

Phase II Planning Meeting – CI Title Apple Valley Offices – September 8, 2003

Attendees: Beth McInerny, Erin Hultgren, Tara Bach, Carol Leonard, Michael Cunniff, Larry Dalien, Gail Miller, Denny Kron, Bob Horton, Bill Mori, Tom Clark, Leonard Peterson, Jim Holan, Jeffrey Strand, Jeff Carlson, Jeanine Barker, Dana Flinck (phone)

1. Identify all County and State departments involved in integration

A complete stakeholder list was identified to ensure all interests are considered as we move into Phase II testing. The following entities were identified:

County Recorders, Auditors, Treasurers, Department of Revenue, MCIS, MCCC, CPUJ, County IT divisions, Assessors, County Financial Services departments, State Financial Services departments, Trusted Submitters, County Admin, State Department of Health, County Planning and Zoning, County Surveyors / GIS, DOT, Department of Commerce, Legal Groups, State Legislature, Banks and other entities filing Phase II documents with counties, national organizations like MISMO and PRIA.

By identifying all groups this committee will be better able to identify information needs and bring these groups to the table when necessary for better planning.

2. What additional complexities are added in phase II that were not addressed in phase I i.e. legal descriptions

The following issues were identified as areas of added complexity with Phase II testing and the documents involved.

- Increased training needs for those submitting electronic documents to be filed at counties.
- Increased number of players / stakeholders with Phase II documents: This includes members at the county and the private sector.
- More money changing hands which leads to increased security concerns
- More investigation of alternative payment methods for fees
 - Credit Card and ACH for example

- Increased number of XML data transmitted from submitter to county
- Complexity of the legal description now required on these documents
- Legislation requirements for these documents

The bulk of this time was spent in a discussion of the legal description. As Jeff Carlson explained, implementing a full level 3 system at this point could present some challenges to some trusted submitters. First, some information, such as legal descriptions, is not yet standardized to the extent that a more precise and rigorous re-structuring in XML would be practical. There are many variations in content and form. Jeff also suggests that current work processes in place among some submitters may need to change in order to facilitate the use of XML. In his experience, the submitters rely heavily on the use of scanned documents and a minimally trained work force which may make a level 1 or level 2 filing more realistic for some documents.

It is not clear what impact a move, if determined as necessary, from a Level 3 implementation to a Level 1 or Level 2 implementation in Phase II would have on other stakeholders, such as county and state government entities, or on the task force's relations to national associations which have championed the level 3 approach. To address those questions, the subcommittee will analyze:

- 1) The definitions of level 2 and 3 implementations and specifically the extent to which image files can be embedded in XML files under the current schema and the extent to which larger and more general XML text fields can replace the more precisely defined data elements in the current schema;
- 2) Developments on the national scene and particularly in the standards and models sponsored by MISMO and PRIA;
- 3) A data model of the workflow from submitter through stakeholders at the county and state levels, to understand what data elements are used when and by whom in automated systems (or systems that could be automated when data becomes available in an XML format); and
- 4) An acceptable minimal level of XML formatted data that would support a mutually acceptable tradeoff in costs and benefits among stakeholders and that would facilitate the adoption of more sophisticated standards and technology as they become feasible

The next Phase II Planning meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 6th at 10:00 at the US Recording / CI Title Apple Valley offices again. Thanks Jeff for hosting these meetings.

Items Not Discussed at this Meeting:

3. Document Filing Priority within a document package
4. Phase II Filing Process – How will XML Schema be transmitted in Phase II
5. Issues from Phase I Testing – How Will Known Issues Be Addressed in Phase II
6. Phase II Milestones and Project Overview