IowAccess

Project Team 1 Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, July 15, 1997 ✧ 9:30 am - 11:30 am

Drake University, Meridith Hall ✧ Des Moines, Iowa

Cedar Falls High School ✧ Cedar Falls

Vinton-Washington High School ✧ Vinton

Project Team Present

Tom Armitage, *Cedar Rapids Public Library*
Norman Baker, *IPERS*
Jim Brendeland (for Don Toms), *Iowa Department of Transportation*
Bob Canney, *Black Hawk County Auditor*
Paul Coates, *ISU Extension Service*
Glen Dickinson, *Iowa Legislative Service Bureau*
Mose Hendricks, *City of Hawarden*
Curt Johnson, *Cedar Falls Municipal Utility*

Linda Plazak, *Iowa Information Technology Services*
Jean Rommes, *Innovative Technologies*
Lowell Sneller, *Iowa Information Technology Services*
Dennis Thurman, *Iowa Braille School*
Jack Whitmer, *Story County Supervisor*

Guest

Jim Day, *Iowa Information Technology Services*
Doug Kearn, *Iowa Information Technology Services*

Staff

Amy Campbell, *State Public Policy Group*

Introductions

Linda Plazak welcomed the Project Team to the meeting and asked for the remote sites to introduce themselves.

Discuss Approach to CIN

Linda Plazak revisited the Criteria for the CIN, which was first presented at the June meeting. The criteria was revised, based on the input from the Team, the Steering Committee, and the leads of other IowAccess projects. Plazak emphasized that this criteria is very important, because this list will form the basis for the selection of a partner or vendor in the creation of the CIN.

- Dennis Thurman asked that "IDEA" be added to criterion #15, to read "ADA, IDEA, and Year 2000 compliant".

Plazak added that Jim Youngblood, the Director of Information Technology Services for the State of Iowa, asked that this group begin the process of developing some evaluation criteria on the use of the CIN, and a timeframe for that evaluation phase.

- Jack Whitmer suggested one evaluation criteria — #1 criteria could be evaluated by setting a target on the number of local governments, state and federal departments to be on the system, and tracking the number that are actually online.

- Whitmer suggested another evaluation tool for criteria #10, #14, and maybe others — log types of uses by citizens would address many of the criteria.

CIN Framework

Norman Baker revisited the proposed framework of the CIN, which was included in the June packets. This diagram demonstrates the framework for the CIN, using the Internet and a public network which would provide security and user authentication. In essence, the user would subscribe to a private network.

Baker stressed that it is important that this network be self-sustaining at the end of this 18-month window, and flexible enough to bring new applications on without significant restructuring.

- The criteria (and policies of the CIN) need to address who will monitor and enforce policies related to changes to information on the CIN

Paul Coates asked if the State should go ahead and take the lead on the construction of a security platform, and not wait for the federal government. Coates suggested that the State start with unsecured data and move later to secured data.

Glen Dickinson asked if IowAccess is going to use WINGS, or if more discussion is needed. Baker stated that the State does not currently have enough information on the system. Suggested we talk to other states that have partnered with WINGS. Linda stated that we will try to contact them to obtain a plan for national deployment of WINGS.

Baker and Plazak emphasized that the State has many options, and stated that the Team's challenge will be determining how to proceed, evaluate options, and outline the relationship the State has with its new partners.

Plazak stated that there are plans to bring both groups in to discuss the options in detail, and that a small group of the Team should be appointed to do this. The Team again expressed concern about the US Postal Service and their federal system — Iowa may want to be interoperable with them, but not become a pilot at this time, unless the State is sure it will receive *statewide* benefit from this.

Lowell Sneller stated that this Team needs to look at both the front-end and back-end — WINGS provides a good front-end, but leaves the back-end up to the State. The Information Network of Kansas provides the back-end and front-end to suit the State, but can not offer a comparable global authentication system.

Dickinson asked if it is possible to combine the two systems, WINGS and Information Kansas Network. Baker reminded the Team that Kansas is a for-profit company, not a state entity, and is in this business to make a profit. This is an important distinction for the group to

consider when looking at the two approaches. Plazak reminded the group that the two systems are NOT mutually exclusive, and stated that, yes, the systems may be combined.

- Dickinson stated that the Team will need to look at chapter 20, and related AG opinions, on what fees can and can not be charged for information. Depending on the approach taken, the system may require statutory changes to allow charges for certain information.

- Jean Rommes explained that some agencies should logically pay to provide the service, since it saves on administrative costs (mailings, service assistance) and time. In addition, it is the mission of agencies to provide services to their customers, and this facilitates effective compliance with that mission.

- Paul Coates cautioned the Team to moving quickly to the private sector and locking itself into any one system — the system needs to be flexible and appropriate.

Rommes asked Sneller if he had an opinion on which approach should be taken. Sneller proposed that the Team needs to go to the source and see how the system is working. Sneller stated that we can see both ends right now, but don't see the in-between, which is the most important part.

- The Team may want to give the person a choice in how they want to be authenticated (local authentication and global authentication options). Several members stated that they did not want to have duplicative systems, and that global determination of authentication and security level designation would be the preference.

- Sneller stated that the Nebraska folks have salesmen that teach users how to use the systems, and sell subscriptions — which generate income for the network (not the state). Theoretically, state agencies would not lose money from fees charged.

Rommes stated that we need to make a concrete decision, based on what is actually available now. Many team members have expressed concern about waiting for a national system that is full of unknowns — and that the Team should approach the creation of a state system that can potentially link to a federal infrastructure. The Team was critical as to what is really available from WINGS.

- Tom Armitage suggested that WINGS is really only offering authentication services, not the actual infrastructure that the state will need to develop.

Plazak commented that Bob Canney and Steve Moon met with Velma McCuiston when she was in town last month and were able to get into a lot more detail about the system. Because of that, they have a better understanding of what the system has to offer. This is the reason a small group will volunteer to serve on the Vendor/Partner Team, so that they may investigate options, interview potential partners, and begin to understand the options available. From their findings, that group will make a recommendation and report to the Team as a whole.

The Team would like to have the vendor contract or MOU negotiated and signed by November 1.

Iowa Standards

Plazak explained the concept of Iowa Standards – a set of minimum and optimal standards to be interoperable with the State of Iowa. This group will be setting these standards by August 15 and will need to make sure that they address all categories.

Mose Hendricks commented that security of information coming in is very important to address. The Team will need to validation of what is coming in and coming out – and who is receiving it.

The Team asked if the CIN will contain both customized and raw data. Both may be available, but customized options are very important. The goal is to give citizens information that is both already formatted in a standard form, and the option to customize that data for their own needs (there may be charges associated with doing this, as opposed to already formatted data).

Plazak asked the team to comment on any existing standards — and forward them to Amy Campbell at SPPG.

Partner Team
Glen Dickinson
Jack Whitmer
Tom Armitage

Standards Team
Jean Rommes
Doug Kearn
Lowell Sneller

Evaluation Team
Paul Coates
Dennis Thurman

Business Policy Team
Bob Canney

Other members will be contacted to see if they would like to participate. Other project teams will also be asked if they would like to participate — and certainly persons in your offices/communities that would be appropriate are welcome to participate. If you are not the person that can address standards, but you have someone in your office/county/city that is — let Amy Campbell know at 515/243-2000.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am.