IOWAccess Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes of January 10, 2007, 1:00 PM
Hoover Building, Level B, Conference Rooms 2 and 3

Present: Sheila Castaneda, Richard Neri, Quent Boyken, Herb Strentz, David Redlawsk*, Dawn Ainger*, Beth Baldwin, Mary Maloney, Tom Gronstal, Kelly Hayworth*, Barbara Corson, Lawrence Lentz, Terri Selberg, Miriam Ubben, Vicki Lensing

Absent: Glen Dickinson, Bob Brunkhorst, Jeff Danielson, Carmine Boal

Guests: Mollie Anderson, Angela Chen, Ann Mowery, Dick Moore, Lana Morrissey, Mark Uhrin, Tim Erickson, Rochelle Little, JoAnn Naples, John Hove, Lynn Walding, Karen Freund, Ralph Rosenberg, Malcolm Huston, Diane Van Zante (recorder)

      * participating by phone

Council Chair, Sheila Castaneda, opened the meeting and noted that a quorum of members was present. The Council's new representative from the Judicial Branch is Beth Baldwin. Beth is the District Court Administrator for the Fifth Judicial District. All members and guests introduced themselves.

1. Approve Minutes - Sheila Castaneda, Chair.

   Dick Neri and Tom Gronstal moved approval of the November 8, 2006 meeting minutes. An oral vote was taken; Beth Baldwin abstained since she was not at the meeting, the remaining members voted to approve the minutes as written.

2. IOWAccess Financial Update – Lana Morrissey.

   Updated financial reports (through November 30, 2006) were distributed at the meeting. No appropriations were received in November. More money was spent than taken in during November, so there was a decrease in net assets of $40,000 for the month. Net assets for the year stand at $2.4 million. Unobligated cash is $1.648 million. Malcolm Huston is in the process of reviewing FY04 project funds that have not been spent.

3. IOWAccess Project Financial Reconciliation – Malcolm Huston.

   Malcolm is putting together a historical perspective of project awards from day one. To cleanse the financial reports, Malcolm met with John Hove to identify which projects are dormant, which projects need further inquiry, and which projects should be closed. A number of projects were earmarked "close and revert." The food stamps project has been withdrawn; it was absorbed into a larger Department of Human Services' proposal. As a result of this overall effort, approximately $235,000 was returned to the IOWAccess fund. Malcolm is compiling a document that contains information about each project, back to day one. It was suggested that we keep a file of those that ended abruptly or those that met some other negative fate (for informational purposes).

4. IOWAccess Manager Funding Addition – Mark Uhrin.

At the last meeting, council members discussed how ITE should bill for Malcolm's time and approved a billing methodology. Originally, $50,000 was allocated. To meet expenses through the remainder of FY07, an additional $47,368.20 is needed. Herb Strentz and Barb Corson moved approval of the funds. An oral vote was taken; the motion was unanimously approved.

5. Iowa Board of Medical Examiners – Request for Approval of Fees for Online Transactions – Ann Mowery.

The Board of Medical Examiners (IBME) currently has one online license service and it has a $12.50 convenience fee. The Board is changing its entire database and hopes to make all license applications available online. A service charge is needed to cover ITE's fee for hosting, Iowa Interactive fees for database development, and credit card transaction fees. Service charges would vary, depending upon the type of transaction. Checks are the only alternate form of payment. It costs $100 more for paper filing than online filing. The Board has seen a 98% adoption rate with the existing online license application. IBME would also need to go before the Technology Governance Board and make administrative rule changes. To assist the newer council members, Quent Boyken explained the Council's role in approving transaction fees. IBME is seeking a maximum 3% credit card transaction fee, rather than 2%. Barb Corson and Dick Neri moved approval of the proposed service charges. An oral vote was taken; the motion was unanimously approved.

6. DAS-ITE – Schools Out - First Year Hosting and Media Requested Enhancements and Stress Testing – Request for Funding ($16,550) – Mark Uhrin.

The system is in production and five school districts have been set up in the pilot program. The goal is to increase to 25 schools this year with full roll out throughout the state next year. There are several media outlets who are interested in partnering with us. Funding is being requested to cover first year hosting costs as well as additional stress testing and enhancements. Recipients of the service include school staff, parents, and caregivers. It is too early in the game to gauge how the system is working so far. The program is being advertised to school administrators and boards of education, but it is up to individual schools to adopt the program. Private schools will also be able to take advantage of the program. Beth Baldwin and Dick Neri moved approval of the funding. An oral vote was taken; the motion was unanimously approved.

7. Iowa Child Advocacy Board - ICAB Online – Request for Planning Funds ($20,000) – Richard Moore.

The Iowa Child Advocacy Board (ICAB) operate two programs: 1) local foster care review boards, and 2) court appointed special advocates. Both are intended to increase protection of children caught up in the child welfare system. Right now, the ICAB is not taking advantage of technology like it could. The proposed funding is to create a general public access website that houses information, aids in volunteer recruitment, and provides volunteers with support and training. The potential is almost limitless. Richard's personal goal is for information exchange with the Department of Human Services and the courts. At this time, there is no estimate of costs for the next stage of development, however at the conclusion of the planning phase, ICAB would come back with at least one proposal to implement. Mark

Uhrin believes they would be ready to come back in about four months. Will the project be shared with other states and can the money be leveraged to obtain additional dollars/federal funds? That depends upon what ICAB decides to do. Larry Lentz made a motion to approve the request. Terri Selberg commented that it would be nice to dovetail off of already funded technology. Sheila Castaneda hopes that ITE will borrow from existing programs rather than start from scratch. Mary Maloney seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken; the motion was unanimously approved.

8. Iowa Civil Rights Commission - Civil Rights Public Interface – Request for Execution and Hosting Funding ($90,000 and $7,140) – Ralph Rosenberg.

The Civil Rights Commission has been trying to utilize technology to provide better service. Tremendous strides have been made this past year. Civil Rights wants to have password protected virtual access so that people can file complaints online and see the current status. This enhancement will save time, money (probably in the six figures), improve employee efficiency, and improve reporting to citizen groups, the media and elected officials. This is a request for implementation funding. The Council already funded part I of the project to move Civil Rights to a more modern system, but that did not include online access. The infrastructure is already in place to support this. Herb Strentz and Mary Maloney moved approval. Some administrative rule changes will likely be necessary, but that should not be a barrier to moving forward. The estimated time to complete is six months. ITE has a high level requirements document and the basis for an estimate, but does not have a detailed infrastructure in place, although it should run on ITE software. In the future, council members would appreciate receiving that type of information; please provide as much detail as there is, even if it is on the technical side. Ninety thousand dollars is a reasonable best guess. An oral vote was taken; the motion was unanimously approved.

9. Iowa Department of Natural Resources (DNR) - Improving Public Access to Iowa's Water Pollution Control Permits – Request for Additional Execution Funding ($137,900) – Angela Chen.

DNR issues water pollution control permits to cities and businesses in Iowa. It is a federally mandated program. DNR has two goals: online permit renewal (currently a paper process), and public access to permits and supporting rationale. Because of the current backlog, about one-third of all permits expire before DNR has a chance to renew them. A web-based system would benefit both citizens and the DNR. This project started about a year ago when DNR received funding for initial planning. The project requirements have been fine-tuned, so the next phase is the design document, then implementation and rollout. DNR came back to the Council for implementation phase money ($66,000 which the Council approved) before they were really ready to do so (the complexity and scope of the project was not yet fully understood). Fifteen thousand was originally approved for the planning phase. For the implementation phase, DNR needs an additional $137,900 over and above the $66,000 that was already approved. Work would be done by ITE. Malcolm Huston commented that the system relies on a very complex, interactive application. One of the outcomes is that DNR will be able to provide better service with its existing budget. Citizen demand is really the key thing driving this project. Herb Strentz and Barb Corson moved approval. An oral vote was taken; the motion was unanimously approved.

10. Alcoholic Beverages Division (ABD) Enhancements to ABD E-Licensing Application –
Request for Design/Execution Funding ($49,999) – Lynn Walding & Karen Freund.
This item was originally tabled at the November meeting. Mollie Anderson, Director of the
Department of Administrative Services, addressed the Council. She advised that DAS and
ABD met and discussed the project at length. As a result of that conversation, Mollie is
comfortable in allowing ABD to proceed and supports this application. In terms of
accountability, DAS holds the risk and the accountability for the information it provides.

Mr. Walding reported that ABD has extensive interaction with the business community;
comments from ABD customers indicate that the current system is confusing. ITE is
encouraged to bid on this project, as are other vendors. ABD is being told that the problem
can be fixed for $45,000. The Chair noted that what was presented to the Council at the last
meeting was a request for "enhancements." There was also a question whether ABD could
find the funds within its current budget. Mr. Walding stated that ABD had not yet seen the
financial savings. Herb Strentz posed a question about agencies that don't spend the money
that the Council has approved; ABD has over $100,000 that it is not using. Mollie advised
that those issues might have to be resolved at a later time. Is the request for $49,999 a way to
circumvent other requirements? No, ABD is already submitting to the process for projects
that exceed $50,000 and is scheduled to go before the Technology Governance Board
tomorrow. The proposal indicates that the work will be done in six to eight weeks. That
would likely be after the bid is awarded. Mary Maloney and Quent Boyken moved approval
of the proposal as written. An oral vote was taken. Director Gronstal abstained (ABD is part
of his organization); all others voted to approve. The motion passed.

11. IOWAccess Process Revision Proposal – Malcolm Huston.
It has been Malcolm's observation that agencies are coming back to the Council to request
additional funding because the initial estimates are off base. Estimates given early on are far
from the actual cost. The roadmaps for completing an ITE project and an IOWAccess
project are different. That is confusing to customers. Malcolm walked through the attached
presentation.

DRAFT IAC
processI.pps

Post presentation discussion:
If we agree on a model for a normal project, we should also agree on a model for a re-
engineered process.
Is it possible to define the kind of project that would use this process? We don't want to
create too much bureaucracy.
You can always modify the process.
All projects need these documents to succeed.
This will result in more well-thought-out projects.
How do we get to the issues of maximizing cooperation with other agencies, reducing
duplication, etc.?

This process makes a lot of sense. It would allow us to determine where the risk is and propose options. I would feel much more comfortable using a process like this.
How do we ensure standardization (such as standardized data elements)?
There is a set of standards and practices within ITE; some of it is simply agencies cooperating with each other.

Does the Council want to utilize this new process? It appears to have merit. One suggestion is to identify a proposal that fits this scheme nicely and use it as a quasi-pilot project. Malcolm's intent is also to allow various exit points throughout the process.

By general consensus, council members decided to use the new process moving forward. They will revisit the process in six months or a year to see how it is working.

12. Policy Discussion – Malcolm Huston.
    a) Can an agency use funds to support in-house development, or must ITE or an outside vendor be the developer?
       The Council can make a recommendation.
       ITE has a very detailed cost analysis for staff time; other agencies may use an artificially low number.
       Being able to view the design documents may be more important than whether it's done in-house or not. We need to ensure that the project is approved by Technology Governance Board standards and fits within the IT enterprise architecture.
       A review should be conducted by ITE in all cases. Where should the money for that come from?
       We want to encourage more local governments to do development. We can't expect ITE to do all the development.
       If it's within state government, I think we can say that it has to be reviewed by ITE.
       Where in the process do we ensure that outside developers adhere to certain standards?
       Possibly the process chart could address that issue.
       We get the biggest bank for our buck when we use what we already have.

    Please think about this for the next meeting and bring back your ideas.

    b) Should Design and Execution allow for an exit point or maybe another decision point between Design and Execution?
       This item was not discussed, although earlier in the meeting, Malcolm indicated it was his intention to allow various exit points throughout the process.

    c) What should happen if an agency substantially delays an application, either delaying start or suspending progress for a period of time?
       This item was not addressed.

14. Follow-up Items from Previous Meetings – Sheila Castaneda.
    There were no additional items.

15. Criminal History Record Checks Project Update – Mark Uhrin.

We are waiting for information from the agency.

16. ITE Project Updates – Mark Uhrin.
There is nothing to report of any substance. None of the projects are in trouble.

17. Iowa Interactive Updates – Tim Erickson.
Lodges were added to the cabin reservation system and experienced a tremendous first day.
Iowa Interactive completed an administrative rules application for the Governor's Office
which allows each agency to file its administrative rules electronically.
The Professional Licensing Division just completed its renewal period; there was a 65%
adoption rate for engineers and a 25% adoption rate for real estate agents.
About ten new applications to set to be released in the next few months.

18. IOWAccess Manager Update – Malcolm Huston.
Malcolm is diligently pursuing some press releases to get the word out. He continues to meet
with groups to promote IOWAccess. What is the status of the IOWAccess brochure? It is up
on the website right now.

19. Wrap-Up and Adjourn – Sheila Castaneda.
Sheila is unavailable for the March 7 meeting, so Dick Neri will be chairing the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m.