

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

To The New Hampshire Department of State

-MINUTES-

***Thursday
January 21, 2005***

Approved Minutes

-MINUTES-

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

January 21, 2005

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

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

William R. Bolton, Jr., State Registrar
Judy Gaouette, Dover City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, City Clerk Appointment
Jill Hadaway, Bow Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment
Debbie Augustine, NH Hospital Association
William Armstrong, IT Manager, DITM Appointment
Thomas A. Andrew, MD, Physician Appointment
John O'Neal, OIT, DHHS Appointment
David Kruger, Public Member Appointment
David Scanlan, Secretary of State Appointment

COMMITTEE MEMBERS EXCUSED:

Dr. Frank Mevers, State Archivist Appointment
David Pollard, Funeral Director Appointment
Fred Ruscsek, Manchester Health Officer, DHHS Appointment
Doug Hall, Vital Records User, DHHS Appointment
Kimberly Johnson, Henniker Town Clerk, Town Clerk Appointment

GUESTS:

Melanie A. Orman, Vital Records, SOS
Steve Wurtz, Vital Records, SOS
Karen Way, OIT
Todd Dahl, OIT
Tom Bruner, OIT, DHHS
Eric Allen, OIT

Approved Minutes

Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee Meeting

1. Approval of Minutes:

Mr. Bolton called the meeting to order. He explained that with Ms. Little gone there was no chairperson and that he would run at least the first few agenda items until the new chair takes over. He then asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the November 18, 2004 meeting. Mr. Kruger offered the motion and Mr. Bergeron seconded. Mr. Bolton called for a vote and the minutes were accepted as written.

2. New Member Welcome:

Mr. Bolton introduced and welcomed new committee members. Ms. Jill Hadaway, Town Clerk of Bow taking Ms. Hartson's place and Ms. Judy Gouette, City Clerk from Dover, replaces Ms. Little. Mr. John O'Neal appointed to represent OIT by Mr. Bailey. Mr. David Scanlan has also been appointed to the committee as a representative of the Secretary of State's office.

3. Election:

Mr. Bolton explained that Ms. Little's departure had left the committee without a chairperson and that vacancy needed to be addressed. He called for nominations for a new Chairperson for the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee. Hearing none, Mr. Bolton nominated Mr. Bergeron for Chairperson. Ms. Hadaway seconded his nomination. With no other nominations being made the Acting Chairperson, Mr. Bolton called for an uncontested election for the Chairperson of the committee and he cast a single ballot for Mr. Bergeron on behalf of the whole committee. Mr. Paul Bergeron, Nashua City Clerk, then became the new Chairperson of the Vital Records Improvement Fund Advisory Committee.

4 NHVRIN Update:

Staffing Update:

Ms. Way explained that she would be providing a brief update and would be covering the items Mr. Bolton had listed on the meeting agenda. The first item was a staffing update. Ms. Way introduced the committee to Mr. Tom Bruner, a Systems Development Specialist IV, who had joined the OIT staff working on NHVRIN. She then informed the committee that there was an intern working on the project as well. Her name is Jennifer Hosmer and she could not attend the meeting as she was in class. Ms. Hosmer is working with OIT on Tuesdays and Fridays. Her assignment is helping with the .Net side and the database side of NHVRIN. Mr. Bruner is primarily focused on the database side.

Ms. Way explained that the team now consisted of Mr. Bruner, Ms. Hosmer, Ms. Goonan, Mr. Dahl, Mr. Allen, and herself. She added that there was still one vacancy on the team and that position was undergoing reclassification. It was a position that OIT had vacant and transferred to the NHVRIN group. They had already received a waiver and were just waiting for the reclassification from the Department of Personnel so it could be posted. The position title would be Technical Team Lead.

Approved Minutes

NHVRIN Release Update:

Ms. Way explained that they (OIT) were in the process of testing NHVRIN version 1.41 in the systems integration region. She added that she had moved the necessary requests to the User Acceptance Testing environment. Those should be completed by the end of the day. They were planning to put the build into the UAT that afternoon so it would be available to internal testers. The target date for release was February 7, 2005 so there will be UAT testing going on between now and then. There were nineteen discrepancies reported to CNSI prior to their leaving that are included in this build.

Ms. Way explained that there would be several other fixes included that were not originally listed as discrepancies. They were work that had not been completed by CNSI before the last release. Ms. Way announced that this would be the last release where CNSI would be the primary developer. In version 1.42 or whatever the numbering scheme ends up being, NHVRIN will be fully supported by the OIT team. Ms. Way explained that OIT plans to go to a quarterly release process, which would be discussed in greater detail later during the SLA portion of the meeting.

NHVRIN Rollout:

Ms. Way reported that Mr. Allen had been working on getting new PCs out to users and getting new users online. She asked Mr. Allen if he could update the committee on the number of users, new users, number on broadband, etc. Mr. Allen reported that since the last meeting of the committee, thirty users had been added to NHVRIN. The total number of users was 140. 138 of which are on broadband. The three towns that are not using broadband are the same towns (Pittsburg, Stewartstown and Unity) discussed at the previous meeting. Mr. Wurtz asked Mr. Allen if his figures counted the new users that had gone on following the training the day before. Mr. Allen replied that they had not, that there were actually now 151 users. Ten more had been added.

Mr. Allen reminded the committee that one of the things discussed at the last meeting was provisioning towns. There were now twelve towns that they had provisioned broadband and firewalls. He stated that he continued to be surprised at the number of towns with access to broadband and those that already have it that are coming out of the woodwork. He estimated that the committee would end up provisioning broadband for twenty-five to thirty-five towns.

Mr. Armstrong asked Mr. Allen to explain what he meant by provisioning. Mr. Allen replied that we are now moving into towns that not only are not automated they are not hooked up to broadband. When he visits the towns and explains that they need to come onto NHVRIN and will need the Internet to use it he often finds they have no access nor plan to obtain it in the near future. If they have no access he offers to provide it to them at no cost to use with the NHVRIN application. Mr. Bolton distributed an agreement that cities/towns being provisioned were asked to sign. The agreement is for the clerk to use the broadband for Vital Records purposes only and to not allow anyone to hook up any other machines.

One of the things Mr. Allen explained that he had been doing over the last several months was negotiating with internet providers and they now have in place an agreement with Comcast, Time Warner, Adelphia, Pine Tree Cable, and Verizon to provide broadband services for town clerks at the residential rates that is roughly \$45-\$55 per month with no

Approved Minutes

installation charges. All in all he felt the providers had been very supportive and agreeable. He is also working with Metrocast and TDS to bring them on board.

Mr. Bolton explained the agreement he distributed to the committee. The agreement allows the town to receive broadband service underwritten by the committee if they agree that they will not use it for other business or try to piggyback other machines onto the Vital Records PC. It also states that once a town brings broadband into its other offices the committee would expect them to then provide their own service. Mr. Kruger asked if the agreement had been implemented with any towns yet. Mr. Bolton replied that it had not. That it was hot off the press. He added that if the committee agreed that this document was sufficient they would then ask those towns already being provisioned and any future towns would be asked to sign it. Mr. Allen stated that it should not be a problem getting them to sign, as he had been very clear when explaining the provisioning of service.

Mr. Bergeron asked if Mr. Bolton was looking for a formal vote on the agreement. Mr. Bolton replied that he was. Mr. Bergeron advised that committee members take a few moments to look at the document. Mr. Kruger asked if when they come up with an agreement such as the one before the committee, did they get a legal opinion on the document before using it. Mr. Bolton replied they did not. Mr. Kruger asked if he thought they should. Mr. Bolton replied that he did not know.

Mr. Kruger then asked Mr. Scanlan if it would be wise from the Secretary of State's perspective to have the document vetted. He explained that in the business world every time he saw a document like the one before the committee, he was under the impression that it went through an attorney. Mr. Scanlan replied that from his perspective this document is just an understanding between the city/town and the state rather than something contractual. Mr. Kruger agreed and thanked Mr. Scanlan for clarifying the situation. Mr. Bolton offered that the language in the document sounded "pretty legal." He said that he guessed it was written that way to give that impression.

Mr. Bolton replied that he was unsure who the "authority" would be in a city or town. The city or town clerk would need to sign off on the document but he was unsure who else from the city/town would need to. He suggested the Mayor, a selectman or the Town Manager could possibly do it. Mr. Bergeron replied that he thought that it would vary from town to town. There are certain types of agreements he is allowed to sign in Nashua and others that must be acted on by the board. Mr. Bolton stated that in reality it might just be the clerks that need to sign.

Mr. Allen replied that he would hope that they could keep it as simple as possible because the more layers of red tape that they have to go through the more it will slow down the process. He felt the agreement was simple. We are offering them a service for free and these are our terms. He asked if there was any reason why a town clerk could not just agree to it and that would be the end of it. Mr. Bergeron asked about just changing the signature line to "Authorized Signature." Mr. Bolton agreed. Mr. Allen asked if in some cases the agreement would need to be brought to a monthly meeting to be discussed.

Ms. Hadaway stated that it was possible. There are some towns where the selectmen are real micromanagers and make sure that anything like this is beyond the town clerk's scope. Other towns allow the clerk to make decisions on their own because they would be

Approved Minutes

the ones using it. She added that she felt it was important that town managers and selectmen know about the agreement because if the town finds out the clerk has this hookup it would be very easy for other departments to all of a sudden decide that they would piggyback or use the clerk's computers for some of their work. She felt that it was important that they be aware of the restrictions.

Mr. Allen replied that the other offices physically could not piggyback. Normally when he has gone in to provision a town the clerk has not had the authority to allow the provider to do the work. They have had to get administrative approval. He was just concerned that it would turn into a big process where the city/town officials were allowed to decide whether the clerk would get broadband service when they were not even being asked to pay for it.

Ms. Orman reported that one of Ms. Hartson's concerns when this was discussed previously was that city/town clerks come and go and the agreement would need to be revised each time. She also was unsure of her authority to obligate the town. Mr. Allen asked if the agreement was "obligating" the town or are we just saying these are our assets and this is the agreement, and if anyone should ignore the agreement we can pull the service. Ms. Hadaway replied that it might seem simple from Mr. Allen's viewpoint but in town government it is not quite so simple. Mr. Kruger added that the interpersonal dealings have to be taken into consideration when dealing with smaller cities and towns.

Mr. Kruger stated that he had two additional questions. He asked if the committee should drop the reference to city on the agreement since he believed from a practical standpoint the cities would not avail themselves of this. His second question was if Mr. Bolton felt he had authority to tap into the VRIF funds without coming back to the committee if towns did avail themselves to this offer. Mr. Bolton replied that he did because the committee had previously voted to support the provisioning.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he liked Mr. Kruger's suggestion of just having town clerk listed on the agreement and he felt that the fact that the clerk would be signing it on the basis of his/her office rather than an individual would have the effect of carrying that responsibility/duty forward. Adding an Authorized Signature line would address any of the variables of whether or not it goes to the selectmen, town manager, or business manager. He felt that would simplify the form and address all the issues raised. Mr. Bolton agreed to add the authorized signature line. Mr. Bergeron asked for any further discussion.

Mr. Kruger made a motion that the VRIF committee accepts the broadband user agreement with suggested changes. A committee member seconded Mr. Kruger's motion. Mr. Bergeron called for a vote and the committee unanimously voted to accept the broadband agreement with suggested amendments. Mr. Bergeron asked Mr. Allen what the timeline was to have everyone on NHVRIN. Mr. Allen replied that it depended on what Mr. Bergeron's definition of "everyone" was. Mr. Bergeron replied that he was referring to city/town clerks. Mr. Allen explained that he meant that in reference to city/town clerks.

To get 100% coverage through broadband seemed nearly impossible to Mr. Allen. He explained that physically the infrastructure is just not there. He still did not know exactly how many towns have broadband access today and how many will have it as they near the end of the project. Mr. Allen reported that all clerks could go on NHVRIN, but a

Approved Minutes

number would need to go on dialup connections and anyone that has used dialup knows that it is a hideous enough experience that to expose a new user to NHVRIN with a dialup connection would be a really bad introduction. He felt that at the rate they were bringing on new towns they could easily hit 180-200 towns by the end of the summer.

Mr. Allen explained that he knew this was also an important issue to the Secretary of State's Office. He reported that according to Mr. Cloutier HAVA would work on dialup. Mr. Scanlan replied that it probably would but it would be more desirable to have users on broadband connections. Mr. Allen stated that if there is no infrastructure set up the options are fewer and pricey. Satellite is one and he had heard that VPNs do not work on satellite because of latency issues. We are not using a VPN so it may not be an issue but the cost is astronomical. A residential hookup is \$600, and \$1000 for a business class hookup and that is installation only.

Depending on whether an annual contract is signed or not it could be anywhere from \$60 to \$100 per month and this would be for towns with incredibly low numbers. They may perform one or two transactions per month. The other option is ISDN and Mr. Allen stated that he would recommend against that too, because it is barely twice the speed of a good dialup connection and he has seen a town using a DSL connection at about the same speed. At that time he recommended that they upgrade to broadband because of how slow the DSL was. He was unsure as to how the committee wanted to approach rolling out NHVRIN and having 100% saturation with those realities in mind. Mr. Bergeron thanked him for his report.

Mr. Kruger asked Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz about the aggregate volume of the potential remaining thirty to forty towns. He thought it must be quite small. Mr. Bolton replied that it was, but they were looking at those sites now. Mr. Kruger stated that he understood that he was just trying to get an idea of the volume involved. If they are at 200 cities and towns by the end of summer what does that really leave? Mr. Wurtz replied that the rollout they had done the day before involved towns that had as few or as many as fifteen marriages per year. That is the level they are at right now. Mr. Wurtz explained that opens up a new business area for those clerks because they are now able to issue records from the NHVRIN database. If we are using number of marriages as an indicator he explained that we are already at the very small town level already.

Mr. Allen asked if Mr. Wurtz could give them an idea of the percentage of Vital Records data was currently hooked up to NHVRIN. Mr. Allen asked if it was nearing 95%. Mr. Wurtz replied that it had passed 95% long ago. Mr. Kruger suggested that it was probably 99% and Mr. Wurtz agreed. Mr. Bolton added that they were all aware of the fact that very little data comes from those smaller towns but the goal was to provide those towns with customer service and to allow them to furnish documents for their residents.

Mr. Allen asked what they thought the customer in that small town would think of having to wait extremely long times for their documents. Would they find it more convenient to go to a town five miles away that is connected through broadband? Mr. Kruger added that wouldn't it be better for them to travel to that town five miles away than for this fund or some fund to have to pay up to \$1000 in order to provide that one record. He did not feel it was economically feasible to provide service to the smallest towns.

Mr. Allen stated that at some point he would like to think that broadband technology would be pervasive throughout the state. Mr. Bolton asked how they could assure that?

Approved Minutes

Is there a way to guarantee that rural underserved areas are given the same advantages as larger areas are? Mr. Allen replied that he had been discussing this issue with Mr. Stevens from the SOS because they have an interest in it also because of HAVA. When Mr. Allen explained to Mr. Stevens how frustrating it is to see a Verizon central office in the Georgetown/Pittsburg area but do not offer broadband there because of low customer volume. It was suggested that someone could go before the Public Utilities Commission. That was mentioned as a possibility but they would like a complete list of underserved areas before they do.

Mr. Armstrong asked if there wasn't a North Country Telecommunications plan that was supposed to be released soon. Mr. Bergeron replied that he was not sure when it was due but he had read about it in the paper. It was aimed at bringing new business into the North Country and recognized that it would be difficult without access to high-speed Internet. Mr. Armstrong suggested that the Department of Resources and Economic Development had been in charge of that in the past and might still be. He suggested that Mr. Allen might be able to use information from that report in this effort.

Mr. Bergeron stated that with HAVA they have until the 2006 election to have everything implemented. He suggested that they push NHVRIN as far as possible and those smaller communities with no access could work with the HAVA group to get them connected prior to the 2006 election. Mr. Allen added that he hoped the number he was throwing out was a worse case scenario. Of the one hundred forty-one towns he had been in touch with, only three have been inaccessible.

Ms. Way reported that Mr. Wurtz had been holding New User Training sessions at the Nash building. In fact, the training room is reserved for training sessions regularly from January to June of 2005. These training sessions are aimed at bringing new users on to NHVRIN. One of the support activities that OIT had been undertaking was rebuilding the WebApp1 development server. It had crashed two weeks before and actually caused them to push back the release from January 31, 2005 because their development environment was down.

They were also reviewing the use of the Haley's Rules Engine so that possibly in the future they could remove it from the application. It controls some of the mandatory fields in the death module. In an effort to reduce costs they would like to take it out because it is not used throughout the entire application. OIT is participating in monthly technical team meetings where staff from the Operations (development) group meet with Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz to make sure the project is on schedule and everyone is on the same page. Ms. Goonan, the OIT Business Analyst, will be spending one day per week with Vital Records staff to get a better grasp of the business processes that are being used.

Ms. Way explained that for the most part, OIT staff assigned to the NHVRIN project is new to vital records software and its processes. They are learning as they go while trying to provide the best customer service possible. They have a database called the Change Request Tracking System (CRTS) and a number of entries have been made into that database identified as problems either through Seneca tickets or Vital Records staff. It allows OIT to examine the issue, identify fixes, etc. while allowing Vital Records staff the ability to see where the issue is in the process, prioritize them and see who is working to resolve them. They have also been doing regression testing. Making sure that the new

Approved Minutes

fixes in the new build haven't "broken" something that was already in existence in the application.

Ms. Way reported that since the last VRIF meeting OIT had closed ninety Seneca tickets. The majority of those had been password resets. Mr. Allen informed Ms. Way that all the open tickets were now closed. Ms. Way then explained that OIT had also been downloading all the deliverables and other documentation that CNSI had developed and put in their web portal called "As-One." That was their central information storage. Because the portal will eventually disappear to us, Ms. Way reported that they had been downloading it and storing it in a central location where OIT and Vital Records staff would have access to it. It will allow everyone to go back and look at things they do not understand and get clarification of information about licensing issues on third party software they used in the creation of NHVRIN.

Ms. Way then reported that she is submitting weekly OIT progress reports to Vital Records based on the status of what the Development group has been working on and also (when she has anything) information on the Operations or DBA group. She added that they had gone through the completion of support transition from CNSI to OIT. They still have contact with CNSI when there are issues they are unable to solve. That contact is becoming more and more infrequent. Ms. Way asked if any committee members had any questions.

Mr. Bergeron asked if she could list any of the issues that were being addressed with the new release. Ms. Way replied that she had not received prioritization from Mr. Bolton or his staff as to what those should be. Mr. Bolton stated that he thought Mr. Bergeron was talking about the version due to be released within the next month. Mr. Bolton stated that there were release notes that described modifications. He mentioned that the Death Abstract was one change, but he could not recall everything off the top of his head.

Ms. Way explained that there were several changes to the death module and to the birth module. There were columns added to a birth table. Things that were not there initially and were later identified as necessary, and functionality that was there, but not working was fixed. She then asked Mr. Bolton if he wanted the release notes sent out to the members of the committee. Mr. Bolton replied that he did. Ms. Way was asked if the release notes were posted on the NHVRIN opening page. Ms. Way replied that they did not currently post them there. Mr. Bolton replied that Ms. Eccleston had posted what was "broken" and what was "fixed." Some of the clerks that do not use it everyday appreciated having that information there and do miss it.

Mr. Wurtz reported that the problem is that sometimes the system goes down without warning. When it is a planned occurrence there is notice posted for a week or two beforehand. Ms. Hadaway explained that the biggest issue she has been encountering is missing data. If they look up something in non-customer search the record will come up. When they change to customer initiated search the record will not come up. Mr. Wurtz explained that there was some difficulty with some of the records that were converted over to NHVRIN. In one case the records were incomplete because New Hampshire had been abbreviated to NH and the system did not recognize that abbreviation so it did not convert it. Ms. Way's team had worked on fixes for those issues.

Mr. Wurtz added that one of the fixes he believed users would find in the new release was when you pull up a record using either customer or non-customer initiated search the

Approved Minutes

record that comes up does not show you everything. The generational ID and junior, senior, etc. was missing from that screen. That is prompting many clerks to go in and try to correct the record. Correction is not necessary as the information is there it is just not displayed on the detail screen. He believed that the fix for that problem was included in the latest release. He did want the clerks to know that what shows on the detail screen is not always the whole picture. Mr. Wurtz was under the impression that the issue of missing information had been resolved in the newest release. Mr. O'Neal asked if Mr. Bolton had stated that they "used" to post the release notes.

Mr. Bolton replied that Ms. Eccleston had posted identified/reported problems and those that had been fixed. Mr. Wurtz stated that not everything in the release notes would mean anything to the clerks. The items that would be of interest to users were posted. Mr. Allen asked if they were not just doing that so users could see the problems already identified and not keep reporting the same issue. Mr. Wurtz answered in the affirmative. Mr. Bergeron asked if it had helped cut down calls. Mr. Wurtz and Mr. Bolton felt that it had helped. Mr. Bergeron asked if it was something that Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz would like to see continue.

Mr. Wurtz replied that from the business side when you have people calling in like they did for the death abstract. That was there and has now been solved. Ms. Gaouette added that seeing it there was comforting as she could tell that it was not yet resolved while it was displayed there. Mr. Wurtz thanked Ms. Gaouette and stated that any time a new release is completed there will be questions about what changes have been made and a posting of this nature would answer many of those questions. Ms. Way asked Mr. Bolton and Mr. Wurtz if they could pick out the items from the release notes that they wanted posted. Mr. Wurtz offered to give Ms. Way the "Reader's Digest" version of the release notes that they wanted posted.

Mr. Bolton suggested that going forward they could pick out CRs (Change Requests) that they have identified that might be important to clerks. Ms. Way agreed. Mr. Allen asked if it would not also make sense to post information, as issues are resolved. Mr. Bolton agreed. Mr. Dahl asked if the committee wanted to see the information by date. Mr. Allen replied that the date might be helpful so they would know when it had been posted long enough. Ms. Hadaway felt that the postings were very helpful to clerks. It not only enabled them to plan for down time, but to know whether to call in a problem or not.

Ms. Way explained that her only other handout was a graph that addressed Seneca tickets. It showed the number of tickets addressed and the date they were addressed. Mr. Bolton asked her if the spike in the graph was because of password issues. She replied that it was. Users were locking themselves out after trying to change their passwords. OIT is trying to determine a more streamlined way to change the passwords for users to eliminate the problem.

5. Budget Update:

Mr. Bergeron stated that a lot of the information he was distributing would be of little interest, but he wanted the committee to see what he was trying to get done. He explained that in his three years with the committee he did not remember a time when everyone was 100% satisfied with the financials they were getting. He spoke with Ms. Penney from the Secretary of State's office the week prior and made arrangements to

Approved Minutes

pick up a detailed report on Tuesday following the HAVA session. He did not get a chance to look at the report until the night before this meeting. When he did, he noticed that the information it contained does not really answer the kinds of questions the committee generally asks.

The report Ms. Penney gave him essentially just listed under expenditures, the check number and the amount. That is not the kind of detail that he wants to see. He reported that he spoke with Mr. Bolton that morning before the meeting to see what kinds of other reports might be available. He did not want to run a parallel financial accounting system, he did want to identify the types of information the state can access and then just plug it into some kind of template so the committee has the same information from month to month. Right now everything is just broken down by class, like employees.

Mr. Bergeron stated that he wondered if there was not some commodity break down, so they might see it broken down a little further. Are there reports where the committee can see specific amounts paid to specific vendors? He hoped that by the next meeting he would have some examples for the committee and that those would allow him to build a different type of revenue/expenditure report so that everyone could understand where everything is being spent. He then directed the committee's attention to the summary sheet. He reported that he had taken the numbers provided on that document from the report Ms. Penney had given him.

Receipts for the first six months of the fiscal year were \$453,000 and the totals expended during that same time was \$230,862. There were not a lot of large items listed on the report other than equipment and other expenses. He asked Mr. Scanlan or Mr. Bolton if they wanted to comment on those. They did not. Mr. Bergeron added that over the next several months he hoped to make the financial reporting to the committee better. Mr. Armstrong reported that there was an ERP project going on in the state. With any luck it would be moving along in the month following the meeting and would allow access to better reports. Mr. Bergeron thanked Mr. Armstrong. He stated that he had told Mr. Bolton that he had spent a number of years in the retail business and part of his daily activity was to sit there and look at the financials and compare the data.

Even today in the clerk's office he still looks at his numbers daily. Mr. Bergeron added that if he was a manager in a state office and could not look at his numbers when he wanted to it would drive him nuts. Mr. Bergeron believes the data is out there "We just need to find a way to get it and display it." Mr. Kruger agreed, adding "We are expending money for permanent personnel for instance. At presumably \$300,000 a year, yet it only shows \$38,000 for six months. Obviously there is something else out there that hasn't fallen into this particular report."

6. Service Level Agreement (SLA):

Mr. Bolton distributed a copy of the SLA that the Secretary of State's office and OIT entered into. He explained that it describes the type of service that OIT will deliver and the implications for both parties. He then asked Mr. O'Neal if he wanted to go into greater detail. Mr. O'Neal replied that he just wanted to draw the committee's attention to a couple of things. He first directed them to #2 Definitions. One of the things he heard Ms. Hadaway say was that if a clerk does not log onto NHVRIN everyday they don't know if the service is going to be available.

Approved Minutes

Mr. O'Neal explained that what he and Mr. Bolton had agreed to was being called "primetime hours." They were 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Friday and 8:00 to 12:00 noon on Saturday. Only an extraordinary circumstance will disturb the application during those times. All maintenance will be deferred and releases will be done after 6:00 p.m. weeknights or after 12:00 noon on Saturdays. Only catastrophic failure will prevent the NHVRIN system from being available during those hours. Also he wanted to point out some additions or changes that had been made since the last time the committee had looked over the agreements. "Cold backups" and "Hot backups," there was some question as to when the application would be available. Again, they had agreed upon the times that the application would be available to users.

Mr. O'Neal explained that Cold backups require that the database come down. That means that the application is unavailable during that time. The cold backup is done at 1:00 a.m. on Monday mornings. The application is generally back up by 5:00 to 6:00 a.m. that same morning. Hot backups are done every night and do not require the application be brought down. They are taking snapshots of the data all the time. Mr. O'Neal went on to explain that he and Mr. Bolton had agreed upon "Priority 1" and "Priority 2" definitions. Further into the agreement there are response times tied to the level of priority. How OIT reacts to each type of problem.

Section three of the agreement is the service provided by OIT. It just describes what the groups in OIT are and what they do. Agency software is Ms. Way, Operations does the support of the Windows environment and the database, and Technical Support is part of what Mr. Allen does. It is just a brief description of the groups and what it is that they do. Under "Rules and Responsibilities" Mr. O'Neal stated that he had categorized 4.1 OIT and 4.2 SOS. 4.1 is how OIT will do it and 4.2 is what DVRA wants OIT to do. Under "Expectations and Assumptions" they cover how they will react to a critical problem, maintenance and outage notification, up-time requirements (99.9%), and definition of what their backup windows are and how they will respond to critical fixes.

Mr. O'Neal promised that he would better package the agreement the next time around. It is supposed to be updated annually or when circumstances change. The agreement basically covers how OIT will respond to outages, what their maintenance windows are, up-time goals, backup facilities they will put in place and response. He added that in 5.2 the assumption is that DVRA staff is available from 8:00 to 4:00 p.m. and OIT's support window is from 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. There is a little difference but not a lot. Mr. O'Neal said that as Ms. Way had previously mentioned in 5.2.2 they were having monthly technical meetings at Mr. Bolton's request and bi-weekly program team meetings where they discuss issues such as what would be in the next release and what are current priorities?

DVRA and OIT are trying to establish a strong working relationship. Mr. O'Neal stated that OIT as a team would be active in the VRIF meetings. They are also having their Business Analyst work with Mr. Bolton's staff so they might better understand the business, because they currently do not. They would also like to have their development staff work as part of the DVRA staff occasionally. He reiterated that the more they know about the business the better they will be able to support the application effectively.

Mr. O'Neal also asked that city/town clerks occasionally invite OIT staff associated with NHVRIN to observe NHVRIN in use in their offices. Ms. Gaouette told Mr. O'Neal to consider himself invited any time. Mr. Bergeron warned Mr. O'Neal to go to the bigger

Approved Minutes

cities where the application is in constant use. He cautioned Mr. O'Neal that he would witness a great deal of frustration during certain times of the day. Mr. O'Neal wrapped up saying that OIT planned to institute a quarterly release schedule following the February 7 release of the latest version of NHVRIN. He added that the quarterly release schedule did not mean that if there was a serious issue with the application that they would make a badly needed fix wait until the next scheduled release. It just means that they want to try and get on a regular release schedule. If there were something terribly wrong with the application OIT would correct it and do an emergency release without waiting for the scheduled date.

7. Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

Mr. Scanlan reported that it was his understanding that the MOU was the next step after the SLA had been signed. It is the financial package and there is no expectation that anything would change from the information previously provided to the committee. Mr. O'Neal agreed with Mr. Scanlan. Mr. Scanlan told Mr. O'Neal that he probably had a better grasp on the timeframe. Mr. O'Neal replied that Ms. Little had asked him to commit that he would have an updated MOU and SLA to the SOS in two weeks. He admitted it actually took him a month. He and Mr. Bolton were able to work on the SLA, but they need Mr. Cloutier in order to work on the MOU.

Mr. O'Neal reported that he had updated the MOU since the committee had seen it last, but it was behind schedule and unfortunately Mr. Cloutier had a previous commitment to HAVA activities and had not been able to commit a great deal of time to the MOU. Mr. O'Neal stated that if he had gotten the document updated earlier rather than later they would probably have a signed document now. He reported that it was ready and had been sent to the SOS for review. They are just waiting for Mr. Cloutier to get a chance to go over it. Mr. Bergeron stated that the Application design for HAVA would end February 1, hopefully freeing up Mr. Cloutier somewhat. Mr. Bergeron asked if the gentlemen thought the committee would be able to see the MOU at the March meeting. Mr. Scanlan replied that they should.

5. Big Ticket Items:

Mr. Bolton distributed a handout to the committee. He explained that the document he handed out was the budget that went forward and was approved. It identified big-ticket items. He explained it is why he felt confident that he could make agreements with broadband service providers. They had previously budgeted forty sites at \$100 each. At the August 12, 2004 meeting in addition to the budget the committee tasked them with putting together a business plan to make sure the budget items go forward and how they will go forward. The business plan has not yet been developed. Mr. Bolton felt the next logical step would be to form a sub-committee to study the issue and come up with a document that would be acceptable to the full committee.

Mr. Bergeron suggested that new members should be brought up to speed. He explained that the committee had contracted some time ago with the InLook Group to have them assist the committee with the development of a business plan for the preservation piece of the Vital Records Improvement Fund expense items. They presented the committee with a report and the committee voted to move forward with the hiring of a local Records Preservation Manager and to establish a grants program. The rest of the InLook Group's report's business plan really hadn't been "put to bed yet." He felt that a subcommittee

Approved Minutes

was a good idea. They could come up with a business plan and then present it to the full committee for its consideration.

Mr. Bergeron asked for volunteers. Mr. Bolton and Mr. Armstrong volunteered. Mr. Scanlan volunteered himself and Dr. Mevers. Mr. Bergeron asked if either Ms. Gaouette or Ms. Hadaway had time to volunteer. Ms. Hadaway replied that she did not have time to be on the subcommittee. Mr. Bergeron offered that he would sit on the subcommittee as well. Mr. Wurtz volunteered to serve as a non-member. Mr. Bergeron thanked him. He reported that with Mr. Wurtz there were six volunteers, but added if there was any interest by anyone else in attendance to please let him know. Any committee members were welcome to attend the subcommittee meetings.

Mr. Bergeron reported that the other big-ticket item was the local records preservation initiative. He asked if there was any news on that end. If the position outlined in the InLook report had been posted yet. Mr. Scanlan replied that when the position had been approved it came to the Secretary of State's attention that there was a highly qualified individual that might be interested in the position, but that individual did not know whether they would be able to accept the position right away. It turned out that he could not accept the position and that development occurred right around election time and was moved to the backburner.

Mr. Scanlan reported that he had told the Secretary of State that they should probably move forward, but he has been extremely busy so there has been no movement recently. He did feel it would be made a top priority soon. Mr. Scanlan thought that he would be able to report some progress by the next meeting of the committee. Mr. Bergeron stated that it was a very important initiative to the committee and they would appreciate it if he would put it on the front burner because there are funds the committee would like to expend this fiscal year. He would like to get the grants program underway so the communities can start working on their preservation assessments and some of the very expensive, time-consuming projects that must be completed before spending anything on restoration or storage facilities. It is very important to the towns that this initiative proceed quickly.

Mr. Bergeron was asked if the funding for these grants came from the committee. He replied that they did and that they were earmarked strictly for vital records. He did add that clerks would gain a lot of knowledge from this initiative that would benefit the town's records as well. The grants would be very similar to the conservation grants except there will be a staff member dedicated to assisting the cities and towns. That person would provide some field assistance as well as manage the grants program.

6. Data Web Tool:

Mr. Bolton stated that it might have been a little premature to place that item on the agenda. He reported that he was working with New Hampshire's former Registrar Mr. Charles Sirc, who now works with the National Center for Health Statistics. There is a contractor Constella Health Sciences that has produced a data web inquiry tool for NIOSH. Mr. Sirc is fairly confident that this contractor could produce a tool that would satisfy data mining needs of vital record data. They have had several conversations and Mr. Bolton had hoped to have more forward progress before this meeting as far as the nature of the help the contractor can provide and what that help would cost.

Approved Minutes

There was a teleconference scheduled for the following Tuesday or Wednesday with Mr. Sirc and the contractor to see what we could expect. Mr. Bolton reported that he and Mr. Sirc had discussed price and determined that it was a relatively inexpensive product, approximately \$87,000 for the full development of it. Mr. Sirc had offered that he could probably provide some federal money (CDC & NCHS) to help with the development. This would be a product owned by the Secretary of State's Office. Mr. O'Neal asked that OIT be included in the discussion. Mr. Bolton reported that the end result would be a web query tool that could provide multiple levels of inquiry for Vital Records data based on research need or general need for recent vital events or for those up to three to five years. Mr. Wurtz added that this project would not be a replacement for EVVE. Mr. Bergeron asked if there would be discussion with DHHS to ensure that this project would meet their data needs. Mr. Bolton replied that they would discuss it with them.

Mr. Bergeron asked if there was any other business.

Mr. Kruger noted that the next meeting of the committee would be held on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 2005.

Mr. Allen asked Mr. Bergeron if he could ask a question. Referring back to agenda item #7, he directed the committee look at page two, detail 30. He noticed that it said Office XP and upgrade to MSOffice 2000. Mr. Kruger stated that they looked redundant. Mr. Bergeron and Mr. Bolton agreed.

Mr. Kruger made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Bolton seconded and the committee unanimously voted to adjourn at 11:50 a.m.