

## **ERERTF Pilot County Proposal– Contract Review Committee Meeting September 4, 2002**

**Meeting was started at 9:30 AM.**

**Attendees:** Chuck Parsons, Bob Horton, Greg Hubinger, Denny Kron, Larry Dalien, Paul Backes, Beth McInerney

The following schedule of events was discussed and agreed to by the attendees.

### **Schedule of Events**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Activity</b>
August 26, 2002	Proposals are due and must be received by 3:00 P.M. CST.
August 26 – September 6th	The proposals will be reviewed for general completeness by BenNevis team.
September 4, 2002	Initial meeting of Contract Review Committee. Meeting time and locations: 9:30 MCIT Building.
September 4 – September 12	Completed proposals will be delivered by BenNevis to the Review Committee. Proposals will be delivered to committee members as they are received.
September 16 from 1:30 to 4:00	Meet to discuss the proposals. BenNevis will do follow up research to answer questions and email the answers to the committee.
Week of September 16	Follow-up meetings with counties to address committee questions
September 20 from 9:30 to 11:30	Meet to make final determination of recommendations. Recommendations will be emailed to the ERER Task Force.
September 26	ERER Task Force meeting to discuss recommendations.

#### **□ Discuss the scope and objectives of the Review Committee**

The scope of activity and objectives of this committee were discussed and agreed to as follows:

- Review County proposals using the evaluation grid
- Use evaluation findings to assist counties to be on a level playing field for pilot activity. This will allow counties equal opportunity for success in pilot testing.
- Identify and understand financial needs at county offices.
- Recommend to the Task Force the allocation of funds to pilot counties.

❑ **Review the schedule of events.**

The schedule was discussed and it was agreed that the time frame is considerably tight. In light of that fact, October may be the meeting where a final recommendation is made to the Task Force. But every effort will be made to stay on course for September.

❑ **Discuss the approach for reviewing/judging proposals. Consider:**

○ **Which costs should be considered for State funding.**

It was discussed that counties are including all costs in their proposal and the committee will need to review proposals for details on costs.

○ **Should the State negotiate with vendors, and if so, who will do this.**

It was discussed that the vendors and counties will participate in negotiations. The Task Force is not involved in this area but the committee could provide recommendations, if necessary, to counties.

○ **How will the committee assess the “readiness” of the counties?**

Using the response matrix and by allowing the committee to ask counties additional questions. An additional step was added to the time line to accommodate the need to communicate questions from the committee to pilot counties.

❑ **Finalize the schedule of events.**

Discussed and agreed to as documented earlier.

❑ **Discuss Trusted Submitter Memorandum of Agreement**

A standard form should be given to counties for use with Trusted Submitters. Submitters will sign a Memorandum of Agreement with each county to whom they will submit electronic documents. This form establishes that the submitter's electronic filings are legal in the state of Minnesota pursuant to the statutes.

There won't be a volume of filings identified in the document but, to the extent practical, documents filed with pilot counties should be done electronically.

Beth will assist Greg Hubinger with this document as needed.

❑ **Additional Discussions.**

It was agreed that at the end of Phase 1 there should be feedback collected from the Trusted Submitters. This would include information such as, what worked, what didn't, what were the benefits, etc...

**Meeting was adjourned at 11:20 AM.**

**Draft of Contract Evaluation Criteria**

<b>Project Approach and Inclusiveness</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria Description</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Un-Satisfactory</b>
Section 1 – Overview	What is your perceived view of whether the county’s project plan accurately captures the requirements for their deliverable?		
Section 2 – Approach	<p>What is your perceived view of whether the approach revealed in the project plan conforms to the EREER Standards?</p> <p>What is your perception of the inclusiveness of this approach? Is the county capturing the full spectrum of needs for this initiative?</p> <p>What is your perceived view of the county’s understanding and ability to achieve the requirements and meet the time line in the proposal?</p> <p>What is your perceived view of the participation of the other officers in the county? Is this inclusive of the Auditor’s and Treasurer’s needs and requirements?</p>		

County Readiness	Evaluation Criteria Description	Satisfactory	Un-Satisfactory
	<p>Other potential readiness criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Comprehension of EREER standards</li> <li>▪ Technology readiness to conduct e-commerce (pilot technology list was sent out already and is on the ERERTF web site for review)</li> <li>▪ Number of trusted submitters</li> <li>▪ Memorandum of Agreement with trusted submitters complete</li> <li>▪ Technology fit between county and submitter – level of e-recording</li> <li>▪ Demonstrated relationship between trusted submitter and county office</li> <li>▪ Integration ability of e-receipt and e-recording of document</li> <li>▪ Integration between county offices (auditor – treasurer – recorder)</li> <li>▪ A Certificate Authority for use with digital signatures has been identified or at least been specified as an early step in the work plan</li> <li>▪ Documented workflow for phase 1 and phase 2 documents identified – workflow that included Auditor and Treasurers</li> </ul>		

<p><b>Project Planning / Milestones</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pilot project owner / project manager is county officer</li> <li>▪ Project team includes the appropriate county members and offices (recorder, auditor, treasurer, IT, etc.)</li> <li>▪ Project team includes the appropriate set of skills and expertise</li> <li>▪ E-recording vendors participation is identified</li> <li>▪ Back office processing vendors participation for all county office technologies are involved in Phase 1 and 2 planning</li> <li>▪ Identification of e-recording level and document type for submitter and county</li> <li>▪ The communications approach with trusted submitters is designed and documented early in the the design process</li> </ul>		
---	--	--	--

<b>Pilot Testing Standards – How to ensure this is a “good” test</b>	<b>Evaluation Criteria Description</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Un-Satisfactory</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pilot duration – bare minimum 90 days</li> <li>▪ County technology is platform independent, county can accept filings from any sender’s technology as long as it follows MN standards</li> <li>▪ County Recorder’s technology has demonstrated ability to integrate with technology in auditor and treasurers office for Phase 2 filings</li> <li>▪ County solution provides a solid foundation for future growth in services (does not need to be completely robust solution at start of pilot)</li> </ul>		
<b>Costs of Effort</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Costs reflect fundamental changes to accommodate e-recording</li> <li>● Costs are independent of natural upgrade needs for county hardware and / or software</li> </ul>		