've never really worked correctly. They also need to configure them to adhere to OIT security standards. If time allows and they complete those activities before December, they will work on additional change requests according to the priority list. Ms. Goonan asked if any members had questions regarding the information she had provided.

Mr. Allan asked if Ms. Goonan knew what percentage of change requests were for enhancements versus pure maintenance requests. Ms. Goonan replied it would not be

Approved Minutes

difficult for her to provide this information. She asked if he was looking for change requests that had been completed or those that were outstanding. Mr. Allan replied that both would be nice. He explained that he felt that bug fixes were mandatory while enhancements might not be. Ms. Goonan replied that with the exception of production problems, all other work that her team does is directed to them by Vital Records. They have no discretion when it comes to NHVRIN.

Mr. Croteau explained that OIT does not prioritize change requests. Ms. Goonan stated that there was a subcommittee that prioritized the change requests for them. Mr. Allan asked Mr. Bolton if he did not have discretion as to how much work he asked Ms. Goonan's team to perform. Mr. Bolton replied that he did and added that most of the enhancements were not fluff. He explained that Vital Records would like to add a credit card interface, but that is a big job so they keep it on the back burner. The addition of electronic certification of death and civil unions to the NHVRIN application is mandated by the legislature, but is considered an enhancement.

Mr. Allan replied that those changes should go into the budget process because Vital Records has to provide estimates for the next budget. He felt they could somewhat control it by telling them what enhancements would have to go into the application in the coming year or two. Mr. Bolton replied that Ms. Goonan had gone through the exercise of assigning how much time each change would take. Mr. Allan asked what the split was between enhancements and bug fixes. Ms. Goonan replied that they had gone through a number of bug fixes when they first began working on the system. These were problems the system had when they took it over from the contractor.

Ms. Goonan felt that the rest were functional changes or enhancements. She estimated a 60/40 split. 40% was bugs and the other 60% was enhancements. Mr. Hall asked if each change request was recorded separately on Ms. Goonan's staff timesheets or was it just the job number. Mr. Goonan replied that they do not time track to change requests. That data could be available, but they do not currently provide it. Mr. Hall asked if they do not report it or they do not record it. Mr. Croteau replied that they do not record it. Ms. Goonan added that she could provide it because she uses a project plan and knows the full-time employee rate and how much time her staff spends on each job. So if that was something the committee wanted she could probably provide it to them relatively easily.

Ms. Goonan explained to the committee that the second handout she distributed was a partial estimating worksheet for the civil union dissolution work. She brought the document to show the committee how much time it would take to do the work. She added that she had not put the actual time estimates on this document. It was the first draft. The point she was trying to make was that the developer has to go through the entire application when considering any and all changes.

They look at the requirements and then determine what the objects are within the system that need to be changed in order to provide that requirement. She wanted the committee to be aware that there is a lot to look at when contemplating making changes to the application. The committee needed to consider that when discussing the project with potential vendors. The civil unions issue would probably be considered maintenance because it was a legislatively mandated item.

Ms. C. Johnson stated that she saw it as an enhancement only because civil unions was not something that was included in the original design of the application. Ms. Goonan

Approved Minutes

replied that from that point of view, she did agree with Ms. C. Johnson, but the committee had to support the system. It was not optional. Ms. C. Johnson asked if anyone from the Secretary of State's office told the legislature what it was going to cost to do something like this. Mr. Bolton replied that there had been a fiscal note filed. Mr. Scanlan agreed that a fiscal note had been filed, but the legislation sailed through the legislature very quickly. Ms. C. Johnson stated that she knew there was no stopping it anyway.

Mr. Hall asked if that meant that there was no money appropriated even though a fiscal note was filed. Mr. Scanlan agreed that there was not. Mr. Allan asked the timeframe for the civil union changes. Mr. Scanlan replied that that legislation went into effect January 1, 2008 and the application needed to be ready at that time. Ms. C. Johnson asked about the fiscal note. Mr. Bolton replied that there was some money for software development and some for new forms. He thought it was somewhere around \$14,000. Ms. C. Johnson asked if that was the real cost to make the necessary changes to NHVRIN.

Mr. Scanlan explained that he believed the amount on the fiscal note was higher than \$14,000. It was suggested that the number was closer to \$67,000. Ms. Hadaway replied that it didn't really matter as the legislature had appropriated no money for it. She then asked Ms. Goonan if she had any additional information to share with the committee. Ms. Goonan replied that she did not but asked if there were any additional questions. Ms. Little stated that she had read in the minutes that there were approximately 100 outstanding change requests. Ms. Goonan replied that there were. Ms. Little explained that she was asking because the list that Ms. Goonan had provided had less than 30 on it, was this just a snapshot of a bigger list?

Ms. Goonan replied that the year before the committee had appointed a subcommittee to prioritize the outstanding change requests. The document that Ms. Little was referring to showed the status of the list that they had prioritized. There were additional change requests but they had yet to be prioritized. Mr. Bolton asked Ms. Goonan if she felt it was time for the subcommittee to meet again to go over additional requests or if she felt her plate was full enough. Ms. Goonan replied that she would better be able to answer Mr. Bolton's question in three to four weeks.

Mr. Croteau added that OIT does not recommend prioritizing every single task, because if they have to estimate every single task they have no time to do the actual work. They take a representative group of tasks that they think are higher priority and present them to Mr. Bolton and his staff to prioritize. Ms. Hadaway thanked Ms. Goonan for her presentation. Ms. Goonan stated that she could work on splitting the costs by shared and direct if the committee would be interested in seeing that. Ms. C. Johnson replied that she would like to see that information emailed to committee members. Ms. Goonan agreed that she could do that.

Mr. Bolton reported to the committee that NHVRINweb would be going online soon. He estimated that it would be going online in the next week or so, but asked Ms. Goonan to verify that. Ms. Goonan replied that they were fairly well staged to go. The remaining work was to test the email portion and they were waiting on the Database Administrator (DBA) to set up the database on the single server. She thought that might be done that day or the next. Ms. Goonan estimated that it would be the middle of August if the test of the email piece went smoothly.

Approved Minutes

Mr. Allan asked if the VRIFAC was charged with monitoring the progress of OIT completing the work scheduled. If that was the case he wondered if some smokestack charts could be created to show number of bugs to be fixed and what percentage were done. Ms. Hadaway asked Ms. Goonan if she hadn't given the committee something like that in the past. Ms. Goonan replied that she had, but not in graph form. That could be done but the problem she had as a project manager providing that kind of report was that some change requests take very little time and they can complete 10 in a week. Others such as the civil union and dissolution changes were very big changes and they would only complete two changes in the next quarter.

These were major functional changes. The quantity completed isn't a metric that would show much. Plus, they always have 100 change requests. No matter how many they do they never seem to go down. When some are completed new ones come in. Mr. Allan asked that she must have estimated how many they would do when she planned the budget. Ms. Goonan replied that she usually planned one quarter ahead. Mr. Allan asked if it was not a significant number, such as 50-100. Ms. Goonan reiterated that her staff was only focusing on three change requests for the coming quarter. She added that she could show other quarters where they completed 35-36 change requests. It just depends on the scope of the changes requested. Mr. Allan stated that the question was whether this committee wanted that kind of detail. Ms. Hadaway replied that she did not know if we wanted to get that detailed. Mr. Allan stated that he did not know what service it would provide.

Mr. Croteau explained to the committee that they needed to talk about the backlog of change requests occasionally. As we go through each quarter of implementation what the new backlog is. His staff hears periodic comments about what takes so long to get the work done. Mr. Croteau stated that anyone that has ever worked on complex, integrated, computer programs realizes why it takes so long. It is complicated work because when you change one item it then ripples into five others that also share that program. You then have to do regression testing to make sure that all six other programs work when you are done. He felt that the trend of the backlog was very important to keep an eye on.

Ms. Goonan explained that the reason she probably overemphasized about the assignment of work is because three full-time developers and a part-time project manager are staffed to complete all of the work assigned to them. The way that she manages that is as the work comes in she explains how long it will take and when they could deliver. Mr. Bolton monitors that and Ms. Goonan stated that she believed that in the two and one half years her team had been supporting NHVRIN they had hit every deadline. Several times the deadlines have had to be pushed back, but all in all they had completed the work they promised.

Ms. Hadaway asked if that had been monitored by Mr. Bolton. Ms. Goonan replied that she meets with Mr. Bolton and his staff every other week. Ms. Hadaway told the committee that she did not think it was up to this committee to monitor things that closely. That was Mr. Bolton's responsibility. Ms. Goonan reported that she felt that her staff and Mr. Bolton's had a really good working relationship. Ms. Hadaway asked if there were any additional questions for Ms. Goonan. Hearing none, she turned the floor over to Mr. Bolton.

Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Bentzler if there had been any movement on the rollout of NHVRIN. Mr. Bentzler replied that they were still looking at five outstanding towns.

Approved Minutes

The towns of Landaff and Stoddard were going to be moving forward soon. He had been in contact with both the clerks. Landaff is bringing the issue to the selectmen and Stoddard's clerk works out of her home. There was talk in Stoddard recently (May) of building a town hall and moving the clerk's operation there, but nothing had happened yet, so they were planning to go ahead and have the satellite system set up at the clerk's home. The only question they had been unable to answer to this point was what would happen when the clerk is no longer the clerk or the new town building is built? Who will pay to move the service? Mr. Bentzler spoke to the New Hampshire Electric Coop about it and because there was no precedent they could not say for sure. Would it be moved as part of customer service or would we be billed? No one could say for sure.

Mr. Bentzler reported that WildBlue is in about twenty towns now and there was discussion at a recent town clerk regional meeting where several clerks were having issues and Mr. Bolton heard about it. He contacted Mr. Bentzler to check into it and Mr. Bentzler had not been made aware of any concerns. He contacted both the towns and discussed the issues they were encountering. After that discussion he recommended that the clerks call the Coop and have them check it out as they were the technical support people. They called and the coop sent out service people and they recognized there was a problem with the dish and fixed it. Since that time he had contacted the towns and there have been no additional problems.

It was frustrating for Mr. Bentzler to find out about the issues after a regional meeting. The main problem was that several towns that were not yet connected were at that meeting and after hearing the complaints were hesitant to come on board. Mr. Bentzler asked that if anyone hears about a problem to please let him know so he can try to resolve it so it doesn't get to that level. Ms. C. Johnson asked if there were still communities refusing to participate. Mr. Bolton replied that we were not. Mr. Bentzler replied that the towns that were refusing earlier (Sullivan, Roxbury, and Orford) were all online now.

Mr. Bentzler had to attend an Orford town meeting to explain to selectmen what NHVRIN and WildBlue was and how they would affect them. It wasn't that it was really going to affect them, but in some of the smaller towns everyone wants to be in on the decision making. Mr. Bentzler reported that there were still a couple of towns he is trying to contact, but because of their hours it is not easy. Ms. Hadaway stated that Mr. Wurtz would be celebrating once all the towns were on. He replied that it was a long time coming and would be a great feeling.

Mr. Bolton reported that he had spent some time at Motor Vehicle the day before seeing a demonstration of a new Lexmark printer they were considering. The printer would satisfy Motor Vehicle's needs (printing tags) as well as the needs of Vital Records. The cost of the printer was significantly higher than we pay for the current printers utilized by clerks. Mr. Bolton explained that Motor Vehicle was doing a survey of users to find out their needs and they were also looking into how much money was available from an OIT grant and whether \$400,000 would be enough to allow for full deployment of the printers.

Ms. Hadaway reported that her concern about it was that Motor Vehicle had said they would give each town small printers and the larger towns or towns that provided their own equipment would get nothing. She felt this would not be fair to all towns and there were a lot of angles that would need to be looked at before going forward with this plan. Mr. Croteau replied that Ms. Hadaway made a fair point. He reported that they were currently working on a grant extension to extend the \$425,000 from OIT that is scheduled

Approved Minutes

to end by the end of the calendar year. There are two printer types that Motor Vehicle was looking at. One was a thermal, heat-based printer, which would not print forms of any significant size, but it did print the stickers that Motor Vehicle needs it to. They were going through a process of identifying the design of their new forms, getting rid of carbon copy type forms and going with a successive perforated forms.

They were trying to eliminate forms right now so the thermal printer had a better chance. There was also a laser version, but it was much larger in size and that was bad for small towns with little space. The large one does not require a second printer to print forms. Ms. Hadaway asked if the larger printer would still require that each station have its own printer. Mr. Croteau replied that they would not necessarily have to do that. That is another design item that has to be determined during the design phase.

Initially, they were given business requirements by the DMV and five clerks that were members of the committee working on this project. They took those requirements and began a design. That design drove them toward the one single printer because of space issues and the laser type was the only one that seemed capable of all the features and functions. Halfway through the design process someone identified the thermal printer and wanted to include it in the running so they were now back redoing their requirements. Mr. Croteau added that every town probably has some idiosyncrasy that makes them different. Some have Vital Records printers that DMV might be able to share and some do not. There are some towns with no printers at all.

In the end Mr. Croteau estimated that there would probably be 5-6 different options, including some towns wanting to share one printer at the counter and others hating that idea because they wanted one printer per workstation. In some cases the Vital Records office is not in the same building or room as the DMV equipment and that would make it nearly impossible to share a printer. Mr. Croteau explained that he felt there was still a lot of work to be done before everyone started picking printers. He did feel that sharing printers between the two agencies was a good idea and had heard Ms. Beecher mention recently that she wanted to negotiate some pricing/cost sharing with Vital Records.

The question then becomes do they split the cost or do they use some sort of transactional based formula to determine who pays what. Ms. Hadaway agreed with Mr. Croteau stating that she would do maybe one Vital Record a week versus the “zillion” motor vehicle transactions she does and realistically should the fund be paying for the full cost of a printer that only issues one or two documents per week. Mr. Croteau stated that given how the state’s funding sources work there were general funds, highway funds, and federal grants. It is important that you follow the rules around the funding types.

6. Vote Reconsideration:

Ms. Little explained that she would have a regular conflict with this meeting that would require that she be back in Keene by 1 p.m. and she wanted to discuss something before she had to leave. Ms. Hadaway immediately yielded the floor to Ms. Little. Ms. Little explained that the 31 pages of minutes from the last meeting really gave her a good understanding of the dynamics of some really challenging issues for the committee in terms of the Vital Records Improvement Fund. There was one vote at the last meeting that Ms. Little was hoping to get the committee to discuss reconsidering. She explained that she assumed the committee was working under Robert’s Rules of Order and since

Approved Minutes

this was the next regularly scheduled meeting since the vote occurred she was hoping that there would be an opportunity to discuss it.

It dealt with the component of the budget for records preservation. She explained that Ms. C. Johnson had shown her the subcommittee's work on the budget and she had seen in the minutes that the amount the committee had appropriated in the last fiscal year was \$872,000, of which \$411,000 was expended, so we were carrying forward the remaining balance into the current fiscal year. In addition to that the committee was recommending another \$720,000. Ms. Little stated that she was suggesting that this was a level of appropriation that this fund just could not support. She felt that of all the committees' responsibilities, the fiduciary responsibility of maintaining the fund had to be the number one priority.

Projecting out that the fund that had close to a \$3 million dollar budget when she left was now looking at less than \$200,000 in two years time was not something the committee should be supporting. Ms. Little explained that she was aware that while she was gone there was a promise and a vote to appropriate \$1,500,000 for records preservation. She gathered that everyone was thinking that they were going to push hard and push \$1.5 million out the door in the next two years, but she did not feel this fund could support that level of expenditures and still give itself room where they were thinking of going to a new architecture and paying for OIT support.

Ms. Little stated that she had not been at the meeting two months prior and was not in a position to move for reconsideration of that portion of the budget, but she asked that another member of the committee do so. She suggested tabling it and asking Dr. Teschner to come back to discuss it further. She suggested spreading the expenditure out a little bit so the pain was not \$700,000 in one fiscal year. Especially considering that Dr. Teschner was only able through all his resources, to push less than \$500,000 out the door. And we were going to carryover another \$500,000 and then push another \$700,000 out the door.

She did not feel it was reasonable to think that we could finalize these grants and get them back out to the clerks offices in time so why did we want to tie this money up when realistically we probably could not produce on it. Ms. Little stated that she hoped that a voting member would move for reconsideration of that portion of the budget and table it until Dr. Teschner could come back before the committee. Ms. Hadaway asked if there was such a motion. Ms. C. Johnson stated that she would move for the reconsideration. Ms. Little seconded the motion. Ms. Hadaway reiterated that the motion was to reconsider the vote on the preservation portion of the budget. To table it until such time as Dr. Teschner was in attendance to discuss it further.

Ms. Little suggested spreading the expenditure out a little bit. Ms. Hadaway added that this could possibly allow them to put more of that money back into the budget and Dr. Teschner could work with a smaller amount of money in the coming year. Mr. Allan made a motion to table the preservation portion of the budget. Ms. C. Johnson seconded. Mr. Hall asked if this action would leave Dr. Teschner short of funding for the work he was already performing. Ms. Hadaway replied that he had more than sufficient funding with what was already out there. Mr. Scanlan explained to the committee that it had taken Dr. Teschner a little time to get the program ramped up but that he was going full tilt now. He felt there would be a big expense in FY08, but that FY09 was something that could still be controlled.

Approved Minutes

Dr. Mevers stated that he thought the committee would see the project peak this fall. As Mr. Scanlan said it took time to get the program going and then waiting for the consultants reports to come back took time, but now they are moving along much faster. He explained that the committee had not really seen the bulk of the expenditures yet. Dr. Mevers felt that reconsidering was one thing, but he did not want to see the committee stop it. Ms. Hadaway replied that she did not think anyone wanted to stop the preservation program; they just wanted to step back and take a closer look at it. To see how much they could pull back on it and spread it out over a longer period of time.

Mr. Croteau stated that when he was called to vote on this item he had abstained, as there was a lot of information he did not have. Generally speaking he thought the trend of the fund was the balance was going down every year. He asked if anyone had projected out several years to see where the fund was going. Ms. C. Johnson shared with Mr. Croteau the subcommittee's analysis of the fund. He asked if there was anything that might change that trend. Ms. C. Johnson stated that there was. When she presented the report to the committee the subcommittee said that if everything stayed status quo, the fund would be defunct in less than three years. There were a couple of things that have happened since. One thing was that an audit of Vital Records was underway and they were waiting to see if that would provide any further delineation.

The second thing was civil unions legislation passed and that obviously would affect revenues going in and it would also affect the expense side as well. The subcommittee also did not account for any interest coming into the fund because if you were depleting the resources there would be no interest coming in. There was also some discussion about the committee needing to look at what was going into the fund revenue-wise and whether or not they wanted to go in and ask for some kind of increase in fees or change the expenditure side to help stabilize the fund.

Ms. C. Johnson explained that from the start the subcommittee had been under the impression that the amount of preservation money appropriated was set in stone and would not change. She did not feel that the committee had adequate time at the last meeting to discuss the issues brought up as a result of the report. She felt that there were so many issues on the table at the last meeting that the report was kind of pushed aside.

Ms. C. Johnson stated that she felt that what Ms. Little had pointed out to the committee about the grant preservation portion of the budget was true, which was why she had moved for the reconsideration. She felt that it needed to be looked at further and to the extent that they could, spread it out a little more. It also needed to be better balanced with the revenue side. Mr. Croteau thanked Ms. C. Johnson for the explanation of the budget situation. He asked Mr. Bolton if he was correct in assuming that the committee was at least six months away from having a report from the vendor in regard to the NHVRIN application. Mr. Bolton agreed with that assumption.

Mr. Croteau wanted the committee to be aware that he could not emphasize enough the number of full-time employees required to maintain a system that is difficult to maintain. The issue of reconstructing the whole system to a new generation or revamping the system we have now was a big and painful project in terms of full-time employees and the assistance of a consultant that was likely in either case. He hoped that committee members would keep that in mind as they voted on some of these other items. Ms.

Approved Minutes

Hadaway replied that she felt that all the committee members were painfully aware of all the expenses looming in the near future.

Ms. Little stated that she believed the reconsideration of this budget item vote by the committee would be received very favorably by the Clerk's Association. She offered to act as ambassador to the clerk's association on this issue should it pass. She felt that if clerks were given the choice of maintaining the viability of this fund and supporting the NHVRIN technology that has made all their lives easier they would be happy to wait a few more years to fix the books in their vaults. They would say you need to maintain the viability of this fund first and foremost. Ms. Little stated that she would explain to them that this was the right thing to do. That the committee needed to slow it down a little and spread it out.

Mr. Hall agreed with Ms. Little, but added that he still had questions about what should be spent from the fund. Improvements he did not mind, but anything that was operational he had severe questions about. Whether it was for Secretary of State staff, stuff at OIT, or a second printer to replace an old one. He had severe questions as to whether that was improvement or just standard operations. Ms. C. Johnson stated that the issue of improvement or operational expense had also been brought up by the budget subcommittee in their report. Mr. Hall stated that they were all going to come back together here and when we receive the consultant's report he felt the committee would have some really serious work to do. Ms. Hadaway stated that a consultant's report would give the committee some much needed direction. The committee then voted to reconsider and table the Records Preservation Grant Program budget allocation until Dr. Teschner could meet with them to discuss it.

7. Preservation Update:

Mr. Scanlan distributed a handout Dr. Teschner prepared for the committee. He explained that Dr. Teschner had left on vacation and that he had only returned from vacation the night before and had not had the opportunity to review the document he had distributed. He directed the committee's attention to the first page of the document. It showed a history of the fund balance through FY07. The first part of the second page showed the revenues by month for FY07 and the second half showed expenditures.

Mr. Hall asked if those were the expenditures or the actuals as opposed to the budget. Mr. Scanlan replied that those were the actual expenditures. Ms. C. Johnson asked Mr. Scanlan if he was aware whether this handout included items Ms. Penney was still trying to transfer over, such as Dr. Teschner's salary. Mr. Scanlan replied that he did not have an answer for that. Ms. C. Johnson stated that she was aware that there were issues with that as she had also sat on that subcommittee.

Mr. Allan asked if this document included obligations. Mr. Scanlan replied that it only showed expenditures to date. It did not include anything that had not been yet been encumbered. Ms. Hadaway asked if Dr. Teschner had left any other presentation material on the grants program in addition to this handout. Mr. Scanlan replied that this document was the report that Dr. Teschner presented to the committee at each meeting. Ms. Hadaway explained that Dr. Teschner had been emailing her the status of all the grants and she was unsure whether he had been sending those emails to all the committee members or not. Other members stated that they had also received those updates. Ms.

Approved Minutes

Hadaway told Ms. Little she would have to be added to that email list. Ms. Little agreed and left the meeting.

8. Salt Lake Trip:

Mr. Bolton explained that he had meant to put a report in writing for the committee but had not had a chance yet. He and his staff had traveled to Salt Lake City to meet with their federal contractors. They met vital statistics and program individuals from the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) and discussed the quality of our birth and death data. They also attended meetings on intelligence reform, which was coming down the pike. They found out that the draft requirements would be coming out in November. The feds desire that the draft be pushed out in November and in Mr. Bolton's opinion that was not going to happen. They will probably want to put this off as long as possible.

Ms. C. Johnson asked if there would be a public comment period on the intelligence reform document. Mr. Bolton replied that he thought so. What we might see is something in September. Right now the other federal agencies that are partnering with DHHS are reviewing the draft. Ms. C. Johnson asked if they would review it and then it would go out for public comment. Mr. Bolton replied that DHHS had been targeted as the intelligence reform drafting agency and their partners were Passport and the Social Security Administration (SSA).

They were all reviewing the document currently and then it would go to the GSA for a final draft and would then go out for public comment. Mr. Bolton thought we would get a little jump on the public comment period. Ms. C. Johnson asked if Mr. Bolton could share that with the committee. Mr. Bolton replied that theoretically we are all one big happy family anyway, so that would probably not be a problem.

The local sub-registrars are considered to be part of the state and that is not being reconsidered. Mr. Bolton suggested that with elections and everything coming up he expected to lose another year before there was a whole lot of movement on intelligence reform. He thought we would end up seeing it in January 2009 and they have already extended the timeframe to that period of time anyway. While in Salt Lake City, Mr. Bolton and his staff also met with representatives of the Church of Jesus Christ Latter Day Saints. Their project to digitize New Hampshire records is ongoing. The older records have already been indexed by the church, and they would next be looking at indexing the more recent ones. He explained that there is web-based software that LDS developed and it is available to anyone worldwide where volunteers can key and verify marriage, divorce, and death records.

When he and his staff met with them they decided that we would meet again in the future to nail down how that process would go. At the point when we are given that software we will engage the volunteer genealogists to help us with this endeavor. We were told that the older records were done, but did not get to see them. Because of that Mr. Bolton was not positive that they were completely done. There is always the discussion about where the collection will be fielded. The LDS were offering to host the data. We could host it, but Mr. Bolton preferred that they do it and that way they maintain it and we just link to it.

There were several software vendors at the conference and Mr. Bolton and his staff sat down and tried every flavor of vendor software there. They did this with the eye on re-

Approved Minutes

architecting NHVRIN in the near future. There was one that looked exemplary at least in functionality and the vendor was the one we initially used for VRV2000. Mr. Wurtz added that New Hampshire staff was sought after by the software vendors. They wanted to spend time with us and to get our opinion on their offerings. They were very eager to hear our comments and opinions of their software packages. One of the things Mr. Wurtz learned through this experience was we all do things somewhat differently with the same result. Some of the packages were difficult for the end user and most of the comments were geared to the simplicity of the NH system was what was missing from their version.

They also learned that New Hampshire is no longer the only state out there that has the electronic birth and death programs. Mr. Bolton reported that there were approximately 34 states with an electronic birth/death application online, which is good news for us because the next time we need to update our system we can actually benefit from some other folks trials and tribulations. Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz were impressed with what they saw in most cases. Mantech, the company that originally designed VRV2000 seemed to have it nailed in terms of what we would consider a good product. It was pretty eye opening how much things have changed out there since the last meeting.

Ms. C. Johnson asked if Mr. Wurtz knew which states were using Mantech technology. Mr. Bolton replied that all of the British Isles were using Mantech, as well as Ohio. Ms. C. Johnson thought there was also a Midwestern state using them. Mr. Wurtz explained that one exciting thing about the Mantech application was that users will be able through telecommunication, to log into their testing environment and really get a hands-on feel without someone standing over their shoulder.

9. Other Business:

Ms. Hadaway asked if there was any other business. Hearing none, Dr. Mevers made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Allan seconded and the meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.