

Electronic Real Estate Recording task Force
Pilot Subcommittee
6 August, 2002

Present: Paul Backes, Bob Horton, Scott Loomer, Beth McNerny, Joel Beckman, Chris Akers, Bob Malecki, Scott Loomer, Gail Miller, Jeanine Barker, Paul Kiltinen, Rick Kvien (via Phone), Joe Witt (via Phone)

Call to order

Bob Horton called the meeting to order at 1:30pm

Trusted Submitters Status – Upcoming Meetings

It was discussed that a Trusted Submitters meeting will take place on Friday, August 16 for the Trusted Submitters who have expressed interest to-date. This meeting will serve to introduce counties to TS that they have not had conversations with as yet.

Counties were reminded that conversations should be going on between TS and them regarding the pilot. But, understanding that not all TS know all the pilot counties, and vice versa, this meeting will serve to make some needed connections.

It was also briefly discussed that a county will want to work with more than one TS in the pilot testing; this will help to ensure volumes are achieved. It was discussed that a county's IT staff may want to begin working with one TS at start up. But it was also agreed that once kinks and issues are worked through, connecting with additional TS as the pilot continues will be beneficial. It was proposed that counties should identify a series of interested TS and begin identifying a sequence of bringing them on. Again, the meeting on the 16th will help facilitate this discussion.

Pilot County Project Planning Status – Next Steps

The pilot counties have begun initial work on project planning and some work was identified in the form of workflow. Not a significant volume of work has been done to-date. This will be addressed in BenNevis work with counties to get thing moving.

Contract between Pilot County and Task Force

Counties were reminded that contracts with their technology vendor will be a necessary component of their contract with the Task Force. Many counties expressed concern that it is not a fast process to get a signed contract through at their county and this may affect their ability to comply with the contract.

This issue is understandable and will be addressed with the LCC and the Executive Committee as a contract template is drafted for the Task Force and pilots.

A contract with any and all Trusted Submitters will also be a component of the contract between the Task Force and the pilot county. It was identified by the county members that there should be a template to use when working with potential Trusted Submitters. If several counties work with the same TS but use different documents to contract with them this may cause confusion. Beth McInerny will draft a list of currently identified items and ask LCC to draft a more formal document from these. This subcommittee asked that the Legal Subcommittee review this once it is created. A recommendation will then be made to the full Task Force. TS issues that were identified for inclusion currently include the following statements:

- Agreed upon model of e-recording that the TS and county will engage in will be identified.
- Commitment to participate in electronic document filings of Satisfactions and/or Certificates of Release with said pilot county for the duration of Phase 1 as indicated in the Task Force project plan (see Appendix W).
- Trusted submitter will make its best effort to provide a substantial electronic volume, similar to its most recent volume count of paper filing with said county.
- Trusted submitter agrees to follow the pilot counties project plan with deliverables and timelines, including following any amendments.
- No agreement between county and Trusted Submitter will include an extra fee for using the electronic filing service, nor will trusted Submitter charge any fee for submitting documents that are not created by them in-house but which are submitted through them.

The contract between the Task Force and pilot counties will also include a complete workflow diagram of all Phase 1 and Phase2 documents. This will identify how their technology will automate processing within and between offices. This should also include how different technologies within these offices will interact.

A workplan, complete with dates, milestones and deliverables is also needed. This workplan should identify how each county will specifically handle e-recording processes.

Costs will also be identified by counties and their IT staff. These will be reviewed by BenNevis as they are received. Counties are encouraged to work with their IT staff and BenNevis throughout this process.

The deadline for all of these documents is August 26th. The pilot subcommittee will recommend to the full task force that a review committee should be in place to analyze the documents. The committee would evaluate the proposals, discuss them with BenNevis to be sure that all plans conform to the task force's standards and then make a set of recommendations to the task force for approval, revision or disapproval of the pilot plans.

Updated Pilot Subcommittee Responsibilities

The updated responsibilities list was unanimously adopted at the last Task Force meeting. This document was distributed again to ensure members had copies.

Pilot Matrix Draft

A draft of a matrix of measurements that will BenNevis will utilize while counties pilot test standards has been drafted. This initial draft was reviewed by the committee. Feedback will be gathered and a final version will be completed for BenNevis' use.

Standards and Schema Review Date

The need for a meeting to review the ERER Standards and schema with the IT members at the Trusted Submitter company's and the pilot counties was discussed. Hennepin county had BenNevis conduct a walk through of schema and standards with Hennepin's IT division and the vendor Ingeo. Hennepin found this very useful and suggested it for all pilot counties.

It was suggested that this meeting option be brought up at the August 16th meeting with TS and pilot counties. It was suggested that this opportunity should be extended to these meeting members and see if this would work for them. A meeting time/date could be discussed at that time.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:00pm