IowAccess Project 14
Team Meeting
August 18, 1997

Present: Jerry Beatty, Tom Bouska (via ICN), Judy Dierenfeld, Joan Discher, Victor Elias, Hollis Hensley (via video conferencing), Linda Hinton, Marge Knudsen, Bobbie Mowrey (for Katie Steele via video conferencing), Dr. Barb Rohland (via ICN), and Deb Westvold.
Staff: Arlinda McKeen, Deb Kazmerzak
ITS: Linda Plazak

Project Plan, Work Plan and Budget

A number of counties have expressed interest in piloting this system.

The IowAccess Steering Committee and the Citizen Council review project progress regularly, which is compiled into monthly progress reports. Harold and Deb have responded to initial comments made by these two groups. The Steering Committee and Citizen Council will continue to provide regular comments as part of their responsibility to monitor and coordinate all 14 IowAccess projects.

RFP

The draft RFP was developed by a subcommittee of project 14 team members -- Deb Westvold, Harold Templeman, Vic Elias, and Linda Hinton. They used the RFP template as a base and inserted the needs for this project. It was then sent to DHS for review and comment. Those changes have been incorporated into the draft being reviewed today.

The Department of Human Services has already hired a consultant to help integrate their computer systems. Harold is looking into whether it would be possible to add this work into that process. Team members commented that they would support using an existing contractor if possible, particularly in consideration of the relatively small budget for this project.

Team members added that they doubt this project would fit the criteria to be included as part of any RFP combination with other IowAccess projects because of the differences in type of data and limited access and confidentiality issues surrounding the project.

Victor Elias reviewed the draft for those at the ICN sites that didn't have copies.

The question of ownership of the system came up -- one of the additions made to the draft by DHS was that they would own the system -- that probably came up so that the contractor cannot sell the system developed for this project. There is a need to look at the wording and clarify with DHS.

Team members discussed whether the counties selected for the pilot need to already have compatible hardware and software. It was suggested that we involve only counties where the systems are compatible with hardware/software needs. If there is not compatibility, it is probably with counties not on CoMIS. We need to ask for some recommendation as to what would make them compatible. If it's going to take too much time and money, we might want to expect that the county come up with the funds, rather than using project funds.

Page 7 G - addresses the issue of compatibility. The contractor can make recommendations as to compatibility.

The suggestion was made that the pilot counties become part of the project team -- and this group will continue its oversight to address issues of compatibility.

It was determined that the consultant did not have to be in place and help select counties, but that the project team would do the selecting.

The minimum data set is used by law in every county, regardless of CoMIS or not. That will help the issue of compatibility.

The compatibility of a system doesn't matter if the data is not accurate or coming in as needed. Looking at the integrity of the data is a place to start with the pilot sites. The data drives the current system, so what is in the system should be accurate.

On page 6 section A -- project start date -- when is the project start date?
Aug. 30 -- RFP goes out
October 1 -- evaluate bids
Oct. 5 -- award contract
The project start date seems fluid -- Between Oct. 1 and December 1. If we start putting dates in, they might be unrealistic. Let the contractor pick the date and move on from there. It was suggested to add that the project start date is negotiated between the contractor and the appropriate entity -- DHS, ICN, or ITS.

The project work plan should be attached to the RFP to give an idea of what the key target dates are.

Linda Plazak -- There are some other things that Project 1 is working on. Draft standards will be distributed to project leads on Wednesday. In terms of getting information back and forth between servers, etc, -- getting the necessary compliance in place. We have named a minimum product and the ideal.

This draft RFP will be faxed or e-mailed to you. Get comments back to Deb Westvold -- if there are a lot of comments we'll do a conference call. This will strengthen the RFP. You can reach Deb at 515/ 244-7181, Fax 515/244-6397, e-mail ccmsisac@aol.com.

Linda Plazak -- We'll also be looking at combining RFP's among projects -- this one may go out separately -- but I want everyone to know that it is a possibility.

Select counties for participation in pilot

Team members discussed the requirements for inclusion in the pilot.

It was suggested that the project include as many counties as the budget allow, ensuring that both CoMIS and non-CoMIS counties are selected to allow for testing communication among different systems.

All of the six counties expressing interest are CoMIS counties. A decision was made to approach Linn County as a non-CoMIS participant. Urban/rural and geographic considerations also need to be part of the selection process.

While it would be helpful if the consultant were selected and able to help determine what is possible as far as number and types of counties, the project will need to move forward before a consultant is secured.

Criteria

- 3 or 5 pilots counties with legal settlement issues
- counties who've demonstrated good data collection in the past
- urban / rural considerations
- geographic considerations to address service differences
- counties where CPC covers more than one county
- counties who are not compatible but will commit their own resources to become compatible will be considered, as long as the time line can be kept
- will include both CoMIS and non CoMIS counties
- counties who will dedicate staff to update and maintain the system once it's up, and are willing to mentor and help train others on the system when it is replicated

There should be some way to keep other interested counties informed who are not selected as pilots.

The RFP should include the names of counties that have been selected so the contractor can respond appropriately.

ITS can help the technical evaluation of sites so we know their current capability and status. We will work with ITS and their expertise to help select counties, based on their available system.

To obtain information from counties, Deb will put together a simple questionnaire using the selection criteria and asking the questions about use of data in the past, including how many new consumers they have had enter the system on whom legal settlement determinations have been done, and whether counties have staff that can maintain this once the system is set up. Team members delegated the selection of pilots to a sub-committee comprised of: Vic, Linda, Deb, Harold and a county representative from a county who does not wish to be considered for a pilot.

Other

Linda Plazak of ITS commented that the RFP is an excellent effort.

The chair expressed apologies for not getting the information out before the meeting due to time constraints.

Next meeting -- there are changes in ICN sites -- we'll send that out with the materials. Sept. 22, 1:30 - 3:30.