

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

To The New Hampshire Department of State

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
September 18, 2003***

Draft Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

September 18, 2003

Health and Welfare Building
Conference Room 110/111
29 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
Jane Ireland, Rye Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Annette Barnaby, Health Information Specialist Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Linda Hartson, Exeter Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment

GUESTS:

David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS
Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS
John O'Neal, Office of Information Systems, DHHS
Mark Parris, Office of Information Systems, DHHS
Steve Wurtz, Supervisor of Registration/Certification, DVR, SOS
Peter Parker, Consultant, InLook Group

Draft Minutes

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes:

At 10:05 a.m. Mr. Bolton called the meeting to order in the absence of Ms. Little. Mr. Bolton informed members that the first task assigned was the approval of minutes and suggested that Ms. Little might arrive during that discussion. Hearing no discussion, Mr. Bolton asked for a motion to accept. The committee voted to accept the minutes as written.

2. InLook Group Presentation:

Mr. Parker distributed a handout to the committee. He reported that one of the things InLook had been asked to look into was the original cities or towns involved in the last project. The committee was interested in finding out what the cities/towns had done with the grants they had been awarded for record maintenance and preservation. Mr. Parker reminded the committee that the grants ranged in size from a little over \$2000 to a little over \$6000. He explained that he was mystified as to what and how they were going to do anything meaningful with such small amounts of money.

Mr. Parker listed the towns for the committee and they are as follows: Chester, Nelson, Pittsfield, Rollinsford, and Fitzwilliam. He reported that each of the aforementioned towns had accomplished exactly what they had set out to do in their grant requests. Furthermore, he felt they managed to use the grant or the “atmosphere” that seemed to come about during that time to parlay their VRIF grant into significant additional monies and volunteer time. Mr. Parker felt that it was very important point that the \$24,000 that came from the VRIF was matched in the past five years by \$117,000 and change.

Mr. Parker explained that what he found particularly interesting was that his report in phase I of the project involved his looking at vital records, their condition, etc. to determine what needed to be done and what efforts would be most beneficial. He did that then and submitted a report to the committee detailing the number of hours that would be needed to “fix” them one by one. As he did that he realized that the volumes were going to be repaired, only to be shoved back into the basement or attic to further decay. Mr. Parker announced that he was pleased to report that not one of the five towns did that.

They all significantly improved the space where their vital records were housed. About \$12,000 was spent on fireproof vaults, additions or amendments to their climate control system. He added that two towns had spent a fair amount of money on archival supplies. He stated that the long and short of it was that the money that had been awarded was money that was incredibly well spent. Mr. Parker went on to say that Madison, which did not receive any grant monies had still gone on to make improvements on their own to not only vital records but their town records. The program had been very successful in his opinion.

Mr. Parker explained that part of his mandate was to look at grant programs in other states. They were asked to look in particular at Maine, New York, and Connecticut’s grant programs. They have visited Hartford, Augusta and would be going to New York the following week. One thing they did do was go online to see what they could learn from states like Delaware, West Virginia, Wyoming, Missouri, and Washington. What

Draft Minutes

they learned is no two states are alike. They also learned that the grants that the VRIFAC made in 1998 were significantly larger than other states made. The only exception to that is Connecticut where they are “handing out money like there is no tomorrow.” The Connecticut program is administered by the state archivist, and grants are not limited to vital records. The amounts of money being distributed are significant and they are based on population numbers in the particular towns. The lowest grant is \$7,000. with the highest being \$17,000. He added that the Connecticut program is not a competitive program. Every town in the state received funds. He explained that it is easier for the state of Connecticut to raise these funds because unlike New Hampshire, Connecticut town clerks are also responsible for deeds and the filing fees for filing deeds. A portion of those funds go into a non-lapsing fund, which is distributed in two cycles per year.

The Connecticut program has been up and running for three years. Mr. Parker stated that they had pondered whether that sort of a program would work in New Hampshire and the answer to that question was no. In Connecticut, the recording fees are based upon deeds rather than vital records and in Connecticut those fees add up to more than a million dollars per quarter. Mr. Parker was amused that Connecticut was interested in possibly beginning a competitive program and was interested in how New Hampshire was planning to do it as they may want to use us as a model.

The Maine system grants go up to \$2,000 and it is a competitive system. The funding is based on a re-grant from the National Historic Publications Records Commission (NHPRC). Every now and then the Maine legislature throws in a quarter-million. This years appears to be an off year as there will be no appropriation. Mr. Henderson told Mr. Parker that he felt that the most valuable part of the Maine grant system is the requirement that towns at least match the amount of money they are given. He strongly suggested that any program that New Hampshire develops, include a matching requirement.

Mr. Parker felt that Mr. Henderson's suggestion was a good one considering what the original five towns had managed to do with their awards. He did add that one clerk that he would leave anonymous had informed him that since the money had come from the VRIF people in town think that is where it “should” come from forever and ever. That some citizens do not feel the town should have to pay to maintain their records.

Mr. Parker directed members' attention to pages 2-5 in the handout he had distributed. It contained a survey/questionnaire similar to one that they planned to send to all the grant programs that they can find. He also asked for suggestions of programs that members might be familiar with. It is their intention to send the survey electronically and then follow up with a telephone call. The call would be to go through the survey with some and to ensure that they receive at least a seventy-five percent response rate. He asked if members saw anything on the questionnaire they felt needed to be changed or corrected to contact him because he wanted it to be as complete, accurate, and brief as possible.

Mr. Parker then informed the committee that Mr. Henderson and UNIS are looking at putting together a pot for disasters. Lack of insurance or self-insurance could inhibit a town if they had a catastrophe and had to clean their records. He then asked the committee if they had considered that or if they would be interested in such a thing for disaster recovery. Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Parker if he was aware of how much Lebanon had spent when they had a flood. Mr. Parker was unsure but stated that he would find out.

Draft Minutes

Ms. Little suggested that a city or town should be able to get insurance to at least cover structural damage from something like that. Mr. Armstrong stated that it seemed that whenever there is a disaster of any sort people generally rally around and they are not usually turned down when they request funding to address the issue. He advised that if the committee did elect to do something like that, they not publicize it in any way. Mr. Armstrong felt the focus needed to remain on prevention. He added that if the records are being stored correctly they should be reasonably safe.

Mr. Parker informed the committee that New York is considering requiring grant applicant towns provide evidence that they have a vault and a disaster preparedness plan to name a few. He stated that he did not feel that sort of requirement would not work in New Hampshire. Ms. Little asked if that included a disaster recovery plan. Mr. Parker replied that a disaster recovery plan requirement would be acceptable, but the other requirements, no. Mr. Armstrong stated that the questionnaire was nice, but speaking from a strategic planning point of view it appeared to not ask what their problems are, issues they deal with, where they are today. He felt it was critical to know where they came from, where they are, where they are going.

One question Mr. Armstrong suggested was asking if they had a strategic plan and if they did, how far along were they? Mr. Armstrong explained that schools could not get federal funding without showing the feds where they were. Mr. Parker replied that many of the programs they had identified had been located online. He explained that the plans are there but some are going nowhere with their plans. They had asked Mr. Henderson how far along Maine was with its plan.

Mr. Henderson had replied that he was unable to quantify or respond because the Maine legislature has cut back on funding which will leave his program level for the next several years. After that, Mr. Parker felt that they would then be ready to move on to phase II, III, & IV. Mr. Armstrong felt that New Hampshire needed to have a plan. Mr. Parker stated that the thing that concerned him was that vital records would be standing alone on this. He felt it was vitally important that we find out who the other players in the area and who will be allies.

Mr. Parker informed the committee that he and his partner Ms. Swank would be attending the city and town clerk association's meeting. He explained that they would be there briefly in the morning and would be on the agenda in the afternoon. They are looking for information. He was hoping to listen more than he talks at the meeting. He hopes to learn what the clerks are expecting and hoping for from this program and where they envision it three years down the road.

Mr. Armstrong stated that another reason a plan is important is that he understood that Keene had a new storage facility and they had extra space for rent. If another town could contract with Keene and not have to duplicate efforts it would save a great deal. Mr. Parker agreed and informed Ms. Little that Keene was about the only player in town. He added that Derry had moved their facility but it was already three-quarters full. Ms. Little replied that they are settling into the new site and plan to have a very aggressive team that will search out cities or towns that need storage space.

Draft Minutes

That was the mandate Keene was given when they were given the money. They had already had some discussion with Dr. Mevers regarding their becoming an agent for the state so they might store not only local government records, but county and state records.

3. Fund Accountability:

Mr. Wurtz reported that the committee had met on August 19 to discuss their goal of ensuring that discrepancies in reporting and depositing funds stops. He felt that they had had a good discussion of the issues involved and road blocks that can come up for both large and small cities and towns. He advised that he would distribute the minutes from that meeting. There was discussion of creating a whole process that would have detailed steps to several suggestions that would require minimal effort. Those ideas ranged from changing the reporting forms that are now sent to the Secretary of State by the clerks, using an accounting package, having staff that would go out and audit the towns.

Because of the wide spectrum of ideas and the absence of some key personnel, it was decided that Mr. Wurtz would draft a new reporting form for the committee's review at the next meeting. The committee would also plan to discuss the issue with Ms. Penney from the Secretary of State's office. She is the person that receives the documents now and they are looking for input from her as to how they could make it easier for her to see when there is an error or how she would like it reported.

Mr. Wurtz stated that the bottom line now is that we are relying on the professionalism of the clerk to report accurately. He stated that one thing that could be done is the clerks could be asked to link funds to document control numbers (dcn). That could be done but would require a little more effort. The committee liked that idea but felt it needed to go further, which is when the additional staff was mentioned. He explained that the committee left it at that and had come to no concrete conclusions or recommendations at that point. He added that there were additional meetings planned.

Ms. Little asked if the representation from the Secretary of State's office was at the meeting. Ms. Wurtz replied that Ms. Penney was one of the staff that had not attended the first meeting and that many questions the committee had were put on hold because of her absence. He added that he had spoken with Ms. Penney since and planned to forward the minutes to her so she might get the flavor of the meeting. She told him she would also make every effort to attend the next meeting.

Mr. Wurtz explained to the committee that the clerks were comparing vital records to other agencies like the Department of Safety, motor vehicle. Motor vehicle was always very strict about their reporting/depositing of funds. They also sent staff out to audit clerks on a regular basis. He reported that Ms. Jewell from the Department of Revenue Administration had been very helpful and had made suggestions as to how the process could be tightened up. Ms. Jewell liked the measures the clerks described motor vehicle using. Mr. Wurtz did not feel it would be a tremendous leap to get to that point.

He felt that the mechanism is in place, in that we have the ability to track the information. It is just a big undertaking to assign a staff member the responsibility of staying on top of it. That, along with the integration of the new web enabled system and its role in automating some of the accountability process. The success of the auditing of the process is the automation of it. Once everyone is working on the same system and using the same accounting package the accountability part would be a more manageable. Mr. Armstrong asked how it was going to happen? How would they get people to use it? Mr.

Draft Minutes

Wurtz explained that the accounting package is built into the software and it would be automatic. Mr. Wurtz explained that there is an accounting package in the current version of the VRV2000, but that it has some quirks and is more cumbersome to use. With the new automated software it is hoped those quirks will be gone and it will be user friendly. It is useable now and some clerks do use it, but it is very rigid and takes a tremendous amount of understanding. Mr. Armstrong asked if there would need to be feeds from our system to the town's financial system so they could do reports. Mr. Bolton replied that they currently have the ability to do reports and will in the future but it does not require any additional links to the city or town. It is built into the software.

Mr. Bolton added that everyone needed to bear in mind that the Secretary of State's office was also preparing to select an automated accounting package that vital records will need to make sure its package is compatible with. Mr. Scanlan advised the committee that the Secretary of State's office would soon begin to use the accounting software throughout the office that had previously only been used in the Securities office. Mr. Armstrong suggested that vital records might just want to use that one and not seek out another. Mr. Scanlan agreed.

4. CNSI Update:

Mr. Bolton reported to the committee that development of the NHVRIN was ongoing and they have been working through some issues that arose from changes being made to the database. He stated that there are some .NET training issues that he would leave to Mr. Parris to discuss.

Mr. Parris stated that he had a different perspective than that Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz as far as the status of the project was concerned. Looking at it narrowly from a technical point of view he had a number of concerns. He and Mr. Bolton had met with officials from the vendor, CNSI where he was able to voice those concerns. He felt that there was some reason for concern. One issue was that he felt that they were several weeks if not more behind schedule. He felt that the dates that he and his staff and Mr. Bolton and his staff had agreed upon were in doubt. The .NET training that was held the week prior was very good and he believed it had accomplished what they had hoped.

The training that followed on the rules engine provided by CNSI was not what he had hoped. He did not feel and his colleagues agreed that they did not feel comfortable with the level of knowledge they gained from that training. He stated that he had requested additional training from CNSI and had not heard back from them yet. Mr. Parris told the committee that another concern was the turnover of CNSI staff, particularly the gentleman that conducted the training, Troy Nolin. He is scheduled to leave soon and they hoped to pick his brain. Mr. Nolin is exquisite in his technical ability, but his ability to share that knowledge is limited. There have also been a total of three database analysts assigned to this project throughout its short life, two of whom left CNSI.

We are now working with the second project manager for this project. Another concern is the NCHS changes that were mandated in the RFP were only just recently looked at by the vendor and they came back with some major changes they want us to make to our database to incorporate those changes. He felt those changes were being suggested rather late in the game. There was a meeting held the day before that Mr. Parris was unable to

Draft Minutes

attend to discuss those changes and it appears that everyone is in agreement as to how to go about making those changes. Mr. Parris is also uncomfortable with the presence, or lack of presence of the CNSI management folks. He is certain that the technicians, coders, etc. are all there doing their job and doing it well, but he would like to see the manager there more often. The gentleman that replaced Tammy Borkowski appears to be a part-time manager and Mr. Parris did not feel he gets enough of his time. Ms. Little was surprised to hear that Ms. Borkowski had left. Mr. Parris explained that she had left her employment with CNSI some time ago. They had assigned Doug Stiehl to replace her. He is also currently managing a project in Maine and seems to spend a great deal of his time in Maryland. Mr. Parris stated that they usually get him on Mondays and occasionally on Tuesdays, but the rest of the time communication is through emails.

Mr. Armstrong asked what the contract called for. Mr. Parris stated that it did not really say anything. Mr. Armstrong asked what the RFP called for. Mr. Parris replied that it said development would be done on-site and that is what they wanted. Mr. Armstrong replied that it would be easier to come to a conclusion if they were aware what the RFP, contract or proposal stated. Mr. O'Neal replied that he was unsure if it was clearly outlined in any of those documents. He added that CNSI has had a great deal of turnover and he wasn't quite sure why. He felt it was perfectly within our right to escalate these concerns to CNSI upper management.

Mr. O'Neal went on to say that if things were on target and the project manager was only around two days a week it would not be an issue, but they are not and he is not around. Mr. Armstrong felt it was important that the language in the contract or RFP be investigated so that Ms. Mason could beef up the standard language in future contract/RFPs. Mr. Parris replied that we had listed the kinds of people they wanted and that they wanted them in-house, but had not specified the amount of time the project manager had to spend on-site.

Mr. O'Neal stated that Ms. Borkowski had spent a great deal more time on-site than Mr. Stiehl was. Mr. Parris commented that Ms. Borkowski was very much on top of the project all the time and inspired our confidence. Ms. Little asked of all the concerns Mr. Parris had raised if there were any the committee could address. Mr. Parris replied that he was addressing them all he just wanted the committee to be aware. Mr. Wurtz asked if the project was several days late beyond what they had built into the initial plan or were they still within those boundaries. Mr. Parris replied that the SSA had initially wanted us to begin thirty days of testing in September and that had been pushed back at least once.

Mr. Bolton stated that the SSA is aware that we are not ready and they are sitting back waiting for us to give them a date. Mr. Parris stated that they did not have a date yet, but had discussed October 15, 2003 to begin testing. He did not feel that was realistic, but hoped that it was. Even with that date it would still be very tough to accomplish all the testing (business office, hospitals, clerks, funeral home, etc.) and get it ready to go live by January 2, 2004. During that time period there are holidays that will need to be scheduled around and that often proves difficult.

Ms. Little asked if he meant that we were forty-five days off the timeline. Mr. Parris replied that he and Mr. Gaff had counted yesterday and came up with forty-seven days off with today being forty-eight. Mr. Wurtz asked if that was calendar or business days. Mr. Parris replied calendar days. Mr. O'Neal reported that they have agreed to allow CNSI to use some of their resources in Maryland to make up for some of the lost time.

Draft Minutes

He added that the initial contract required all work be done on-site, but they had decided since it would all have to come here to be integrated by the on-site team it would be fine.

Mr. O'Neal admitted that he felt that if we could get caught up that way he doesn't really care what they do. They had not given him a firm number of days they felt they could get caught up, but he felt they should be able to at least cut it in half. Mr. Bolton added that no matter how quickly they develop it they would still run into problems. Even if they were able to deliver it the day after this meeting there would be issues with testing, etc. that would hold it up.

Ms. Little asked Mr. O'Neal if his place on the agenda regarding Microsoft .NET training was related to this issue. Mr. O'Neal replied that is related in that it involves staff working with the web enablement project. He stated that because it was a separate agenda item he planned to address it separately. He did not want to take away from Mr. Parris' time. Ms. Little agreed and explained that she only had one question. Mr. Parris had discussed the training they received that was good. She wanted to know who provided that training. Mr. Parris replied that subject was what Mr. O'Neal was going to address. Mr. Parris added the training was provided by New Horizons and there are six classes to the series.

Mr. O'Neal asked to make a comment before beginning his discussion on the Microsoft .NET training. He stated that Mr. Parris had made a comment the day before about the rules engine training that had not been well received and he had hoped that he would make it at this meeting as well. He had pointed out that the contractor is responsible for the rules engine for 120 days after the project is complete, so we have a year and a half to get used to it. The introductory training was not what they had hoped for, but it is not like they need to retake it next week. They can keep chipping away at it.

Mr. O'Neal requested that the committee approve the use of \$19,600 of VRIF money to pay for the Microsoft .NET training. It would be for state staff in support of the vital records project. He stated that he was aware that the contractor is doing the technical work for it, but it had always been his intent that the staff work with the contractor and if he had fully trained staff he would have thrown them at this project to help get caught up. He still intends to have state staff working with the contractor, not only to keep things on track, but so that they might learn more before the software is handed over to us.

Mr. O'Neal informed the committee that .NET is new technology and as Mr. Parris had reported the training began last week. New Horizons is a statewide training vendor. There were eleven staff assigned to the training. He was requesting tuition reimbursement for four people. He explained that two of the staff would probably be a non-issue because they were already Secretary of State employees. Ms. Eccleston and Eric and they would probably not be an issue. Mr. Dahl is relatively new addition to Mr. Parris' staff. He is an experienced web developer who came from the state web team and is not .NET trained but will be working with the vendor.

The other two people are partially (50%) funded by VRIF. Ms. Little asked if he could just talk about the support plan for the project between the Secretary of State and Office of Information Technology, would they be working together? Mr. O'Neal replied that it has been his intent from the beginning that his people continue to maintain the software. He added that Mr. Sullivan is the IT manager for the Secretary of State and questioned whether he would have the time to maintain NHVRIN when it goes live.

Draft Minutes

Mr. O'Neal stated that he was under the impression that he would have a core team and the Secretary of State's office would have a core team and they would work together to maintain the system. Mr. Scanlan agreed. Ms. Little stated that she had always assumed that OIT would take the lead and the Secretary of State would serve as backup. She thought this only because they had been maintaining and updating the software all along. The skill set available from OIT far outweighed what would be available at the SOS. She added that she had discussed this with Mr. Gardner the week prior. She did not think the SOS was going to ramp up IT support for this initiative. The goal in her opinion was to leverage it the support we currently have. That was the focus she would like to see. Mr. Armstrong reported that OIT would also be providing network and server support to the initiative. OIT is responsible for a lion's share of the infrastructure for this project.

Mr. O'Neal reported that the entire cost of training is \$53,000 and he was requesting that VRIF provide tuition reimbursement for four people totaling \$19,600. Ms. Little asked for discussion. Mr. Bergeron reminded Ms. Little that a quorum had not been reached. Mr. Bolton suggested the committee could recommend that it be approved, but Mr. Bergeron asked if that would be legal. It was suggested that a telephone poll could be taken. Mr. Bolton replied that the committee should just put forth a recommendation that the Secretary of State expend these funds for this purpose. He was unsure as to whether a vote needed to be taken. Ms. Little agreed, adding that the Secretary of State has the authority to expend these funds and the committee would only be making a recommendation. Mr. Bolton agreed.

Ms. Little moved that the committee support the Secretary of State in the expenditure of the funds from the VRIF for the .NET training. She asked for discussion of the matter. Mr. Armstrong stated that he was concerned that by doing it that way they were setting a dangerous precedent. The next time there is a vote needed and no quorum, what would happen? Mr. Bergeron explained that is why he brought it up. Mr. Bolton replied that there could still be discussion, that it was just a recommendation. Mr. Armstrong replied that he did not know why they could not just do a telephone poll, he was sure everyone would say yes. He asked that the committee follow its previous actions. Ms. Little agreed with Mr. Armstrong and asked Mr. Wurtz to poll the absent committee members for their vote. He replied that he would. She then asked for a vote. The five members in attendance unanimously agreed that they would recommend the expenditure.

5. Other Business:

Mr. Bolton asked to go back to discuss CNSI a little more. He stated that with all development projects there are bumps in the road and unforeseen problems. He also regretted losing Ms. Borkowski and was unsure about Mr. Stiehls role in the process. CNSI has continued to assure us that this is moving along and the business office is operating on the assumption that it is. The database changes may be late in presentation, but they should be transparent as well. The changes will be made without affecting the timeline. Mr. Bolton replied that from the business office standpoint the project is moving along and they are pleased with the progress made. He is still planning for a January 1, 2003 start date.

Draft Minutes

Mr. Parris replied that he had not intended to worry the committee only to make them aware of his concerns. Ms. Little replied that his comments were very much appreciated. Mr. Bolton stated that he also appreciated Mr. Parris' comments. He told the committee that he also appreciated Mr. Gaff from Mr. Parris' staff. He has the ability to see the big picture and look ahead in the process for problems. He can then bring them to the attention of others so that they can be addressed before the situation becomes critical.

Mr. Armstrong suggested a contract amendment be made to ensure the contractor knows we intend to use specific accounting software. Mr. Bolton replied that we might have to use a contingency plan. The CNSI staff is hard at work on the project and he does not want to throw something else at them.

Ms. Little stated that she wanted to bring up an item of business she was curious about. She was wondering about the virus attack DHHS had suffered several weeks prior. How it happened, etc.? It had thrown all the clerks into a chaotic situation. Customers were very unhappy and she wondered if there had been any thought to a contingency plan for when the main site goes down. Mr. O'Neal had not realized that everyone had been affected so severely and reported that he was probably not the person to discuss that.

Ms. Little was not sure, but stated she thought that her office had been down at least a whole day. Mr. Wurtz agreed with her explaining that a half-day was lost the first day and a half day lost the second day. Mr. Armstrong replied that Mr. Anderson is fully aware of the need for security against viruses. He added that he knew it was of no comfort now, but vital records would eventually benefit from that planning.

Mr. Parris informed everyone that although he was unsure of the situation they were speaking of, it was an important reminder that city and town clerks need to run virus software updates regularly. Ms. Little asked if that could be put on the agenda for the next meeting.

Mr. Bolton reported that he had met with the New Hampshire Oncology group and he was happy to inform the committee that they would have eight or nine physicians that would be willing to help us with the pilot program. Ms. Ireland asked why we want to allow physicians into the system. Mr. Bolton replied that it is a national model for death registration. They require the certifying physicians to log onto our system to enter cause of death information or verify that the information provided is correct.

Mr. Bergeron asked how they were planning to make sure the connections were secure. Mr. Armstrong asked if a password was considered sufficient. Mr. Bolton replied that they would probably go with whatever OIT deemed was the standard. Mr. Armstrong replied that it was not that simple. He reported that there are many options available when it comes to electronic signatures. Mr. Bolton replied that it would ultimately be up to the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) to determine what direction they want to go.

Mr. Bolton thanked Mr. Janosz for helping him and the vital records staff deal with a funeral director that had been having difficulty. Mr. Janosz replied that he was happy to help and that the matter had been put to rest.

Meeting adjourned.