



Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force

www.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/lcc/erertf.htm

June 10, 2004

ERER Task Force - Phase I County Status Reports

Pilot County Workgroup Meeting – June 8, 2004

- Dakota County
 - Discussed the standardization of electronic payment.
 - Trusted submitters need to understand the laws for payments to counties. Timing and method of payment were discussed
- Lyon County
 - Experienced an issue with documents that were labeled “Abstract” and “Torrens”. These documents errors were caught in their check queue. The documents were rejected.

Standards Evaluation Status

- Dakota County (Fidlar) has been validated for the Assignment of Mortgage.
- Hennepin has been validated for the Assignment of Mortgage
- Ingeo/Renville is still performing internal testing and development on SAT's and COR's.

Schema Review

- Skytek is working with Ted Lautzenheiser to implement and post version control for schema versions. A copy of the version 4 schema and change control information will be on the LCC web site.
- The removal of the Date of Birth field will be included in the schema changes made by Skytek.
- The following table summarizes the feedback provided by the pilot counties/vendors and trusted submitters related to the Object Oriented work.



Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force

www.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/lcc/erertf.htm

Pilot County/Vendor	
Renville County/Trimin Systems	<p>Reviewed in detail all spreadsheets documenting the suggested changes. Feedback was positive. One take away question was related to the suggested changes in the use of PrimaryName.</p> <p><i>Clarification</i> – The current schema naming conventions related to the use of PrimaryName are inconsistent with the current use of Name. In some instances, PrimaryName is being used in contexts that do not contain an OtherName. Thus, the elements would not require a “Primary” prefix.</p> <p>However, independent of the clarification, Skytek is recommending unique names to objects unless they are currently used in an existing reusable structure.</p>
Dakota County/Fidlar	Unable or unwilling to devote time to the effort
Roseau County/WCI	Unable or unwilling to devote time to the effort
Hennepin County	Unable or unwilling to devote time to the effort
Trusted Submitters	
Ingeo	Reviewed the overall approach to the object oriented work and feedback was positive. Agreed on the need for the OO work to be incorporated in future work by the technology/vendor group.
US Recordings	Unable or unwilling to devote time to the effort

Implementation Guide

- The first draft of the Implementation Guide has been distributed to the Phase II Planning Committee for review. Members are asked to give feedback by June 14.
- Pilot counties were asked to review “Best Practices” and provide feedback.



Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force

www.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/lcc/erertf.htm

Technical Sub-committee

- The Technology Subcommittee met on Tuesday, May 25th to discuss issues regarding the Date of Birth change on the CRV and the Relationship Status
- **Relationship Status and DOB**
 - For Relationship Status, it was determined that an OTHER selection with the ability to add free form text could be added to this list. This follows the MISMO recommendation for enumerated list exceptions.
 - Both John Lally and Nancy Dean felt that the Date of Birth field is not necessary for the schema and would cause Revenue additional work to secure this information. They ask that this field be removed as they would reject a document containing that information. DOB is a required field on the schema and would affect each and every filing of this document.
 - It was agreed that if a schema issue affected all documents being filed using that schema, a change would be considered for implementation during the testing phase. A schema issue that affected a portion of documents being filed would be assess for the volume of documents affected and would be considered on that basis to be modified or documented for review after testing.
 - Pilot counties have been asked to work with current and potential trusted submitters to find out what volume of documents the Relationship Status enumeration issue affects. U.S. Recordings (through Mike Cunniff) reports that one in five documents is affected by the relationship status enumeration.
- **Standard Architecture for Transmission**
 - The group also discussed the benefits of having a standard architecture for transmission of data.
 - SKYTEK has reviewed Revenue's standard architecture in use with communications between Revenue and the IRS. This and any other county architecture's can be used in a discussion of a standard.
 - It was determined that a work group will be created to begin discussing this standard and those meetings will begin right away.
 - A packaging standard for bundled documents was also mentioned as a needed standard.

Vendor Group

- The vendor/technology group met on Monday, June 1 to discuss the creation of a standard schema validator for working with the ERERTF schema.
- Skytek is working to collect information from vendors and counties about which validation engines are being used by e-recording applications.
- The next step will be to determine what problems exist with the schema and how to fix the problems.
- Eventually, some reference validation implementations on commonly used platforms will be posted online so that new and existing vendors are able to use these as a guide when creating their own e-recording systems



Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force

www.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/lcc/erertf.htm

Dakota County

Status Item	% Complete	Status
Baseline Measurements	100%	Narrative completed
Pilot Measurements Matrix	100%	Completed for Phase I. Still Requires Phase II and Trusted submitter input.
Cost Benefit Table	50%	
Project Plan Status	NA	No update
Standards	NA	No update
Pilot Risks	NA	No Update
Implementation Findings	NA	No update
Best Practices	NA	No update
Issues	NA	Noted in Risks section
Status		Satisfactions - 05/27/03 thru 06/08/04 (Abstract Only) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• TOTAL – 3,539 COR's - 05/27/03 thru 06/08/04 (Abstract Only) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Total C.O.R's.- 55



Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force

www.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/lcc/erertf.htm

Hennepin County

Status Item	% Complete	Status
Baseline Measurements	50%	Pre-pilot measurements 100% complete.
Pilot Measurements Matrix	0%	No Update
Cost Benefit Table	0%	No Update
Project Plan Status	NA	No Update
Standards	NA	No Update
Pilot Risks	NA	No Update
Implementation Findings	NA	No Update
Best Practices	NA	No Update
Status Update	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Hennepin County continues electronic processing of Satisfactions and Certificates in production mode.



Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force

www.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/lcc/erertf.htm

Lyon County

Status Item	% Complete	Status
Baseline Measurements	50%	County IT will be tracked thru the project especially implementation period. Not enough data to compare certificates of release to satisfactions, but our system handles them the same
Pilot Measurements Matrix	25%	
Cost Benefit Table	0%	
Project Plan Status	NA	No update
Standards	NA	No update
Pilot Risks	NA	No update
Implementation Findings	NA	Received 52 electronic filings thus far.
Best Practices	NA	No update
Status Update	NA	6/8/2004 as of this date we have filed 64 electronic filings successfully and returned 6. Electronic filing has a much lower rejection rate than paper documents. Having been a successful pilot county I will be submitting invoices for the testing, implementation phases and retainage. And hoping the leg., in its great wisdom, will have a special session and we will be allowed to continue with electronic filing. The banks and vendors will or should be furious with them. To be so close to this tech and not be able to do it because no one can compromise is an injustice.



Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force

www.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/lcc/erertf.htm

Renville County

Status Item	% Complete	Status
Baseline Measurements	50%	
Pilot Measurements Matrix	0%	
Cost Benefit Table	0%	
Project Plan Status	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop and Test Coding of Business Rules – October 31• Develop and Test Integration Solutions – November 10• In-House & On-site Testing - November 11• Internal testing continues
Standards	NA	No Update
Pilot Risks	NA	No update
Implementation Findings	NA	
Best Practices	NA	No update
Status Update	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• No update



Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force

www.commissions.leg.state.mn.us/lcc/erertf.htm

Roseau County

Status Item	% Complete	Status
Baseline Measurements	50%	Pre-pilot measurements are 100% complete. No data for COR's because they do not record any COR's.
Pilot Measurements Matrix	0%	
Cost Benefit Table	0%	
Project Plan Status	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tract-N-Dex is installed and is in production. • CROS is installed and is in production. • ERER system is installed and tested using self generated documents and documents supplied by US Recordings. • No correct documents have been submitted and tested from Ingeo.
Standards	NA	No Update
Pilot Risks	NA	<p>County ISP, Internet technical outsource is unable to provide secure connections to dedicated machines either in the DMZ or internal. A technical resource is working on this currently.</p> <p>Ingeo – Trusted submitter has not yet supplied submission of test documents. In the event Ingeo is unable or unwilling to provide test documents, we will need to find another trusted submitter</p>
Implementation Findings	NA	No Update
Best Practices	NA	No Update
Status Update		<p>No idea when Ingeo will be sending good documents. Documents that are being sent have two problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1) Content model errors. These are being caught during the schema validation part. How is it that the Fidlar system is not catching these same content model errors during the schema validation process? Is Ingeo sending files using two different schemas? • 2) Style sheet errors. These are being caught after manually fixing the content model errors and passing the test documents through to the end of the process and generating a tiff image