

The following items were discussed and/or decided on the technology conference call at 1 PM on Wednesday, July 24, 2002. People on the call included Jeff Carlson, Mike Cunniff, Mark Yelich, John Jones, Cindy Koosmann, Beth McInerney, Gabe Minton, Paul Backes, Poul Elverum and Pam Trombo.

We reviewed the document that was prepared by Pam Trombo that listed the elements in the PRIA and MISMO DTD's, and included her questions and Gabe's responses. From this it was decided that we will use the PRIA name tags and structure first. If elements are not included, we will use the MISMO name tags and structure. If elements are in neither, we will create a Minnesota extension for elements (using _MN as the leading part of the name), an inserted container (using the word Extension on the new element group), or add a whole new container (naming to be determined by Gabe). It was clarified that the name tags are the XML name for data elements. John Jones indicated that the PRIA naming conventions were developed from the perspective of the recorder. The IT personnel that create the applications to prepare the documents and record the documents need to use the XML standards. However, they should use the data name that the users are most familiar with when displaying the information on screens and reports.

There was concern expressed about the stability of the PRIA and MISMO standards, since it appears that they continue to be revised, and John Jones indicated that the PRIA version 1.0 had not yet been approved. John said that he expects final approval of version 1.0 within two weeks. From the pilots' perspective, we would need to set a stake in the ground on the version of the PRIA (and MISMO) standards that we would use, because we should not change our standards during the pilots unless there is a critical problem.

Gabe indicated that MISMO is maintaining a large data dictionary for the elements. We should have access to that dictionary as we proceed.

Pam has some follow-up questions that she will send to John by end of day Thursday, and John will respond back within a couple days.

We discussed the Smart Document standard, which will need to be followed by those submitting XML created by DTD. The Smart Document includes three sections, data, presentation and metadata. Others list digital signatures as the 4th section. Gabe said that MISMO decided to leave the mapping up to the trusted submitter, because each trusted submitter will have their own document view. The task force had also decided that each trusted submitter could create their own document view. Therefore, we should leave the mapping up to the trusted submitter.