January 6, 2004 – Technology Review of Schema

Present: Joel Barten, Joe Notling, Dean Pass, Scott Loomer, Ray Hirte, Mike Cunniff, Brent Worden, Scott Carlson, Pam Trombo, Luci Botzek, Nancy Dean, John Lally, Jeff Carlson, Beth McInerny

There was a great deal of discussion at last week's meeting and I have summarized below:

- The use of underscores to reference a higher level qualifier is not preferred for the MN ERER Standards, but instead explore the use of the full context to clarify
  - E.g. ExecutionCounty

- The county names spreadsheet was found to be a useful tool for coming to consensus around enhancing the schemas to better clarify elements. This renaming approach will be utilized on an as-needed basis within the schema.
  - "Document" as identified on the elements for discussion list is going to be excluded from further analysis per other issues related to packaging of documents

- The case sensitive issue will be included in the next schema version and reviewed a the March 5 meeting

The following is proposed as a recommendation to the task force as the on-going approach as a result of discussion at this meeting:
- A listserv that allows for threaded discussions and supports the posting of schema drafts for review will be created to review documentation, provide feedback and vote on the possible changes with a majority vote passing decisions

- Spreadsheets will be created for the elements identified for discussion and distributed via email to the listserv, the elements identified will be separated in 3 groups for review with the groups setup as follows:

Group A	Group B	Group C
County	EntityName	Name
State	Individual	OtherName
Township	IndividualGroup	PrimaryName
Details	Organization	RecordedDocument
Header	Parties	RecordedInformation
	SignedByParties	SupplementalInformation

- Feedback will be collected on a listserv along with a vote on whether or not to move forward with the changes pending – timelines will be used to ensure that progress continues and work progresses.
- Feedback will be reported to indicate agreed to changes based on consensus
- Approved changes as identified in the spreadsheets will be brought to the Task Force for approval
- The schema will then be enhanced per the approved changes and Task Force approval

To accommodate that approach and complete this work prior to Phase II, we recommend the following dates and schedule

- January 26 – The first group of elements will be distributed with discussion threads throughout the week
- January 30 – vote to approve or reject changes
- February 2 – The second group of elements will be distributed with discussion threads throughout the week
- February 6 – vote to approve or reject changes to the second group
- February 9 – The third group of elements will be distributed with discussion threads throughout the week
- February 13 – vote to approve or reject changes to the third group

** February 12 – Update on status is given to Task Force regarding schema changes

- March 1- approved schema changes are distributed to listserv
- March 5 – Schema changes are reviewed in final meeting at MCIT
- March 11 – Schema changes are presented to the Task Force for final approval to become the next version (3.x or 4.0)

In order to avoid confusion we ask that each Pilot County or Trusted Submitter provide a vote. Although discussion will logically include many members at a pilot county or pilot submitter company a single vote representing that pilot entities feelings should be cast.

In this scenario a vote to measure consensus on change will be collected from each of the following:

Hennepin (reflecting feedback from Perficient and internal teams) will submit a vote,
Renville (reflecting feedback from Trimin and Ingeo and internal teams) will submit a vote,
Roseau (reflecting feedback from WCI and internal teams) will submit a vote,
Dakota (reflecting feedback from Fidlar and internal teams) will submit a vote
Lyon (also reflecting feedback from Fidlar and internal teams) will submit a vote
Department of Revenue (reflecting feedback from internal groups or vendors it may be using) will submit a vote
US Recording (reflecting feedback from Perficient and internal teams) will submit a vote. These are the groups currently utilizing the schema and have the most hands-on experience in this area.

This report will be discussed at January 22nd's task force meeting. Thanks.