

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

*To The New Hampshire Department of State*

***-MINUTES-***

***Thursday  
September 15, 2005***

# Approved Minutes

## **-MINUTES-**

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

September 15, 2005

Health & Human Services Building  
Conference Rooms 113/114  
29 Hazen Drive  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

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

William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar  
David Scanlan, Deputy Secretary of State, SOS Appointment  
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment  
Andrew Chalsma, Health Statistics, DHHS Appointment  
John O'Neal, OIT, DHHS Appointment  
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment  
Debbie Augustine, NH Hospital Association  
Judy Gaouette, Dover City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment

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

Fred Rusczek, Manchester Health Officer, DHHS Appointment  
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment  
Jill Hadaway, Bow Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment  
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment  
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment  
Kimberly Johnson, Henniker Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment  
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment

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

Steve Wurtz, Vital Records, SOS  
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS  
Daniel Cloutier, SOS  
Karen Way, OIT  
Eric Allen, OIT

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

# Approved Minutes

## 1. Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Bergeron began the meeting and explained that many of the usual attendees had prior commitments. He directed committee members to the minutes for the May 19, 2005 meeting. Hearing no comments or corrections, Mr. Bergeron asked for a motion to accept the minutes. Ms. Gouette offered a motion and Mr. O'Neal Seconded. The committee then voted unanimously to accept the minutes as written.

## 3. NHVRIN Update:

Mr. Bolton stated that he had asked Mr. Allen to prepare a report on connectivity issues and possibly offer some solutions that might assist in getting the remaining towns online. Mr. Allen explained that there were three towns that did have access to broadband but had decided to opt out. He had recently identified two more towns that did have access through wireless means, Errol and Orford. The wireless technology is one that he had not used yet on this project. Mr. Allen was aware of one town that was using it with a great deal of success and that was Sandwich and they had done it on their own. There are three towns still on the DMV system. All together there are about thirty towns that are still without a broadband connection.

Mr. Allen reported that one of the things they had tested was a satellite connection and it was "a miserable failure." The town clerk in Easton was good about trying it and was very enthusiastic. She was actually pleased with it, but Mr. Allen reminded the committee that she was comparing it with the typewriter that she normally used. He reported that the satellite connection was fine for downloads, but the problems with latency and the upload speeds were not there. It was taking an hour for the clerk to do a record. The other technology Mr. Allen had been looking into was wireless. There are a host of technical obstacles there because you still need to have a central office with the capability for it.

Mr. Allen had contacted North Country Internet Access (NCIA), a kind of a middle player between the big providers and the communities. They would go in and put in the wireless access points and such. He was waiting to hear back from them. He wanted to see if they felt there was a potential business model where we could "help to try and see the communities." It would be more expensive than cable or DSL and a little more than satellite, but would still not approach the monthly cost of a T1 or a fractional T1.

The initial numbers they have been playing with to get into a community would be a couple thousand dollar investment. To set up individual sites would be \$200 for equipment. The monthly fee would be about \$60-\$70. The overall initial investment would be substantially less than a T1 and the monthly fee as well. Mr. Allen explained that it would be up to NCIA if they wanted to try and push up to those thinner areas of the state.

Mr. Allen explained that we were now reaching some really thin parts of the state and things have slowed dramatically when it comes to getting NHVRIN rolled out to any new users. Mr. Cloutier asked Mr. Allen who would be responsible for setting up the initial infrastructure for the wireless network. Mr. Allen replied that it would be NCIA. Mr. Cloutier asked if they had discussed NCIA specifying a minimum-security model? Mr. Allen replied that they had discussed it briefly but had not had an in-depth discussion. It

## Approved Minutes

was definitely an issue. Mr. Bolton asked if that would not be more of an issue for the provider.

Mr. Cloutier explained that what he was concerned about was open networks like the one up at the Red Jacket Inn where anyone can access the wireless network. All they have to do is get authenticated and then everything they do is wide open unless they use “https”, which the state does use. He was mainly concerned with who was paying for the bandwidth, who can get on, how much bandwidth will we have, and will we be sharing it? Mr. Allen replied that he had asked those questions and they claimed that they would allocate us dedicated bandwidth. He stated that he had asked how they would do that and they replied that they could do that easily.

Mr. Allen added that one solution that would address all security issues was to just throw the VPN connection back up. That solution is available to us at any time if we wanted to go there. He stated that he had nothing further to report and asked if anyone had questions. Mr. Bergeron stated that Mr. Kruger had previously asked for a report on the number of records produced by the towns that they were considering for the extra efforts for. He went on to say that it was his understanding that Mr. Wurtz had pulled some of that information together and he was anxious to see the results.

Mr. Bergeron suggested that it was almost a philosophical decision that needed to be made. Is it economically feasible? Did the committee want to invest or recommend the investment of that kind of money to reach out to these small towns? Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Wurtz to explain the information he had provided the committee. Mr. Wurtz explained that the handout contained a summation of 2004-2005 events for the twenty-eight locations not currently on NHVRIN. The rest was kind of a breakdown of all locations. Mr. Allen stated that some of the towns listed were now on NHVRIN. Mr. Wurtz replied that the report had been compiled shortly after Mr. Kruger made the request so it could be dated.

Mr. Bolton stated that he was aware that the towns listed were not big population centers. He asked if there was a way to list the number of certificates the towns generated. Mr. Wurtz replied that there was not. It did show the number of new marriages, licenses, etc. Mr. Bergeron suggested that even if those figures were available they would probably not bolster the numbers a great deal. He stated that you could probably triple them and still have low numbers. Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Scanlan if there had been any discussion within the SOS about how they planned to handle the small towns when it came to HAVA.

Mr. Scanlan replied that they had not yet had a detailed discussion on how that was going to work, but he assumed they did recognize that those towns needed to be connected to the HAVA system in order for it to work. He felt that ultimately there would be cooperation. Mr. Bergeron asked if they had considered not having them connect at all. Mr. Scanlan replied that they had not and deferred to Mr. Cloutier. Mr. Cloutier replied that he was under the impression that it was a requirement that all clerks have access to the central database. He stated that he was unsure whether or not they had that choice and would have to look into it further in order to comment.

Mr. Cloutier stated that the other choice they have is after getting through the testing phase with broadband and dialup they may find that dialup will suffice for those smaller towns that have minimal activity. It might be slow but would be sufficient to meet

## Approved Minutes

requirements. He added that they had not even broached that subject with towns yet. Mr. Allen asked if it would be helpful that those towns would have minimal impact on the database. Mr. Cloutier replied that it was probable that was what they had been thinking. He explained that they (SOS) had to go out there and look to see what was available before making any decisions.

The towns need to have access, as this is their database. There is no reason why they shouldn't have some sort of access. Mr. Cloutier suggested that towns like Harts Location and Dixville have reasonably stagnant populations that rarely change. There might only be twenty-four entries in the system in a year to say they picked up a ballot. He stated that there was a need for a cost benefit analysis to determine how best to do it. Mr. Cloutier reiterated that the Secretary of State had not put a lot of thought into that yet. They would have to test it.

Mr. Scanlan added that there had been a hearing recently with the Finance committee of the House where they were discussing HB232, regarding having some kind of municipal internet. He thought that the bill called for T1 lines to every community at a pretty exorbitant cost. Mr. Scanlan reported that he was unsure what the outcome of the legislation would be because of the associated high cost. During the hearing he heard a lot of discussion about the NHVRIN system and HAVA. Mr. Bergeron asked if Mr. Bolton had anything to add.

Mr. Bolton replied that he did have something to say about the rationale for wanting to bring NHVRIN to those smaller towns and there were several reasons he felt it was important. One was that from the beginning of the automated system discussion clerks were promised that it would produce revenue and that had been the reason they had supported it all these years. He wanted to make sure that all clerks had the opportunity to collect those fees. Another very important reason is customer service. People that live in Croydon may have issues with travel or even with a telephone for that matter and they should have access to their vital event documents. Their city or town clerk might be their only option to obtain a vital record. We would be providing a customer service to all the citizens of New Hampshire by making sure that all clerks have connectivity.

The last point that Mr. Bolton wanted to highlight was one that he considered kind of a critical driving force. That is the rapid pushing through of Federal Intelligence Reform Act. They are looking at several issues regarding the issuance of birth certificates. They are looking at paper type, physical locations where records are kept and issued, number of issuing authorities. New England historically has a lot of issuing authorities. There are 66,000 issuing authorities in the United States, yet there are only fifty-seven registration areas. The focus is to try and ensure that everyone be mandated to ascribe a minimal set of criteria, type of facility, facility control is in place and access to a centralized database. NHVRIN provides access to the New Hampshire central database.

Mr. Bolton explained that those recommendations would be out shortly. He expected the first draft of the proposed regulations to be released within the month. Once that happens he will have a better idea of the ramifications for New Hampshire issuers. Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Allen what towns he was working with currently to get them on the system. Mr. Allen replied that he had several at different stages. Errol is a town he had approached because he had recently found out that they did have access to wireless. He asked Mr. Bolton to confirm but was under the impression that they were still waiting for

## Approved Minutes

Errol to respond. Mr. Bolton agreed with Mr. Allen's depiction of the current status of the rollout.

Mr. Allen explained that he was planning to contact Orford for the same reason. As far as traditional broadband access he had approached Jefferson and the clerk there was not very receptive so he decided against pushing the issue. Mr. Bergeron asked if towns like Bath and Jefferson would not have to get on board if the federal Intel Reform regulations and/or HAVA required it and what their reasoning was for opting out. He asked if it was because they did not want to get involved with using computers? Mr. Allen replied that they were not interested in using computers.

Mr. Allen explained that he was surprised that he did not encounter more of that kind of resistance. He had encountered resistance in many of the smaller towns, but they had not put up a big enough fight and he had worked his way in. To only have three out of two hundred towns refuse to participate was an amazing response in Mr. Allen's opinion. Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Bolton what he was recommending regarding the outstanding towns. Mr. Bolton replied that they were still working with a few communities and he believed that Grafton might still come on. He felt that Mr. Allen's work with NCIA to determine what towns had access was a good move and should continue. Mr. Bolton stated that G4 had compiled a list of the CO's of all the communities. He felt that list could come in handy even for NCIA.

Mr. Bolton felt there were still viable options available to bring those remote locations on to the system and explained that they were still awaiting a satellite solution. Mr. Allen added that there is a provider that is not yet in the area, but is claiming speeds via satellite that would accommodate NHVRIN. Mr. Bergeron stated that it might be helpful to keep Mr. Scanlan in the loop on towns that were resisting, because when HAVA goes online those towns will become their problem. He stated that if the SOS can break down the door for HAVA they should then be able to bring NHVRIN along. Mr. Bolton reported that there are only a small number of towns that are problematic and there are several solutions available to them. He explained that he was aware that the volume was not there, but felt there were several reasons to continue going down this road.

Mr. Bolton suggested querying all of the thirty-seven outstanding sites to determine if any of them are anxious to get started with NHVRIN. That way if we did elect to go forward with one of the alternative options we would know that they would be willing to use it on a regular basis. He also felt that we needed to continue to cultivate a relationship with NCIA and G4. Although G4's solution is the most expensive it covers the entire state. They are offering a T1 to each site and the positive aspect of that is that they would do all the infrastructure/groundwork and they would not create a contract. We could sign up with them for a month or two and then tell them that we no longer need their services. Mr. Bolton suggested that we survey those sites and if there is interest, select a solution and return to the committee with a package.

Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Allen if NCIA had given him a timeline. Mr. Allen replied that they had not. In fact, he said they had been "disappointingly slow." Mr. Bolton stated that there were still a few loose ends and that he would prefer to present a package to the committee at a later date. Possibly they could present at the next meeting in November. He also wanted to remind the committee that in the past they had not been averse to spending money for connectivity solutions and the modem bank. At times the cost

## Approved Minutes

approached \$40,000 per month. Even if we elected to give every city and town a T1 the cost would only be about \$11,000 per month.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Bolton if he was correct in understanding that G4 would only charge a little under \$300 to install the T1. Mr. Bolton replied that he was correct. There would also be a variable cost for each location based on their proximity to the central office. Mr. Allen asked if the state just stopped paying would they just shut off the service? Mr. Bolton replied that Mr. Allen was correct. He added that G4 has a variable rate from about \$319. per month going up to \$490. Mr. Bolton explained that it was a “damn good” rate for a T1, but that clerks do not need a T1. Mr. Bergeron likened it to selling a \$10 camera for \$8. They would make their money on the monthly charges not the installation.

Mr. Bolton replied that he thought they were also taking a hit on the monthly charges. He felt it was a very attractive offer. Mr. Allen asked Mr. Bolton if they (G4) were considering reselling parts of the T1 elsewhere. Mr. Bolton replied that he thought their focus was on things like voice lines, competing with companies like Verizon. He did not think the communities they are talking about have a huge market. Mr. Bolton actually felt that having a T1 in those towns might even encourage companies to move there. Mr. O’Neal asked if there was a formal outreach program for the towns that are not connected. Mr. Bolton replied that they were working with the Executive Committee to at least let them know their advances, desires, progress, etc. He was under the impression that most clerks were aware of the need/goal to get NHVRIN out statewide.

Mr. O’Neal suggested sending a formal letter to the clerks on SOS/DVRA stationary. Mr. Bolton explained that they had taken more formal actions early on and that was another reason for the query. Mr. Bergeron suggested that Mr. Bolton share the results of the query with Mr. Scanlan. Mr. Allen stated that he had been in touch with all but about five towns and even though there had been some warning some did not seem to make the association between Mr. Allen and DVRA. He reiterated that most towns seem to be interested. Many towns feel left in the dark because they know they have no choice. The only ones that would resist would be the towns that have been previously mentioned as refusing to participate.

Mr. Bolton reported that he had spoken with the Roxbury Town Clerk and her husband and the clerk was not completely dead set against new technology, she just wanted to make sure it was integrated. She wanted one computer that she could utilize for all the different aspects of her job (voter registration, DMV, and vital records). He explained that she was not alone in feeling that way. Mr. Bergeron expressed doubt that they would ever see a machine that would share space with motor vehicle. Mr. Allen replied that he had received a shock in the last several weeks. He heard from someone at Motor Vehicle, but wanted to nail it down with the network lead for DMV.

Mr. Allen had heard that DMV has been making some changes with towns and have allowed some towns to connect through ISIS to their closed circuit that are not completely under their control. What they are doing is putting those towns through a network review to ensure that they are satisfied that those devices are secure. They let us connect our VRV assets to their network and the only difference is our device was only on that circuit and had access to nothing else. The model we are looking at would not only allow us to hook up our device to their network, but in order for us to work in

## Approved Minutes

NHVRIN we need the internet. That would require two cards in the machine. One to the router and one to the internet.

Mr. Allen wanted to investigate that option further because if it is true it will open up a lot of avenues to DVRA. This would be a big plus for those small towns that do not want three different machines in their offices. Mr. Wurtz asked if MAP was web enabled as he had heard at the clerk's meeting that it was. Mr. Allen replied that it was not. Mr. Bolton added that he thought that what they had meant was that it was through a browser. Mr. Allen added that there was a very clear distinction there. His understanding was that it is browser enabled which means you can use Internet Explorer as the application you can use to open the application and get a picture. Web enabled implies that the user can go out on the internet to make the connection. What they are really doing is using the browser to connect through the closed circuit. He estimated that ninety-percent of those that initially use it would be confused by that. Mr. Cloutier explained that it was similar to how AOL started. There was no internet at the time, it was their own computer system. The internet did not come in until later.

Mr. Allen reported that with the solution he was suggesting the browser would function both ways.

#### **4. Data Web Tool Update:**

Mr. Bolton reported that the contract was in place with the exception of several documents that were forthcoming. The contractor is the Constella Group, LLC. Their team is back on board and is looking at the tool and putting together requirements documentation. DVRA and OIT staff have been participating in weekly teleconferences with Constella staff. Mr. Bolton reported that the contract end date is December 15, 2005. That is the date when we should have the tool in place.

#### **5. Quarterly Budget Update:**

Mr. Bergeron reported that Ms. Penney had sent him a breakdown of the fund for the current fiscal year. He explained that the only thing that was not included in the report was the revenue. The revenue for the last fiscal year was \$913,768. That was up from last year, which was \$888,971. Mr. Bergeron pointed out to members that on the last page he had created a breakdown of the history of the fund going back to 1992. He pointed out that he had done this from his own personal notes and the numbers did not add up. He had asked Ms. Penney to look into it to find out where the error might be.

Mr. Bergeron stated that the reason he had brought it up is if members looked at the figure for expenditures (\$489,703.) they would assume that revenue carried forward would be approximately \$430,000, but that is not the case. There is only about \$230,000 that was brought forward. Mr. Bergeron reported that Ms. Penney was going to check into it and had suggested that possibly the numbers from when the fund was with DHHS were incorrect. He offered that his own numbers might have been incorrect.

After Ms. Penney checks the figures the committee should have a clearer idea of the balance of the fund going forward. Mr. Bergeron explained that the commodity items were broken down in a little more detail. In past reports they just had "current expenses are X amount of dollars." It is now broken down into smaller classes like supplies,

## Approved Minutes

publications, food, postage, etc. Mr. Bergeron was pleased that the report was becoming more detailed. He explained that he had no data for fiscal year 2003. The one thing he found very interesting was how much the fund had grown. Starting out with \$308,000 a year to almost \$1 million.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he was aware that the contribution to the fund had been increased, but that he still thought its growth was significant. He is concerned that the balance going forward is growing so high. In the future he thought the committee should discuss either how to use the fund or how to lower the revenues paid into the fund. It is just going to become too attractive a target for the legislature. Mr. Bergeron stated that it was his opinion that If we don't need the money it should not be building up like that.

### **5. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU):**

Mr. Scanlan explained that the SOS is aware that the MOU is a priority of the committee and he wanted to apologize that it had not yet been completed. Resources in the SOS have been stretched very thin due to a large number of pressing projects. He added that not everyone in the SOS's office is comfortable with the Service Level Agreement (SLA) that is in place. He hoped that they would be able to get to it soon. He reported that they had completed another MOU with DHHS relevant to vital records based on the distribution of information and confidentiality.

Mr. Scanlan felt that both departments were comfortable with the agreement. He asked Mr. Cloutier if he wanted to add anything about the OIT MOU. Mr. Cloutier stated that the MOU is pretty much in its final format and although it has not been signed there has been a verbal agreement put in place. He explained that he could be held responsible for that, as he has been spending many, many hours on the HAVA project and it fell off the radar. Mr. Cloutier asked Mr. O'Neal if he felt that not having the document signed was having a negative effect on the relationship between the SOS and OIT. Mr. O'Neal replied that whether or not the document is signed he would still support the NHVRIN project. He felt it was just a matter of principle.

Mr. O'Neal reported that there were still invoices that were outstanding. Mr. Cloutier expressed surprise at that. Mr. Scanlan asked if Mr. O'Neal was referring to 2004 invoices. Mr. O'Neal replied that it was both 2004 and 2005 invoices. Mr. Cloutier asked if the amount still outstanding was the \$1500 difference that was because of the way it was invoiced and paid. Mr. O'Neal agreed that it was. Mr. Bergeron said that it was his understanding that the MOU was supposed to address some of the financial issues.

Mr. Cloutier replied that it was not to address the 2004 balances that were coming forward it was for 2005. The amount in question came about when Ms. Penney took a number of smaller bills added them up and sent payment. OIT then informed her that her payment was short and she asked for details that would explain the difference. He was unaware of what had happened since that time. Mr. O'Neal replied that Ms. Hoover had supplied that information to the SOS in July.

### **6. Vital Records Preservation Administrator:**

## Approved Minutes

Mr. Bergeron asked what had happened with the position. Mr. Scanlan replied that for a number of reasons the Secretary of State had not decided to go forward with that position yet. Mr. Bergeron replied that the committee is advisory only and if the Secretary of State decided against it that was his choice to make.

### 7. Clerk Report:

Mr. Bergeron stated that he had shared with committee members but doubted that they had had the time to read it yet, his recap of what he thought had gone on in the past year. At least one of the clerks that sits on this committee reports back to the annual convention on the committee's progress. So this was just one of several reports that the clerks had an opportunity to hear at the meeting. He explained that he had already touched on several of the issues at this meeting.

The financial accounting aspect had improved in Mr. Bergeron's opinion and Ms. Penney had promised to try and resolve his concern over the discrepancy in the revenue carried forward. The MOU and the VRIFAC program administrator position had all been touched on. The only thing in the report that had not been discussed at this meeting was the backlog of change orders for NHVRIN. Mr. Bergeron asked where they were at this time. Was there still a large backlog of change requests? Mr. O'Neal replied that he did not have an exact number, but he thought there was approximately sixty. He explained that one thing that had not been covered during the NHVRIN update was that Ms. Way's group was gearing up for a new release for the end of October.

It would be in User Acceptance Testing (UAT) in the next few weeks. The primary reason for the release is to remove a rules engine/software that CNSI used in the Death and Birth modules. That has been their major focus as of late. He added that CNSI did them a big favor and removed the rules engine for them and his staff is now working to ensure all the pieces are still there and testing. A lot of the backlog for problems gets moved around as priorities shift.

Mr. O'Neal explained that what he had proposed to Mr. Bolton was that after this latest release they categorize those requests into three categories. Category one would be for things that need to be fixed right away. Category two would be "it works as it was designed, but it's not working correctly. If we changed it this way it would be better." Category three would be for functionality that does not yet exist. He thought that Mr. Bolton had packaged them into those categories and as soon as his staff has some free time they will begin working on them. He expressed a desire to fix all the bugs.

Because they do the training, Mr. O'Neal has asked Mr. Wurtz and Ms. Bentley to bring things to their (OIT) attention that would improve the application. Mr. Bergeron asked if they would be announcing to the clerks the new release information. If so, would they be given advance warning of what to expect from it? Mr. O'Neal replied that he looked to Mr. Bolton to provide guidance on what he wanted released to users. Ms. Gaouette asked what kind of timeline they were looking at for the changes not the new release.

Mr. O'Neal replied that the SLA calls for a quarterly cycle. What Ms. Way's group would do is provide the quarterly releases which, would include front-end changes. Those are the pieces that users see. Some of the problems in the inventory are back-end changes and they can be made at anytime without a new release. If they are going to do a

## Approved Minutes

release in October the next one would occur three months later and that is when they would begin to “whack away” at the backlog.

Mr. Bergeron asked if Mr. O’Neal anticipated any further snafus like the recent one where there was a change in the web address and clerks were not notified. Mr. O’Neal replied that he thought Ms. Kipp, a business analyst had come up with the perfect words of wisdom “you just don’t know what you don’t know.” He thought that the team in the process of trying to release something that they knew was important to DVRA because of the password expiration had made some decisions late at night that they thought were in the best interest of the application. Those decisions turned out to not be the best decisions. Mr. O’Neal expressed that he felt it was made for the right reason. That is the main reason he wanted to categorize the outstanding change requests.

Mr. O’Neal added that this team is brand new and they are struggling to get up to speed with the application. He explained that he believed the team had a great deal of potential, but needed to learn. They did not understand the ramifications of their decision to change the address when they made it. Mr. Bergeron asked if anyone else had any other questions.

### **8. Other Business:**

Mr. O’Neal replied that he did not see all of the transfers for 2005 on the financial form. He only saw \$136,000. Mr. Bergeron asked if it should have been more. Mr. O’Neal replied that according to what he had it should have been \$343,598.

Mr. Cloutier cautioned that rather than say transfer they should be referring to “class 27.” He explained that they may need to also look at “class 92” as he thought there might be another \$91,600 there. Both he and Mr. O’Neal thought the numbers looked low and felt that the discrepancy Mr. Bergeron mentioned might be found in those numbers. Mr. Bergeron stated that he would ask Ms. Penney about that. That it may be that some of those invoices are buried in other line items. Mr. Cloutier suggested they may have been thirteenth month transfers that were not picked up when Ms. Penney did the data query.

Ms. Way asked if they could go back to an earlier part of the discussion. She reported that her team was working on the project plans, which identify the tasks that are necessary to complete the items that have been requested in priority order by Mr. Bolton’s staff. She explained that when DVRA was returned to OIT from SOS Mr. O’Neal had put together a team to support NHVRIN and since returning they have been asked to direct some of their resources to assist Constella with the web data query tool. That is another reason that there is a backlog. Those are some of the things they were having to do to try and meet all Mr. Bolton’s business needs. Something has to give. There is only so much they can do.

Mr. Bergeron asked how much time Ms. Way believed they were spending on the Constella project. He had been under the impression when this project was initially discussed and approved it had not seemed like it would be a lot of hours. Ms. Way replied that it had escalated into a lot more hours than originally thought due to their having to provide data abstracts to Constella. At that time Ms. Way stated that she had one full-time employee pretty much focused on that project. Mr. O’Neal stated that he was not sure that he would categorize it as more than they had anticipated but he said that he would like to draw the committee’s attention back to the January meeting when he

## Approved Minutes

warned the committee that no matter the amount of effort required it would still take away from NHVRIN support. Mr. Bolton stated that he believed that when the committee voted on the tool Mr. O'Neal had suggested a twenty percent increase or something like that.

In regard to the numbers of change requests, he reported that in the long term it was like eighty or ninety and with regards to past releases he thought they had done four to five requests per release in addition to mandatory fixes. He stated that if we were looking at quarterly releases to include the outstanding change requests, we would be looking at a lot of quarterly releases. Ms. Way replied that it would depend on the scope of what those changes were. Mr. Bolton replied that he felt that the committee had the resources to throw at support for the application. Mr. Bolton felt that they should throw additional resources at the outstanding change requests and get them out of the way. That would allow them to then return to strictly maintaining the application.

Ms. Way stated that it again went back to the complexity of the requests. She cited the password redesign as an example. It was a much larger change request than their initial assessment suggested. They thought that it was just a couple of code changes and it ended up being a complete redesign due to business requirement sessions they held with DVRA. Therefore, it took more resource time to complete that change. They have not been able to evaluate all the change requests in order to give an estimate as to how long it would take to complete them. Some will be simple, others more complex. They would not have that answer until they sit down to do the next project plan and determine what is going to be included in the next release and how many resources it will require to complete it and get it tested in a three month period.

Mr. Bergeron asked Ms. Way at what point when a change request is submitted do they supply an estimate of the time involved. Ms. Way replied that right now as change requests come in they are just going into a change request database because all their resources are being directed towards release 2.2 and the web data query tool. Mr. Bolton felt that they could assign a level of effort to research the request as they do to completing the CR. Ms. Way replied that they do not always put in a level of effort. If it has not been analyzed they do not. Either Ms. Kipp or Ms. Way enters the CR in the database and when one of their team has some free time they assign them a CR for preliminary analysis. They go through and look at what the issue is and see if they can recreate the problem.

If they can they do some preliminary analysis and give an estimate. That is used in scheduling a task in a project plan. That is still not necessarily a hard and fast answer as to how long a change request will take. Mr. Bergeron asked Ms. Way to explain what will happen after the October release. There are eighty to ninety change requests in the hopper. How do they go about prioritizing them, assigning them, and making estimates of the time involved in completing and closing them? Ms. Way replied that of the ones that are categorized as ones, she would look to DVRA to say which ones are the most important.

Once that had been determined she would look them over and assign them to someone for preliminary analysis so they could get an initial idea from the developers as to how long each one will take. They will then take that information and build a project plan. It will describe which change request they think they can get done in the allotted time frame. That would be run by DVRA to see if the times are acceptable to them. They

## Approved Minutes

may not be able to get everything that DVRA categorized as highest priority into one project plan. Mr. Bergeron asked if there had been any discussion about the possibility of bringing in additional people or resources or sub-contracting some of the work out so that it can be caught up. Mr. O'Neal replied that there had been two discussions.

One was for Constella, Mr. O'Neal has other resources assigned on the DHHS side that could do some filling in for some of the data work. He also suggested to Mr. Bolton that he might want to speak with the Deputy Commissioner of DHHS to see if they could work out a swap. Mr. O'Neal is not authorized to swap employees around. Mr. O'Neal and Mr. Bolton had also discussed a contractor that is currently in the Nash building doing the web billing project, HCL Technologies. He reported that they are superb developers who are already integrated into the OIT framework. They would shortly be freeing up from that project and would be perfect additions to the DVRA team. They are familiar with the same technology and although they would not know the application they certainly know the infrastructure.

Mr. Cloutier expressed confusion. He stated that because of the SLA and things of that nature that the consolidation of the IT resources of the state into a centralized unit called OIT was going to help us to not have to go outside for additional assistance. If that is the case why is not that when a project is presented to OIT and other agencies needs are being met, why can they not just move resources to the project in need of assistance? Why would SOS have to go on the side and ask another agency if they mind if we use OIT resources? Mr. O'Neal replied that he just felt that was protocol. Mr. Cloutier stated that as far as he was concerned they were OIT employees assigned to a task. Not a person assigned to an agency.

Mr. O'Neal replied that they are assigned to an agency. Mr. Bolton pointed out to Mr. O'Neal that in the past staff assigned to DVRA have been pulled onto other projects because DVRA's needs were being met. Mr. O'Neal replied that DVRA had been part of DHHS at that time. Mr. Bolton replied that OIT was now DVRA's IT provider. Mr. O'Neal reiterated that if SOS wanted additional resources they would need to discuss it with the Deputy Commissioner or the Commissioner of DHHS.

Mr. Bergeron asked if there was any other business. Mr. Bolton stated that there had been discussion about the Intelligence Reform Act and changes that may be coming down the pike. He reported that it was going to be fairly significant in its effects on local clerks. Mr. Bolton felt that it was their (committee tasked with making recommendations) desire to limit the issuing agents throughout the nation and their target is birth. Along with birth would go all the other issuance areas, death, marriage and divorce. Their recommendations will have significant impact on all the local registrars. They are also expected to throw money at the project. The rumored amount nationwide is \$150 million. Hopefully New Hampshire will be able to grab some of that money.

The current plan is to base it on a state's volume. How many records or how many people are born in your state. New Hampshire does not have that many records. There might be a target on the committee to look at monies we already have to possibly backfill some of the money if the committee plans to bring everyone up to a certain level. Mr. Bergeron asked if the final report was due out in November. Mr. Bolton agreed that it was. Mr. Bergeron asked if Mr. Bolton would report on that to the committee at the next meeting. Mr. Bolton replied that he would.

## Approved Minutes

The next meeting is scheduled for November 17, 2005.

Mr. Bolton made a motion to adjourn. Mr. O'Neal seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 11:09 a.m.