The following are drafts minutes that have not been officially approved by the Chair of this subcommittee.

Phase II Planning Meeting – 3-22-04 – MCIT 10:00

Attendees: Beth McInerny, John Engerholm, Mike Cunniff, Bob Horton, Jim Holan, Jeffrey Strand, Marie Kunze, Scott Loomer, Larry Dalien, Tom Clark Nancy Dean, Larry Jacobs, Gail Miller, Lucy Botzek, Denny Kron, Carol Leonard, Bill Peterson, Stephen Baker, Chuck Hoyum, Jeff Carlson, Rick Kvien (phone).

Follow up discussion on CRV.

McInerny noted that having a Web portal for the CRV was not in the pilot's original plan and not having it does not preclude testing of the Deed with a CRV. There is a schema for the CRV and that can be filed electronically from the submitter to the county along with the Deed. The county will have CRV information in XML format. Revenue currently receives CRV information from counties in a flat-file format. Counties can reformat the XML data to flat file and send that to Revenue until Revenue is in a position to accept XML data.

The web portal for a CRV is still an interesting concept in that it could facilitate the filing of these documents electronically regardless of how the Deed is filed with the county. This committee will recommend to the Task Force that a CRV Subcommittee be formed in order to identify alternative filing methods for the CRV and the costs of those alternatives. With this information the Task Force can then better assess the alternatives and more confidently take next steps in implementing any of them.

1. **Phase II Filing Process – How will XML Schema be transmitted in Phase II**

John Engerholm described the approach that the State of Colorado is taking around standardizing the interface for eRecording. Colorado noted that without a standard interface, establishing and maintaining business relationships between counties and submitters will be more time consuming and inefficient. In addition, implementation costs will be higher for all parties and the rate of adoption for eRecording will be slower.

Engerholm provided an example of:
• County A's interface for document submission is defined as 'SubmitFile' and requires three data elements: 'LogonName', 'Password' and 'Document'. It returns a transaction id as a number.

- County B's interface for document submission is defined as 'SubmitDocument' and requires three data elements: 'userName', 'password' and 'file'. It returns an indicator of the result as a string.

- A title company, doing business with both counties, must build a unique interface to each county.

Jeff Carlson was going to review the interfaces US Recordings developed for Dakota/Fidlar along with what was being developed for Hennepin County to compare and gather further information.

2. **Issues from Phase I Testing – How Will Known Issues Be Addressed in Phase II**

3. **Phase II Milestones and Project Overview**

4. **e-Mortgage Schema Needs**

John Engerhom described how the current MISMO e-mortgage document that is in DTD could be converted to a schema and work to match that document with Minnesota's needs could begin earlier than 4th quarter of 2004, when MISMO hopes to have a schema document ready.

Because MISMO will be updating their work and data dictionary when they complete the conversion it was agreed and will be recommended to the Task Force that we wait for MISMO to publish as schema based e-Mortgage and file a Minnesota extension to that document.

5. **Cost Estimate of Phase II**

See Other Meeting Minutes