

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

To The New Hampshire Department of State

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
March 17, 2005***

Approved Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

March 17, 2005

Health & Human Services Building
Conference Rooms 112/113
29 Hazen Drive
Concord, New Hampshire 03301

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Jill Hadaway, Bow Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment
Andrew Chalsma, Health Statistics, DHHS Appointment
William Armstrong, IT Manager, DITM Appointment
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment
John O'Neal, OIT, DHHS Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment
Fred Rusczek, Manchester Health Officer, DHHS Appointment
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment
Kimberly Johnson, Henniker Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Judy Gaouette, Dover City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Debbie Augustine, NH Hospital Association
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment

GUESTS:

Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS
Steve Wurtz, Vital Records, SOS
Barbara Kostka, Vital Records, SOS
Karen Way, OIT
Eric Allen, OIT

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

Approved Minutes

1. **Agenda Change:**

Mr. Bergeron called the meeting to order. He explained that there was a great deal of activity going on at the state house that afternoon and Mr. Bolton would only be able to attend the first thirteen minutes of the meeting. With that he announced that the agenda would be altered to allow Mr. Bolton to address the issues pertaining to him before he had to leave. Mr. Bergeron added that the committee would return to the regular agenda following Mr. Bolton's departure.

2. **Financial Information:**

Mr. Bolton explained that Ms. Barbara Hoover had been scheduled to but was unable to attend the meeting. She was supposed to explain how OIT arrives at its billing for NHVRIN. They use an allocation process, but because of the previously mentioned activity she was unable to attend.

3. **Data Web Tool:**

Mr. Bolton reported that there had been a teleconference the day before with the contractor Constella and their developer. The meeting was productive in that they described their need for a certain data set. They need it so they can apply it to their web tool to see how it is working and would then be able to demonstrate its capabilities to the business office and the committee. Mr. Bolton explained that it was a little disconcerting that there was no firm knowledge in how this tool would be going forward in its development. The developer seemed unaware of the extent to which we would like to see this tool developed.

Mr. Bolton reported that he planned to contact NCHS to see if they could arrange for the contractors to travel to New Hampshire for at least one JAD session. Ms. Way also felt that would be a good idea and it would allow a little more comfort in going forward with the contract. Everyone would then be on the same page. Mr. Bolton added that the contract had not been completed yet. He was working on it currently and hoped to have Constella under contract by April 1. It was his goal that the previously mentioned JAD session, occur sooner rather than later. He added that they would invite other interested parties (DHHS, NHHA, VRIFAC members, etc.) to attend this meeting when it is scheduled.

4. **OIT/SOS Memorandum of Understanding Update:**

Mr. Bolton reported that he, Mr. O'Neal, Ms. Hoover, and Mr. Cloutier had met and he felt they were very close to finalizing the agreement. He was under the impression that they were only waiting for Mr. Cloutier to return with revisions or further comments. Mr. Bolton asked Mr. O'Neal if that was his understanding and if he had anything he wanted to add. Mr. O'Neal replied that he agreed that the document was nearly complete, but he had not heard anything since the meeting Mr. Bolton described. It was mentioned that Mr. Cloutier was tied up with HAVA issues, but that he would soon have more time to devote to this project.

5. **NHVRIN Release Update:**

Approved Minutes

Mr. Bolton reported that the subcommittee had met following the last special VRIFAC meeting. At that meeting they discussed the committee budget as far as they identified large ticket items like software, contracted help, and general expenditures like those associated with rolling out new hardware. They identified some areas where the spreadsheet needed to be cleaned up. Mr. Bolton explained that he had not had the time to clean it up yet, but would. When it was complete he planned to present it to the committee for review.

The subcommittee also discussed going back to the cities and towns that were reviewed during the last evaluation. That study looked at twenty-seven to thirty communities and delivered reports on them. The committee reconstituted those reports and will be going back to see if the needs described in the report still exist. Mr. Bergeron distributed a copy of the letter he had sent out to those towns. He added that there were several other projects the committee also wanted to look into. One concern discussed involved looking into the possibility of a microfilm backup to the records that are being created as a means of ensuring their long-term preservation. He and Dr. Mevers felt rather strongly that an electronic backup of Vital Records is not sufficient.

Mr. Bergeron explained that he was even more wary of the electronic backup following his experience in the city of Nashua that very morning. The city IT staff loaded new virus scan software onto the city network overnight. He was unaware what was in it, but it had wiped out emails and corrupted Word files. Mr. Bergeron had an email from Mr. Scanlan discussing the status of their (SOS) filling the vacant position for the Vital Records Improvement Lead person and when he went to print it this morning he got a message that it had been deleted because of the virus scan. His deputy opened an inventory document that was also destroyed. Mr. Bergeron stressed that as of that morning he would not be the one to recommend an electronic backup.

Mr. Bergeron reported that the subcommittee had also decided to speak with Mr. Kruger about what kinds of progress is being made in the genealogical world as far as the scanning of the Latter Day Saints and New England Genealogical Society records. That may be a project this committee might want to get involved with and move some of the public domain records into a digital format. He stressed that there were a number of projects they were looking at. Some had been discussed and been on the table a long time but the committee had never been able to financially support them. It is now better equipped to.

Mr. Bolton distributed a budget that Mr. Bergeron put together for the committee with figures supplied by Ms. Penney from the Secretary of State's office. Mr. Bergeron explained that for the time being the committee would continue to receive financials like those in front of them because that seems to be the format in which Ms. Penney is comfortable providing them. He and Mr. Gardner felt that once the new position was filled that person could be tasked with providing a more detailed budget to the committee. They could really dig into the class levels and provide the committee with more detail. Current SOS staff does not have the time to do it. He explained that the only big change he noted on the budget document was the transfer of \$73,000 to OIT. That is the first time that has come up, but it will continue to on a regular basis.

Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. O'Neal if there had been any movement on the OIT position waiver. Mr. O'Neal replied that there had not. He thanked Mr. Bergeron for the letter he had prepared in support of a waiver. He then explained that they had gone through a

Approved Minutes

number of “fire fights” preparing for meetings with the Governor’s office that have not taken place yet. He explained that they were still basically in a holding pattern. Mr. Bergeron asked if there was anything else he or the committee could do. Mr. O’Neal thanked him and stated that Mr. Scanlan was ready to do a Secretary of State letter for him too, but he did not see the need for it at that time.

Mr. Bolton asked Mr. Bergeron if he had brought a copy of the email Mr. Scanlan sent him. Mr. Bergeron replied that he did not, but that it basically stated that they had put in a request for personnel and supposedly the process was started. Mr. Bolton stated that it would probably get caught up in the process like the preservation position. Mr. O’Neal added that he thought that everyone was very focused on the budget at that time. Mr. Bergeron asked if this was not the week that everything had to go to the finance committees. Mr. O’Neal replied that yes, they start their debates this week. Mr. Bergeron announced that it was time to return to the original agenda.

Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Bergeron explained to the committee that there were two sets of minutes to approve. There were minutes for the regular January 21, 2005 meeting and the February 11 specially called web query meeting. He asked if any members had any additions, corrections, or clarifications to the January minutes. Mr. Kruger made a motion to accept the minutes as written. Mr. O’Neal seconded and the committee voted unanimously to accept the January 21, 2005 minutes as submitted. Mr. Bergeron then asked if anyone had any additions, corrections, or clarifications to the February meeting minutes. Again, Mr. Kruger made a motion to accept and Mr. O’Neal seconded. The February 11, 2005 special VRIFAC meeting minutes were accepted as submitted.

5. NHVRIN Update:

Ms. Way distributed two packets of information to committee members. One of the packets distributed contained copies of the release notes for the newest NHVRIN release. She reiterated what Mr. O’Neal stated about the vacant position being in the waiver and reclassification process. She reported that release 1.41.1 had gone live the previous weekend and one of the slides Ms. Way presented was a brief overview of what they (OIT) had done preparing it for release. There were eighteen different issues addressed in the release.

OIT staff was able to baseline the NHVRIN code so that it is now in OIT’s configuration management tool. OIT is now fully responsible for the code behind the NHVRIN application. CNSI will no longer be performing any further modifications to it. That is now part of OIT’s responsibility. Ms. Way declared that part of the transition complete. She stated again that the latest release notes were included in the packet and that they were in the process of going through the notes to determine what information should be posted for users to access.

Some of the support activities that Ms. Way and her staff had recently been involved in were two new releases within the last three months. They put out release 1.40.1, which had fixes to the birth, death, and marriage resident reports. That came about because clerks were finding marriages, births, and deaths attributed to their city or town that were

Approved Minutes

for out of state residents. CNSI did a quick fix and OIT deployed it. Some current priorities OIT is working on is they have begun the analysis to remove the Haley's Rules Engine software from the application so we will not have to worry about the ongoing maintenance costs that have popped up in the last few months.

They are also doing web page postings and maintenance as needed, as requested by the DVRA. If there are messages that the business office wants relayed to users or new links to documentation they want posted, OIT puts them up on an ad hoc basis. They are also going through a preliminary analysis, working with the Department of Motor Vehicles in matching their licensing records with Vital Records data so they are not sending renewal messages to citizens that are deceased. They have had a number of complaints from the people that are upset that renewals have been sent for a loved one that has been deceased for several years. Mr. Bergeron reported that in Nashua they have the same problem with dog licenses.

OIT is also in the process of developing data extracts and the data extract process for the web query tool vendor. Ms. Way reported that they hoped to have a data set to send to the contractor by the following Monday. They are also identifying items and have a number of change requests that are already logged that they are looking at for the next release. She explained that we are now on a quarterly release schedule, which meant that the next release should go out in approximately three months. Ms. Way explained that her staff needed to sit down with the DVRA staff to prioritize items that they want to see in the new release. They need to determine how many fixes they can do and still get the release out on schedule.

Ms. Way explained that the next slide on the handout showed the number of change requests that she and her staff had been able to address and close since October 2004 when the application was returned to the OIT servers. Since the January 2005 VRIFAC meeting they had closed eighteen. Ms. Way then yielded to Mr. Allen to continue with the OIT update.

Mr. Allen reported that there were now 151 city and town clerks using NHVRIN. The following week there would be 16 additional users added after a training session. There are at least 10 already lined up for April, but they are shooting for 15. That will bring the total to 182 by the end of April. Of those, all but three will be on high speed. We will be down to two towns left on AMC by the end of April. As far as connectivity was concerned, Mr. Allen had identified 179 towns that do currently have broadband access. Whether they have it or not is another story but we can get it in there.

There are nine that have no broadband access at all. The rest are either on DMV or we just don't know. There are 18 towns that we are provisioning, two towns that have moved provisioning to taking care of it themselves. Mr. Allen stated that he hoped to see more of that in the future. He expects us to be provisioning 32 towns by April. One issue that he has run into, because he is going into towns that have had very little knowledge of who we are. They have had minimal contact with Vital Records.

Mr. Allen said that he had actually encountered open hostility. One town in particular pretty much told us to get lost. Mr. Bergeron asked if Mr. Allen had not run into difficulty in three towns. Mr. Allen replied that one town (Bath) had definitely said no. They had taken it to their selectmen and it was turned down. Knowing what their attitude toward the project, Mr. Allen did not think they presented a very enthusiastic view of the

Approved Minutes

project to the selectmen. Mr. Bergeron added that Mr. Bolton had offered to go and speak before the selectmen to explain NHVRIN. They were a town that did have broadband access but had no interest in linking up with Vital Records. Mr. Allen stated that he had brought up this town because his directive has always been to link up every town he can and this town was perfect, but opted not to participate.

Mr. Kruger suggested that Bath is not a tiny town and that there must be some activity in that town. Mr. Wurtz replied that in terms of Vital Records there was very little activity in Bath. He went on to say that he did not know if the reluctance to hook up with Vital Records was the town officials or just the town clerk. Mr. Allen stated that when he first approached the clerk she claimed that she was not involved in any of those decisions that she would have to put him in touch with the town secretary. He felt that she clearly wanted nothing to do with the situation.

Mr. Allen reported that he ran into a similar situation in Roxbury, but they had not yet said no. He spoke with the husband of the town clerk, who is also a selectman and got the distinct impression from him that his wife would not want it. Mr. Allen stated that he had asked why and the gentleman replied that she was a luddite (has no interest in technology whatsoever and does not even have a computer.). He had not spoken with the town clerk yet so the door was not completely shut, but he suspected it would be. Mr. Allen reported that the third town was Newcastle. He had not spoken with the town clerk, but had spoke with the deputy.

The deputy was very interested but expressed doubt that the clerk would be as he is very "territorial" and does not want anyone doing vital records, but him. The deputy felt that the clerk would be reluctant. Mr. Allen asked Mr. Bolton to personally call the town clerk to offer the service. The gentleman did call Mr. Bolton one day as Mr. Bolton was on his way out the door and Mr. Bolton got the distinct impression that he was not interested in coming on board. Mr. Allen added that he fully expected this to happen occasionally. Mr. Bergeron stated that it was his understanding of the law that we cannot make the clerks participate. Mr. Wurtz agreed, adding that from the beginning the division has done everything they could to encourage participation. He added that often when a new clerk comes in they are interested in working in NHVRIN.

Mr. Wurtz suggested that maybe the clerk's association might be able to assist in encouraging participation among its membership. He felt that possibly pointing out some of the benefits, such as being able to offer services to their residents they could not before, might help to convince some clerks. Mr. Allen explained that he already had to do that a lot. Now more than ever he has to sell what we are doing. Mr. Wurtz added that Vital Records has promoted that automation for years and he strongly suspected that many of the clerks that are not interested in change are also not active in the clerk's association.

Mr. Wurtz felt that many of the problems we encounter in trying to reach these clerks, is that they are just so disconnected from the whole environment. They choose to not attend meeting and therefore have not heard a lot of the discussion about automation. Mr. Kruger asked that since we are up to 98-99% of clerks on board, what is the cost of allowing these clerks to bow out of the system. Mr. Wurtz replied that if the towns were the size of Nashua we would be very concerned, but they are not. If they have an event that needs to be registered they will continue to do it manually, which is all they have available to them. That will require Vital Records staff will then have to convert the

Approved Minutes

manual document into electronic data. So it will not stop the flow of data it will just add another step to it, which is what we do now.

Mr. Kruger stated that he expected that response and surmised that those few clerks not coming online would represent a cost to Vital Records by requiring staff enter records onto the system. Mr. Bergeron explained that he felt there were several issues. He felt that the major issue is the fact that Vital Records would need to maintain parallel systems. Mr. Wurtz replied that the good news is that the parallel system that clerks are using is the typewriter and he is well versed in that system. He explained that he had heard the Bath story that morning and had gone into look at numbers to see what impact their refusal might have.

At first glance Mr. Wurtz could not find any recent records attributed to Bath. Mr. Bergeron expressed concern and suggested that there should be something as people do die there. Mr. Kruger suggested that the majority go to a hospital in another town. Mr. Pollard added that if someone dies it is the funeral director not the town clerk that files the death record. Mr. Wurtz stated that there could be things going on out there. He offered that the automated system forces a clerk to be accountable. Accountable for the documentation, the filing of the record, and the fees owed to the state. Those not on the NHVRIN system, are not really accountable to anyone.

Mr. Wurtz said that the biggest impact is to residents of the town that have to travel to another town in order to obtain certified copies of their records. All the services that could be brought into their community will not be. Mr. Bergeron stated that he would bring this issue to the attention of the clerk's association. He felt that even those that do not attend meetings must read their quarterly newsletter. He added that it was a matter of law that these people have to be connected to the internet to be part of the state centralized checklist. Ms. Hadaway replied that the clerk does not have to be part of the checklist. It can be the supervisors of the checklist that link to the internet. Mr. Wurtz said that because the Bath town hall has high speed internet access someone there must understand that value of it.

A committee member stated that the clerk's in question are not looking at this from a customer service perspective or they would be interested in making this service available to their residents. Mr. Kruger added that they do not want to learn something new or have another duty. Mr. Wurtz suggested that as technology becomes more and more intrusive into their world. Many of the hesitant clerks would retire and incoming clerks would hopefully be more enthusiastic about NHVRIN. We may not get them all online by this fall, but he felt that eventually they will all come along.

Mr. Allen reported that he had been making some inquiries about satellite service for the north country where there is no broadband access. The satellite companies do not make it easy if you are a government entity. He made a multitude of telephone calls to internet salespeople at Directway, the largest satellite internet provider in the country. Once he mentioned that there would not be a credit card to charge and that they would need to be approved as a state vendor they lost interest because they realized they were not going to get a sale right there on the spot. They instead, directed him to a link with forms and after digging as deeply as he could he found the only way to do this would be to submit a web inquiry form.

Approved Minutes

Mr. Allen reported that he was waiting for a response from them. He added that there are a lot of good deals out there if you are hooking it up as an individual. You can now get it hooked up for less than \$100. That is a substantial drop from the \$600 her was quoted previously for an individual or \$1000 for a business. There is a required 15 month service contract at \$100 per month. He was unsure as to whether that would be available to us or not. Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Allen if he had access to the spreadsheets of all the contracts. Mr. Allen replied that he did not know if he did or not. Mr. Armstrong stated that he was reasonable sure that there was already one company that the state was working with. Mr. Allen replied that it would be great to have someone to talk with about it. He added that things are moving pretty quickly and if he found enough towns with broadband he hoped to have 200 towns on board by the beginning of summer.

Mr. Bergeron told Ms. Way that he had received an email from the Dover city clerk and she had expressed concern that some fixes were released the weekend before and that there had been no notice or forewarning. She asked if that was true, why is there no policy in place about notifying users? Why was no one told about this release? It made it very difficult for those trying to use the system over the weekend, especially funeral directors. Mr. Bergeron explained that it was not meant to be a criticism, but asked if there was a way that users could be notified in advance of any NHVRIN down time. Ms. Way explained that we normally post a notice on the front page of NHVRIN. Because of other events earlier in the week that did not happen for this release.

The release was completed in one week so if a funeral director had not been on for more than a week they would have missed the notice anyway. They also post a notice (redirect page) so that users cannot even get into NHVRIN. So when they type in the URL they get a page that says, "NHVRIN is down for maintenance" and it gives them an approximate time it will be up and running again. Another problem that was noted was that Seneca told clerks that did call in that they had no knowledge of the system going down when they had been notified.

Ms. Way explained that it was just a matter of Seneca not reading their email. Mr. Allen is working with them on that to prevent it from happening again in the future. Even if Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz had been in the office to provide the language for a posting on NHVRIN it would have only been posted for two days. Mr. O'Neal explained that it was OIT's policy to provide a one-week notice for an infrastructure change. He added that the policy would not be sufficient for those users that only log on occasionally. They would still not get the information in time. Mr. Allen asked Mr. Wurtz if he hadn't mentioned that the business office usually sends out a fax.

Mr. Wurtz replied that historically they had always warned users by fax. He explained that for unforeseen circumstances a fax had not gone out that day. Mr. Allen offered that Mr. Wurtz had been in the hospital that evening. Mr. Pollard noted that there are still funeral directors out there that do not have fax lines. Mr. Bergeron stated that he would let the clerk know that this occasion was the exception rather than the rule. Mr. Allen stated that he, Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz had all been beating themselves up about it. Mr. Wurtz agreed that as a team they had dropped the ball.

Mr. Kruger asked how monumental the changes were that went into the release. Were they so important they could not have waited another week to allow for proper notice to users? Ms. Way replied that some of the fixes were significant and had been requested by clerks. Mr. Kruger asked how significant the changes identified for the next release

Approved Minutes

were. Ms. Way explained that they did not have any identified yet. She added that they had a list of 75 open change requests. They generally go through the change requests and try to recreate issues that have been reported and determine if it is a problem and if it is, what kind? They then determine a fix or work around and provide a list to Vital Records staff. It is then up to Vital Records to determine which ones take priority and make OIT aware of that ranking.

Mr. Kruger asked if any of the 75 change requests would be considered “show stoppers?” Ms. Way responded that there should not be. If there were no one had alerted her to it. If there were Ms. Way explained her staff would have been working on it immediately. Mr. Wurtz added that if it is a “show stopper” it is acted on very quickly. He explained that the Resident Report issue around the first of the year had been a “show stopper” and Ms. Way’s staff had jumped right on that and provided a fix. Mr. Bergeron asked Ms. Way if her staff dealt with accounting issues with the software. Mr. Wurtz replied that the SOSKB that was coming down the pike and asked Ms. Way if she had additional information.

Ms. Way stated that she would explain what they (OIT) were proposing they do with SOSKB, but wanted to be sure she understood what Mr. Bergeron’s question was. She explained when it comes to the reports generated about what a city or town owed in fees to the SOS her staff does maintain that part of the application. Her staff will be providing data from NHVRIN to SOSKB and the vendor brought in by SOS to build the invoicing system. Mr. Bergeron stated that he does not do many birth records, but he encountered a situation he wanted to share. An individual came into his office looking for a birth record for his child.

Mr. Bergeron pulled the record and discovered that the man was not listed as the father on the record. He did have all the paperwork to begin the process to have his name added, but was not on the record. Mr. Bergeron hit the cancel button and the system expected to collect the \$12 fee. Mr. Wurtz replied that it was a training issue. He explained that the money collection issue was common. If the system performs a service it expects to be paid. Mr. Bergeron asked if there was a glossary that explained what “cancel” means. Mr. Wurtz replied that there really is no way to cancel. This is what he spends the majority of his time on when doing the advanced training sessions. When you think you have gone too far and do not want to see it anymore, even the untrained clerk can click the big X and it all goes away.

In reality it is all still there and the \$12 is still there. Through pending searches they can find anything you have ever started and not completed. He explained that a great of time is spent in the advanced user training sessions showing users how they can avoid going too far to back out of a transaction. If Mr. Bergeron went and noticed that the father’s name was not on the record he could cancel that transaction and go to correction to amend the information, which corrects the database. He could then go back through the pending searches and select the correct record without having to re-key anything. That will bring you right back where you left off and you would be able to print the correct record and collect the fee like you are supposed to.

It is just a matter of closing one transaction, opening another and then going back to the original. You do that with very few keystrokes. That information is available in the advanced user training sessions Mr. Wurtz is currently holding. He explained that the training is imperative before we ever try to move permanently to an accounting system in

Approved Minutes

NHVRIN. There is no need for the system to collect a fee until you have told it that a certificate has printed correctly. Both Mr. Bergeron and Ms. Hadaway disagreed with Mr. Wurtz. Mr. Bergeron stated that if he answered “no” when the system asked if the certificate had been printed correctly and it printed it again and he then said “yes” the system then wanted \$24 instead of \$12. Mr. Wurtz replied that it was indeed a training issue and invited Mr. Bergeron to attend one of his advanced training sessions. Mr. Bergeron replied that he would be happy to. Mr. Wurtz then explained that when the document did not print correctly and the user tried again they would need to use the “exchange” option and the system would not charge an additional \$12.

Mr. Kruger asked if there was any way of going back in and purging those erroneous charges from the system. Mr. Wurtz replied that SOSKB is not mandated right now, but in the near future it very well might be. If that becomes the case we will have to say “Effective such and such date you will be accountable for the transactions made on your computers and there may be a need to establish a way to remove transactions from the system. The goal of the advanced training is to break the system at least four times to show the pending searches. At the end of the training we go back to clean up those transactions without collecting additional monies.

Mr. Wurtz added that sometimes though, users will have to take it on the chin if they have gone too far. If the system has performed a service it will need to request payment. There is no undo button to bring them back to the beginning. The system is too sophisticated through the audit trail to allow that. There are several opportunities along the way to identify if a transaction has gone bad and possibly change it. If not, collect the fee and then print the correct record and do an exchange. The theory has been proven, but all the users must be brought to that level.

Mr. Allen asked felt that having an additional step to correct a mistake is too much. He felt that users might be more inclined to correct their mistakes if they were prompted to. Mr. Wurtz replied that clerks could close their eyes, collect the money and hope no one knows, but that will not work. If they are going to be accountable for the money the process is, yes I collected the money. Did the certificate print correctly? No, then go back up through the exchange process and now it identifies the DCN number of the voided certificate and collects a fee for only the DCN that was issued.

Mr. Allen suggested that it might be easier for users to have the system prompt them for the exchange option if they select No when it asks if the certificate printed properly. Mr. Wurtz replied that it does. When you select no the system asks how many certificates are you voiding. Mr. Bergeron disagreed and Mr. Wurtz again invited him to attend an advanced user training session. Ms. Hadaway explained that one of the difficulties her staff member encountered was that she was having difficulty printing a certificate and pulled out some more safety paper. The paper was out of order so she had to void another DCN in order to continue and somehow along the way she was missing the exchange piece.

Mr. Wurtz suggested that operators would need to be trained to anticipate what the system expects. When a user tells the system they want to print two documents the system anticipates the next two DCNs and if the operator does not have those two numbers in hand the system does not know that. When they try to print the exchange record and do not give the DCN the system expects they will be there all day long. Through the training process you can minimize those types of issues by saying when

Approved Minutes

printing multiple copies make sure you have consecutively numbered safety paper in your hand. Those are just little things, but it is those little things that will beat you every time.

Mr. Allen suggested a pop up that suggests users call Mr. Wurtz with problems. Ms. Hadaway responded that they already do that. They do not need a pop up to tell them that. Mr. Bergeron asked what kind of timetable they were looking at and if they were still looking at piloting it in a few cities and town first. Mr. Wurtz replied that they were still planning pilots, but had not heard anything about when. Ms. Way stated that OIT had not been made aware of any timetable either. The last meeting they had participated in was to finalize the data elements that SOSKB would need from the NHVRIN system. They went through and had that document finalized and had heard nothing from the vendor since.

Ms. Way was under the impression that the vendor had been more tied up with HAVA because the invoicing piece will be tied in with them as well. Mr. Wurtz added that collectively there was still a great deal of work to do, getting all the towns up and running with the NHVRIN system is 1, and the total understanding of the accounting that is available in NHVRIN now and whether it is user friendly or not for everyone's ability to be functional. Ms. Hadaway replied that it was not. Mr. Wurtz continued that only when that is functional would the SOSKB system be beneficial. There was a great deal of work to do before we reached that milestone.

Ms. Hadaway stated that as a clerk and collector working with all the different software packages that they do (motor vehicle, etc.), there is always a way to cancel or delete a transaction and it does not hang around out there or multiply on you. She was concerned that the system was too particular and unforgiving. There have been times when they have looked under non-customer initiated search for a record because someone was not sure if their child's information was on file or not. They find it there and then go in through customer initiated and it will not come up. She does not want to charge them for the transaction but the system expects to be paid.

Mr. Wurtz replied that there were several parts of Ms. Hadaway's explanation of the situation that triggered him. If it is in non-customer it is definitely in the system. In customer initiated little things like a misspelled name or overpopulating the fields can return a no record found result. There is a way to change that from a fee to a no fee. There is a way to complete the transaction without a fee. Ms. Hadaway replied that users need to know how to do that. As clerks that is what they are used to. Mr. Wurtz stated that NHVRIN might be a little more complicated, but there is a way to end a transaction without having to collect a fee.

Mr. Wurtz explained that if the child was born in the clerk's town they would show under non-customer initiated, but if they were not born there they would only show up under customer initiated because clerks can only see their own city or town events on non-customer. Mr. Wurtz told Ms. Hadaway that because they could find it under non-customer, but not under customer initiated that narrowed it down a great deal. Ms. Hadaway reported that she was under the impression that there was some issue with the county or other information in the record.

Mr. Wurtz explained that there had been some conversion issues earlier but that those should have been taken care of by that point. In customer initiated search if you type in first name Stephen and last name Wurtz and if you are a typist that likes to hit the space

Approved Minutes

bar you can inadvertently add a space to a name and it will not be obvious to you, but will require that you add a space every subsequent time you try to pull it up. State users have the option of using soundex to find records. If someone calls us and says that they know the record is there but it will not come up in a search the first thing Mr. Wurtz tries is the name with a space before or after the name. Mr. Kruger asked if it would not be wiser to search for printable character as opposed to what we normally use.

Ms. Way said that a better way to search would be to do a wildcard search. She explained that if you did not know the exact spelling of the last name it could be programmed to look for names like Wurtz. Mr. Kruger replied that you could but he was addressing this particular issue. He felt that we were inviting human error and with the system as unforgiving as it is we should make the search criteria broad. He added that it is very difficult to un-train bad habits. Mr. Wurtz agreed and added that the space is the most frustrating because you cannot see it. He suggested that Ms. Way or Mr. O'Neal might be aware of a way to enhance the search that would allow it to find those names with extra characters or spaces.

Mr. O'Neal suggested that the application could be adjusted so that it would not save spaces when a record is added. Mr. Wurtz explained that the system will not take a number or symbol. Mr. Kruger asked why it could not be taken one step further to include spaces. Mr. Wurtz replied that was the direction he was headed. Ms. Way suggested that could interfere when there are records added with two last names that are not hyphenated, but separated with a space. It was decided it would have to be leading or end spaces that would not be allowed. Within the name a space would be allowed.

Mr. Armstrong stated that it was probably a good thing that the SOS was behind on getting SOSKB implemented. It seems like there will have to be a great deal of analysis of how to present it to the people. It sounds like a disaster waiting to happen. Ms. Way replied that the invoices coming from SOSKB look exactly like the report that users can currently pull up in NHVRIN. The issue that they discussed most during the initial discussion phase was the accountability and the audit trail. Ms. Way stated that she did not think the presentation was the issue it was the accountability and the audit trail. Mr. Armstrong agreed with Ms. Way that it would be the big issue.

Mr. Bergeron remarked that they in Nashua would need to balance their system on a daily basis. Mr. Wurtz apologized if members had heard this before, but offered that Vital Records staff balances their account on a daily basis using the same system so it is not a theory it is functional. They do have their share of things going wrong at the end of the day or during the day for that matter. The reconciliation between what NHVRIN says you owe and what SOSKB says you owe, how we are going to do that has yet to be discussed and it is most critical.

Mr. Bergeron explained that all the items on the agenda had been covered. He asked if there was any additional business. Ms. Hadaway asked Mr. Bergeron what timetable he had put on his survey. When clerks had to have them back to him. He replied that he would remind them after thirty days because he felt that after that long they would have forgotten that they had even received them. He also stated that he did not expect a 100% response. There had been turnover in some of the towns and clerks that are there were not around when the original survey was done.

Approved Minutes

Ms. Hadaway asked who would determine which towns would be selected. Mr. Bergeron replied that he felt that would be part of the budget that the big-ticket committee is working on. He hoped to have the subcommittee come before the full committee and explain how much they recommend is spent on specific projects. There were about thirty towns that did the survey in 1996. It has been nine years and it would be interesting to see what, if any work was done since and how much still needs to be done. There may even be new needs now. He felt that they should be able to come to the committee and give some recommendations within the next two months.

Mr. Armstrong asked if it was important that the new person be hired before decisions are made. Mr. Bergeron felt that it was important to get that position filled, but added that he believed the committee could release funds or recommend the release of funds for those cities and towns that have participated since that 1996 survey. Their needs have been previously documented. If the committee throws out grant applications to 240 communities and they all start coming in, we will need to follow up on the details, dollars, and what it is they really want to do.

Mr. Kruger made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. O'Neal seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 11:22 a.m.