

Technology Subcommittee Meeting - May 25, 2004

Attendees: David Arbeit, John Lally, Nancy Dean, Erin Hultgren Greg Dougherty, John Engerholm, Greg Hubinger, Luci Botzek, Pam Trombo, via phone: Bill Mori, Gail Miller, Mike Cunniff.

Meeting objectives: Discuss schema issues regarding the Date of Birth (DOB) element on the CRV and the Relationship Status as an enumerated element which causes some filings to be rejected. The need for a standard architecture for the transmission of documents was also discussed.

Date of Birth on CRV: 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.

Relationship Status (marital status as discussed at the TF meeting) on SAT, COR and Assignment: It was determined that changing this field from an enumerated to a text field may result in the loss of data quality and consistency. For example: one person may type the word Unmarried and another type UnM. This could result in inaccurate data collection regarding information in this field. It was mentioned that this field has already been changed once from v2.0 to v3.0 to add Married Person to the list of selections. It was determined that an OTHER selection with the ability to add free form text could be added to this list. The OTHER data could be reviewed regularly to see what new selections should be added. It was agreed that since we are in pilot testing, it would be prudent to wait until the end of Phase I testing to see what additional changes may be requested on this field, or any other field and add them at that time.

Luci Botzek noted that it would be good practice to identify the types of changes that would be considered for incorporation during pilot testing and the types that would be documented for review and incorporation after completion of a phase's testing. 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. Skytek will contact Pilot Counties to ask current and potential trusted submitters what volume the Relationship Status affects. John Lally indicated that since no CRV's would be recorded with a required DOB, this change should be made so that Revenue can begin development and testing.

Changes to the schema also brought up the status of Object Oriented work that Skytek has been contracted by the ERERTF to complete. This would produce changes to the schema that would more align it with the best practice of object oriented programming. They have completed discussions with Ingeo and TriMin and are waiting to have time from Hennepin, Fidlar and WCI. They estimate that discussions would last between 1 and 2 hours and encourage all vendor groups to participate. They will document a report outlining the changes and the discussions with vendors they have completed. SKYTEK will also add the CRV change to its OO work.

Standard Architecture for Transmission: Greg Dougherty led the discussion of the benefits of having a standard architecture for transmission of data. This standard would enable quicker startup times for new entrants into e-recording and would provide consistency between partners. 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. A document bundling standard has been discussed at the

Phase II Planning committee and their work will be brought into this discussion also. Beth will work on setting up the first meeting with interested members.