

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

To The New Hampshire Department of Health & Human Services

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
November 21, 2002***

Approved Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

November 21, 2002

New Hampshire Department of Safety
1st Floor Conference Room
10 Hazen Drive
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Armstrong, IT Manager, DITM Appointment
William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar
Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment
Linda Hartson, Exeter City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Tom Janosz, Funeral Director Appointment
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment
Jane Ireland, Town Clerk Member
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Patricia Little, City Clerk Member
Vacant, Health Information Specialist Appointment
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment

GUESTS:

Dr. Jesse Greenblatt, Director, Division of Epidemiology and Vital Statistics, OCPH
Melanie A. Orman, Program Specialist, Bureau of Vital Records, DEVS
Barbara Kostka, Executive Secretary, BVR, DEVS
John O'Neal, Office of Information Systems, DHHS
Mark Parris, Office of Information Systems, DHHS
Rick Bailey, Office of Information Systems, DHHS
Steve Wurtz, Supervisor of Registration/Certification, BVR, DEVS

Approved Minutes

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Quorum Discussion:

In Ms. Little's absence, Mr. Bolton called the meeting to order. He suggested there may be a problem as there were barely enough committee members in attendance to make a quorum and in that number he included a couple votes in absentia, including Dr. Mevers. Mr. Bolton then asked if any voting members were planning to leave before the meeting concluded. Mr. Bergeron replied that he would be leaving at 11:00 a.m. Mr. Bolton suggested that the committee alter the agenda to accommodate everyone's schedule. All those in attendance agreed.

2. Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Bolton asked if committee members had had opportunity to go over the minutes. He added that Dr. Mevers noted that in the fourth paragraph on page 9, the intro is "His concern is that he knows" and in the second sentence the word "given" is missing. Mr. Kruger moved that the committee accept the minutes as amended. Ms. Hartson seconded Mr. Kruger's motion. The committee then voted unanimously to accept the minutes as corrected.

Mr. Bolton introduced Ms. Linda Mower, Clerk from the town of Campton. Ms. Mower had been designated as the liaison between the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee and the City and Town Clerks Association's Executive Committee. He asked those in attendance to introduce themselves to Ms. Mower, so that she might familiarize herself with committee members.

3. Election:

Mr. Bolton informed the committee that it was time once again, to elect a Chair for the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee. He then opened the floor for nominations for a one-year term. Ms. Hartson stated that she had spoken with Ms. Little earlier and had asked if she would be interested in serving another term if nominated and Ms. Little replied that she would. Ms. Hartson then nominated Patricia Little for another term. Mr. Kruger seconded Ms. Hartson's nomination. Mr. Bolton asked the committee if there were any other nominations. Hearing none, the committee voted unanimously to elect Ms. Little for another term as chair.

4. Genealogical Research Vault Staffing:

Mr. Bolton advised the committee that Dr. Greenblatt may be unable to attend the meeting, but that they were looking into creating a position called Genealogical Research Center Clerk. He then distributed a supplemental job description for the position. He added that the committee had been aware since March, the need for someone to staff the genealogic vault in the business office. Dr. Mevers put together a plan that included staffing of the vault. At the time, he suggested the hiring of a full-time records clerk for the library so staffing would not always be dependent on volunteers. Dr. Mevers rationale was to begin to put Vital Records documents in real alphabetical order, while

Approved Minutes

also unfolding, flattening, and placing in acid free folders. Mr. Bolton added that staffing the vault would satisfy several pressing business needs that the bureau had.

Mr. Bolton explained that there were two goals. To make the vital records available to the public and genealogical researchers during consistent business hours. There have been several instances where there was no volunteer staff available and bureau staff had to be pulled from their regular duties to man the research vault. There is also a daily lunch period when the vault closes. That tends to create a hardship for researchers that have to leave for that period. Volunteer hours no longer match current business hours. Mr. Bolton added that staffing the center full time would also satisfy some data quality issues. Cards in the collection could be arranged by given name or if we were to go forward with alphabetizing the cards, this person would be tasked to do that as well.

He went on to say that they were seeking this position as a deliverable in the current contract that they are going forward with to satisfy the development of a business plan for vital records management. Mr. Bolton felt that rather than wait for that recommendation to come forward in May, the committee should just go ahead, create the position and fill it. That will enable us to get a jump on the next fiscal year and as it stood at that point, the committee could afford it. He then asked if anyone wanted to discuss the matter. Ms. Hartson asked if the position would be funded entirely by the fund and if it would be a state position. Mr. Bolton replied yes to both questions. She asked if any committee members or Personnel had a problem with that. Mr. Bolton replied that they would just create the position and use the VRIFAC funds to pay for it. Mr. O'Neal added that several IT positions are funded that way.

Mr. Kruger asked what the bottom line cost would be. Mr. Bolton replied that it would be a labor grade 10, (technically a counter clerk III) and benefits are approximately 37%. Mr. Andrew stated that the total cost would be approximately \$28,000 per year. Mr. Kruger thanked Mr. Andrew and Mr. Bolton for the information. Mr. Kruger went on to say that he and Mr. Bolton had previously discussed some of the tasks assigned to this position and for the record he wanted to record his opposition to any "massive" re-alphabetizing of the cards in the vault. He felt that given the technology that is coming and the digitizing of records that may well be online in the next few years, it would be a waste of time and the state should not pay for it, nor should the fund.

Mr. Bergeron asked who was currently performing most of these duties. Mr. Bolton replied that Mr. Kruger was the coordinator of volunteers. Mr. Kruger added that volunteers do all the work, and when one is ill or does not come in, bureau staff step in and assist customers. Mr. Kruger stated that in previous years, if the volunteer did not show up, the room would just not open that day. He added that the population that they are drawing volunteers from for this type of work is aging rapidly and they are not able to replace those no longer able to volunteer.

Mr. Armstrong asked if this was planned as a temporary position. Mr. Bolton replied that it was not. Mr. Kruger stated that if the records are eventually digitized and alphabetized, then they will go online and the bureau may be able to close the vault altogether. The physical documents would probably end up in Dr. Mevers world in the archives. Only when the digitized version was totally unreadable would the searcher be referred to the archives for a consultation. In that event, he felt that the position might just go the way of the vault. Mr. Bolton replied that he was not certain of the timeline, but he had been looking at Mr. Parker's initial report from 1996. It asserted that even if records are

Approved Minutes

digitized and available online there will often, still be a need for people to come in and see the physical record.

Mr. Kruger stated that he felt those instances would be minimal. Having been a volunteer for the bureau for five to six years, he felt he had a pretty good handle on what the needs of the researchers are. It would be a very small minority that would demand to look at the actual record. Virtually all will be happy with finding the information online. In fact, he felt that closing the vault would go far to reduce the congestion of the office. Mr. Armstrong replied that he agreed completely with Mr. Kruger and reiterated the question about the new position possibly being temporary. Mr. Bolton explained that it was his intent that the position created be permanent.

Mr. Andrew added that there is a classification called “temporary personnel” that has many full-time employees that have been with the state for years. He explained that they have not been able to create permanent positions in several biennia, so the term “temporary” is misleading. Mr. Armstrong stated that those positions must be renewed every biennium. Mr. Andrew explained that in the standard definition of the word, this position is not “temporary.” Mr. Armstrong stated that there is a difference when a person takes a job and they know it is temporary. Mr. Kruger added “it can go away.”

Ms. Hartson stated that she was concerned that the position would also serve as backup to the counter clerks who interact with clerks as well as the general public. Mr. Bolton replied that the main focus of the position would be the genealogic research. He suggested that if Ms. Hartson wanted to suggest some edits on accountabilities she could. He felt that the appropriate solution is for them to be there to help the volunteer, cover breaks, and if the alphabetizing goes forward, work on that. Ms. Hartson was concerned that the office might become accustomed to that person being there to help and if the position is eliminated might have difficulty.

Mr. Armstrong reminded Ms. Hartson that “temporary” is considered that only in budgetary matters. The board would have the option every biennium to renew the position or not. He agreed with Dr. Mevers regarding alphabetizing the records in the vault. Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Bolton if over time, if Dr. Mevers plans for preservation needed support, if this position could be used to help other towns or cities, not always in Concord. Mr. Kruger stated that he felt that if this committee is funding a position there should be no reason why, if needs change, that the position responsibilities could not be altered by the committee, in the future. Mr. Armstrong replied that the only problem with Mr. Kruger’s assumption was that if you change a job description significantly, the person initially hired might not have the required qualifications.

He suggested that rather than encounter those kinds of problems several years down the road, the position should have more flexibility written into it now. Mr. Bergeron stated that he felt that if the committee established a grant program there would be clerical support needed for it as well and this might be the position that could provide that assistance. He suggested a line be added to the description that stated “supports the implementation of the recommendations of the Vital Records Improvement business plan” or something broad like that.

Mr. Bailey pointed out to committee members that the position as described is only a labor grade 10 counter clerk, a fairly well defined position. He said that he agreed that the committee might want to tweak the position in the future. He suggested the

Approved Minutes

committee be cautious as to how much they add and when or they might find themselves not with a labor grade 10, but a 12 or 14 and be paying for that before it is necessary. Dr. Mevers replied that he made a good point. Dr. Greenblatt asked to add that he was under the impression that the main motivation for this position was providing good customer service. Despite the excellent work of the volunteers people are demanding access and regular good service in an expanded time frame and bureau staff have been able to fill in when necessary, but the department feels it is a real business need to have the vault staffed. He went on to say that he thought the department would like to try to envision the preservation part to be a second effort. The department would certainly offer assistance to that, but would like to consider clerical support for a future grant program as residing outside the Vital Records unit.

Mr. Armstrong stated that he thought the purpose of the fund was not to augment staff, but for vital records preservation. He felt that this position would be the committee augmenting state staff with funds not necessarily intended for that. If the records are digitized, then that will probably happen sooner rather than later. Mr. Bolton replied that any digitizing of records was a year or two down the road. Mr. Kruger added that it was more likely three or four years away. He felt that the position being suggested was a good use of the funds. The fund is not a "preservation" fund, but an "improvement" fund. Part of the improvement is improving the service and access of the public to records.

Mr. Kruger then explained to the committee that one of the bigger tasks handled by volunteers has been the "mail-in" service. People from all over, write in looking to have genealogical research done. The volunteers locate the record and attach a photocopy of it to the record and then bureau staff have to add the certification and mail it back out to the requestor. It is quite cumbersome at times as there are many requests and more coming in daily. He explained that in New York the turnaround time for a genealogical research request is measured in years, but in New Hampshire it is generally no more than two weeks as it exists now. The better we look the better it is for the state. Mr. Kruger made a motion that the committee, accept the position as written. Ms. Ireland seconded his motion. Mr. Bolton asked the committee for a vote and the committee voted unanimously to approve the position.

5. Budget Discussion:

Mr. Andrew distributed a handout to the committee. He reported that in 1999 it was agreed that there would be an annual report on the finances of the committee. The document he had distributed was the annual report for the year that ended June 30, 2002. He pointed out that the first page gives out state budget categories showing what was spent and on what. Below the dotted line there was a little more detail on equipment, contracts and what the department calls current expenses. He had left in some of the categories that usually appear in detail, but currently have no expenses, such as future rollouts.

Mr. Andrew reported that he felt there were some important things to point out to the committee. He reminded them of the Legislature taking funds and adding them to appropriation funds for Vital Records. There were no Vital Records Improvement Funds used in the first year of the biennium. The department was able to utilize other funding sources. The total expended was \$219,000. For the year ending June 30, 2002, the

Approved Minutes

balance in the fund is \$1.6 million. Mr. Andrew advised that page two and three of the document, were just a bigger picture of essentially the same format. He directed the committee to the lower portion and pointed out that last year \$400,000 was set aside last year for web enablement and it remains there. They have identified other activities in the future that will require contractual obligations so the committee will see another \$400,000 for the next year.

Mr. Andrew asked Mr. Bolton to expand on his explanation. Mr. Bolton advised the committee that the contract would probably be in the \$1.4 million dollar category. That is within the ballpark the committee discussed, but right off the bat they noted additional expenditures that would be necessary for the software. The current software that vendors were given a demonstration of, did not include all the modifications that are planned. There will be a new rollout in September that will include many changes and another in April. Those items will then have to be developed by the vendor and will be in addition to the original RFP. In essence, they have built in a cushion that is easier to do ahead of time than doing contract modifications down the road.

Mr. Andrew then pointed out the placeholders for additional staff to install equipment. He added that it was anticipated that during the next fiscal year that might be needed. Mr. Bailey stated that up until now his staff has been able to handle that function, but with the web enablement project those staff members will not be as free to run around to the different towns to do installations. Mr. Andrew pointed out the \$50,000 set aside each year for the preservation activities and stated that those funds would begin to be used this year as well. Mr. Armstrong asked how much money the Social Security Administration was putting in for web enablement. Mr. Bolton replied that they had contracted for \$497,000 and \$1 million in state IT funds.

Mr. Andrew pointed out to the committee that communication costs were now being paid for by the fund. Mr. Bailey reported that with the larger cities now using VPN solutions dial up costs would be considerably lower than in years past and he hoped that the actual expense would be lower than what was budgeted. As an example, he stated that prior to the VPN, Nashua would be on the dial up seven and one-half hours a day, five days a week at 6.5 cents per minute. Mr. Andrew pointed out the expense for the VPN Concentrator was located on page two. He then stated that his report was complete and asked the committee for questions.

Mr. Armstrong asked if item 30 was for all computers sent out to cities and towns and Mr. Andrew replied that it was. Mr. Armstrong stated that those numbers should remain constant then. He then asked Mr. Bolton if he thought that digitizing would go forward. Mr. Bolton replied that he thought that it would. A private company had come in that could provide imaging and indexing. He added that it also depends on how quickly the LDS gets their project rolled out. They have initiated their digitizing and indexing and it is free.

Mr. Kruger added that if the church is going to digitize from the microfilm that exists and provide the volunteer force to index and it is for free we should not stand in their way. Mr. Bolton replied that because it is free the bureau has no way to motivate them to move on it. Mr. Armstrong asked if Mr. Bolton might not then get a quote from FileNet. Mr. Bolton replied that he would like that. He also added that if the committee wants a stricter timeline it might consider supplementing the LDS work. Mr. Kruger stated that he did not think there was enough money in the entire fund to pay for indexing all the

Approved Minutes

records. It requires double entry keying to do it right. He did not think the state should be paying for that.

Mr. Bolton stated that he felt it was at least worth discussing with them. Mr. Kruger replied that the price Mr. Bolton had mentioned to him from a vendor would not cover in any way the indexing of the records and that would not be acceptable. Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Bolton if it would not be worth it to hold a meeting with FileNet. Mr. Bolton replied that it was. Mr. Kruger explained that the manpower expense of double entry keying would be astronomical. Ms. Hartson asked about discrepancies in the translation from card to computer. Mr. Kruger explained that is the reason the information is keyed twice. A computer then verifies the two entries and then another person also verifies it. That is the only acceptable way to do it. Mr. Armstrong suggested that he and Mr. Bolton meet with FileNet and report back to the committee at a later date.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he had a comment and that it was one he had raised in the past as well. The preservation line item has a set amount budgeted each year and he felt that the amount budgeted each year should be a percentage of revenue. When the \$50,000 figure was set it was based on about 8.5% of the projected \$600,000 in revenue. The total revenues have continued to rise and that line item has remained constant. He suggested that once the preservation business plan comes he intended to make a motion that the committee find a suitable percentage and tie it to the revenue. He said that it may not be until fiscal year 2004-2005, but he wanted to propose that change.

Mr. Kruger added that he would support that discussion. He pointed out that as the fund gets larger it becomes a bigger target for the legislature. Mr. Armstrong asked if that did not warrant the committee moving quickly to get the strategic plan solidified. Mr. Kruger replied that it did. Dr. Mevers reported that the contract was moving forward through the process. It has to be approved by Personnel, the Attorney General and Governor and Council. They were hoping that all that would be accomplished in the next six weeks. The contractor and Dr. Mevers have signed off on it.

Dr. Mevers explained that it is a joint project between the bureau, public health and records and archives. He added that his office was handling the administration of the contract. Mr. Bolton added that the target date for the contractor is June 30. Mr. Kruger asked what the final bid was. Dr. Mevers replied that it was \$29,000. Mr. Kruger thanked Mr. Andrew for a short, sweet, and understandable presentation.

6. OIS Update:

Mr. Parris distributed a handout and referred committee members to the second page. Since the committee met last, quite a lot has happened. There were eight proposals submitted. They were fairly diverse yet similar in many ways. The selection committee sat down and read each proposal. They were able to narrow the field to four rather quickly. Those four were invited to make a presentation for the committee. Over a two-day span the vendors made their presentations at the Legislative Office Building.

Following that go around, the committee met again and further narrowed the field to two. At that time the committee requested written clarification from the two remaining vendors and invited one back to give another presentation on a specific portion of their presentation that dealt with a rules engine. The vendor did come in and did a

Approved Minutes

presentation to better familiarize committee members with the rules engine. Following that presentation the committee met again and came to a consensus as to which of the two vendors they wanted to begin discussions with.

The committee also discussed their justification in not selecting the other vendors, and their reasoning for going with the one it did. He reported that Mr. Bolton was currently working on a recommendation to send to upper management. Once that is approved they will begin negotiating with the vendor. Mr. Bailey stated that they had to be very careful in discussing this until the actual selection process is complete. He added that the good news was that they are nearing the paperwork only phase of the process. They are very confident that the vendor they have selected has the ability to provide a product that will meet our needs.

Mr. Kruger asked if the project was on time. Mr. Bailey replied that they had already been behind the schedule for the electronic death registration part of the contract. It had originally been scheduled to be available before now, but since the actual procurement started, the committee is probably only about a week behind schedule. He estimated it would be another week or two for approval, a week or two for negotiations, and a week or two to get it through Division of Information Technology Management. Mr. Armstrong added that it was a difficult process because there was a significant difference in price in equally qualified vendors. Mr. Bailey added that they might not have proposed work that was sufficient to the task. Mr. Armstrong explained that the committee was continually challenging itself to justify why it would pay a higher price, what was the justification. There were very sound business and technical reasons they went the way they did. He wanted the committee to be forewarned that there were significant price differences.

Both Mr. Bailey and Mr. Armstrong wanted the committee to be assured that the selection committee approached the proposals from every angle and challenged themselves to justify their decision. Mr. Bailey added that when the selection process is officially completed they would be able to discuss it in much greater detail. Ms. Hartson stated that she was confident that committee would support the selection committee decision because they are more familiar with the technical aspects of the project. Mr. Armstrong said that the real wild card in the process is the new governor. He is very IT oriented and we don't know if he is interested in this contract or not.

The contract may be floated to Mr. Benson's transition team. Mr. Kruger asked how big this contract would be on the radar screen. Mr. Bailey replied that it was middle for large departments, but would be huge for a small department. Mr. Armstrong added that there are not many multi-million dollar contracts that go out each year. Ms. Hartson stated that given the scope of the project wouldn't it be inline with the price. Mr. Bailey replied that it definitely would be and explained that that would be one of the advantages of getting eight proposals. Mr. Armstrong added that it fits in well with Mr. Benson's clicks not bricks ideology. He just wanted the committee to be aware that things might be more complicated than originally thought.

Ms. Hartson asked if now would not be a good time to survey users about changes they might like to see in the VRV2000 software. There are some defaults that clerks find repetitious. The need to use a mouse rather than being able to tab through pages is cumbersome. Mr. Bailey replied that Ms. Little had asked the same thing. He explained

Approved Minutes

that this contract is just to re-platform the VRV2000 software, not one to create a new version. Changes made to the software will originate with the states IT staff.

If we asked the vendor to make additions to the software it would be at additional expense. Going on the web will allow a lot of freedom, but by the same token there are some areas where there are limits as to what you can do. The vendors have allotted time to meet with users to work out any issues with those limits as well as the freedoms. Many issues will be able to be resolved in-house. Ms. Hartson replied that clerks did not intend to have anything created with this suggestion. Mr. Bailey said that he believed that most of the issues he has been privy to appeared to just be fine tuning which his staff could handle, but many things will be impacted by the addition of the web. Mr. O'Neal added that there should be a way for users to get their concerns and wishes to the IT staff. Ms. Hartson replied that she felt a survey needed to be done. Many small towns may not reply, but larger towns and cities would probably respond. Mr. Armstrong asked if a focus group might not be in order. Ms. Hartson agreed that it would. Mr. Bergeron suggested that they include users of different skill levels. Mr. Bailey asked Ms. Hartson for a top 20 list from users. There may be some things that one user may like that another finds unnecessary. Some users might prefer the mouse, others not.

Ms. Hartson suggested that possibly something could be coordinated through the bureau to survey all users. Mr. O'Neal asked if Ms. Hartson thought two half-day focus groups would be more helpful. She did, but was concerned about the time of year with the holidays and tax time. Mr. Armstrong added that once the software has been web enabled, it would go back to the OIS staff and they would continue to collect changes and fixes and update the software on a regular basis. Mr. Bolton added that the bureau holds user meetings. Ms. Hartson stated that possibly one of the reasons this came up at this time is that the clerks felt burnt by Mantech during the development of VRV2000. Mr. Bailey said that there were two advantages. When VRV2000 originally came up no one knew anything about it, but that has now changed. Users are more knowledgeable and the OIS staff is maintaining and updating the software now. Mr. O'Neal asked Ms. Hartson to let Mr. Bolton know when the clerks were ready to meet.

Mr. Parris reported that the VPN Concentrator has been installed and tested. The networking group set up some client files that needed to be installed at user sites and chose Nashua. They chose Nashua because it is a huge user and they have been on a VPN client previously. There were several minor problems with IP addressing. It turned out that they used the same IP scheme that the state uses and it created problems. Those issues were overcome with a hardware piece that was purchased along with the VPN Concentrator and it is now working really well. Since that time they have also brought up Dover and Portsmouth without the hardware piece and without trouble.

Mr. Parris pointed out a list in the handout of towns, cities, funeral homes, etc. that had been contacted about possibly being brought up. The final page of the handout gave details on training that is planned for all networking people at the Nash building. He wanted the committee to know that they are making a concerted effort to make sure that a lot of people understand the VPN Concentrator. The hardware, software, connections and maintenance of them is a key element to making this work. Ms. Hartson asked Mr. Bergeron how he found the VPN Concentrator. Mr. Bergeron replied that other than the start up issues they encountered it was going well. He reported that they came to install it the day after elections and even though they were told not to bring both terminals down at

Approved Minutes

the same time they did. It caused some stress as customers began to line up outside the door and had to be instructed to come back later.

7. EVVE Project:

Mr. Bolton reported that Ms. Little had wanted to know what had happened with the EVVE project why we walked away from it. He explained that EVVE was online verification of electronic vital events that the SSA and NAPHSIS were partnering to do with states. When we had initially volunteered to be one of those states, the pilot would have run from October to March of 2003. Then it would be rolled out to other states if the pilot worked and a pricing protocol was developed. Mr. Bolton explained that the department had elected to not participate in the financial compensation side of the pilot and that concerned the NAPHSIS executive board. They indicated that the pricing mechanism was a big part of the pilot rationale, and if we could not accommodate it now then we should consider pulling out. Mr. Bolton stated that it was not a bad thing because we would have had to put all the architecture, file transfers, and databases in place to be ready for an October launch.

The postponement allowed us some breathing room. His staff can meet with Mr. Parris and his staff, contractors and put together a requirement document to put all the databases where they should be. We would be ready by April when it may go online for all the states. Additionally we will be ready to roll out to other providers and see if there is a market for a means to access verification data. Mr. Armstrong asked what he meant by his last statement. Mr. Bolton replied that he was referring to the Immigration & Naturalization Service, passport offices, and motor vehicles. Ms. Hartson asked what vital information they would have access to. Mr. Bolton replied that motor vehicle would like to verify that they are not issuing a license to a dead person and the INS would verify if the person was truly born where it was stated. He added that the FBI verifies birth information as well for employment purposes.

Mr. Armstrong asked why they would not get that information from the SSA. Mr. Bolton replied that the SSA is not interested in doing that. Mr. Armstrong asked how it would work. Mr. Bolton replied that they had a contractor build a web enabled software piece. NAPHSIS would be the router. Mr. Armstrong asked how it would know what state to go to. Mr. Bolton explained that each state would be given a name. Mr. Armstrong asked how they get the social security number. Mr. Bailey replied that they would be working from information provided on an application.

Mr. Armstrong asked if Employment Security might want to use something like that. Mr. Bolton replied that they might. Ms. Hartson added that they often have military recruiters coming in to verify birth data. Mr. Bolton explained that the SSA can use it to verify information they receive or they could request the information. Others would only be allowed to verify information. Mr. Bailey said that the unfortunate thing is that it would be a stand-alone program.

8. Next Meeting:

The next meeting was scheduled for January 16, 2003