

# Preserving State Government Digital Information New Partners Meeting Summary

**Thursday August 20 – Friday August 21, 2009**  
**Minnesota Historical Society**  
**St. Paul, Minnesota**

## Participants

*Robert Horton, Jennifer Jones, Carol Kussmann, Charles Rodgers, and Shawn Rounds (Minnesota Historical Society) met with Michele Timmons (Minnesota Revisor's Office; Robbie LaFleur and Elizabeth Lincoln (Minnesota Legislative Reference Library); Lynn Ewbanks (Arkansas Historical Commission); Mary Brewer (Arkansas State Library); Ann Jenks (North Dakota State Archives); and Audrey Grafsgaard and Marilyn Johnson (North Dakota Legislative Council Library).*

*\*Due to travel cancellations, representatives from Nebraska were unable to attend.*

*The purpose of this meeting was to welcome the three new partner states to the Minnesota NDIIPP project and to give them an overview of the projects past and future activities. Meeting face to face fostered greater discussions about topics of concern for the new partner states.*

*The following account is summarized and paraphrased. PowerPoint Presentations can be found on the project website.*

## General Summary

The meeting started with introductions and a presentation given by Bob Horton that provided background information on the project. This set the stage for Shawn Rounds' presentation on technologies being developed for the project. Discussions followed both presentations. The afternoon involved touring the Revisor's Office, the Legislative Reference Library, and learning more about the Revisor's Bill Drafting system. Seeing how the pieces fit together and the practical aspect of these tours was appreciated by the participants. The following day was spent learning more about the new partner states. Each representative was asked to give some background information on their state and share why they were interested in the project and what they found the most interesting. Bob wrapped the meeting up by sharing a timeline for major project goals through 2011.

## Thursday August 20, 2009 Meeting Summary

Introductions were followed by presentations given by Bob Horton and Shawn Rounds.

### **Project Background: Preserving Legislative Digital Records, Bob Horton**

#### *Background: MHS...*

The Minnesota Historical Society (MHS) has been interested in e-records for some time. As we all know, technology has changed how we record content and what we as archivists do. MHS has been involved in a number of projects including developing the Trustworthy Information Systems Project<sup>1</sup> (focused on how systems are built and how policies are built around them); the Electronic Records Management Guidelines<sup>2</sup> (a set of guidelines that addresses specific questions such as file formats, file naming, digital media, storage concerns...); and worked with the Department of Human Services on a practical implementation on how to develop a set of policies and retention schedules.

This was followed by E-Government Research and the Persistent Archives Test-bed program (PAT) which made us understand that collaborations are absolutely necessary. Some of the collaborations MHS has participated in include working with legislative tapes, record retention schedules, and government publications. MHS worked with the legislature because of the development and adoption of their XML bill drafting system and wanted to work with a branch of government that was producing a valuable set of records. From past project experience, it was noted that XML could be used to as a tool to help share information, content, and services. This led to the E-Legislature Project<sup>3</sup> in 2005.

#### *Assumptions and Conclusions...*

From all of these projects MHS learned that collaborations and standards were necessary; a national cyber infrastructure would be useful; use value is important (investment is a function of use); the change from paper to digital and the workflows were not going to happen overnight; and the projects must be sustainable overtime. In general that you need to have a base set of standards that reach a national cyber infrastructure. This led to working with the Library of Congress (LOC).

#### *NDIIPP Program...*

The Library of Congress also believed in both collaborations and standards and helped develop the National Digital Information Infrastructure Preservation Program (NDIIPP). One purpose of NDIIPP is to provide a catalyst of working together and developing technologies that others may also find useful. Through this program, LOC funded a variety of study efforts that talked about needs, interest, and capacity of digital preservation.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/tis/tis.html>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/electronicrecords/erguidelines.html>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.mnhs.org/preserve/records/elegislature/elegislature.htm>

#### *Four State Grants...*

The four most recent projects are headed up by representatives in Arizona, Minnesota, North Carolina, and Washington State. The Arizona project is focusing on LOCKSS technology (Lots of Copies Keeps Stuff Safe); Minnesota on legislative records; North Carolina on GIS data (Geographical Information Systems); and Washington on a digital archive solution. The overarching goal of the Arizona and Washington project is preservation, while Minnesota and North Carolina are focusing on specific content types.

#### *Preservation Issues...*

Issues we have been looking at along the way... disaster recovery, legal framework, public attention and expectations, complexity of systems, costs, and lack of a good model...

#### *Familiar Challenges...*

We have had same issues for some time... each media type has its own preservation and access issues....

#### *Solution: ongoing process...*

Focus on standards, migration, conversion, innovation, and collaboration...

#### *Policy Framework...*

One must also look at the policies in place, and not focus solely on technology. Any system developed must include system documentation. There must be a way to ensure accountability, freedom of information, and transparency as well as privacy. Costs and organization is also important.

#### *Legal framework...*

Statement that the legal framework for electronic records is out of date.

#### *Sustainability: business case...*

Must build a business case around legislative content that: uses appropriate solutions, is integrated into routines, defines priorities, has reasonable costs, proves use value, and shows efforts of collaboration. Each state has a different environment, as we look at building a model, it must be flexible enough to allow for necessary changes. The goal is to build something here in Minnesota and see how it can be adapted in other states. We know that we can't ask people to change their routines, do much more, or spend money to help us. That type of system will not work. We need to create a system that does not involve massive changes, and one that will fit into daily business routines. Costs need to be controlled, and the emphasis must be on use value.

#### *Archivists' Role...*

As an archivist/librarian, what do we bring to a collaboration? We can add value, to make the information better. Each of us must define a niche – we cannot be experts at everything. We can also help facilitate the use of information for the record creators, our patrons, and others interested in context. We are also interested in long term access and preservation, maybe more so than other players at the table.

### *Conceptual Framework...*

Must build a conceptual framework that includes access, guidelines and standards, outreach, education, and promotion. Understanding nationally what is going on over the long-term is also very important. Data consultants can assist with this.

### *Project outcomes...*

The goal of all NDIIPP projects is to preserve at risk digital content; Minnesota is focusing on state legislative materials. We will build a model and test it with Minnesota data. Then test it with other states (CA, KS) and begin determining how other states can also adopt it and how it can be built into the larger cyber infrastructure with LOC.

Education and promotion will be key.

### *Project Partners...*

Minnesota, California, Kansas, California Digital Library are technology partners and will have a more active role in the testing of the pilot project. NCSL (National Conference of State Legislatures) is assisting with outreach and promotion. The other states (Arkansas, Illinois, Mississippi, Nebraska, North Dakota, Tennessee, and Vermont) are currently acting as an advisory group, and can get more involved as they wish. Thomson Reuters represents the private sector and has been a valuable partner because they know about XML and how to manage content.

### *Partners unique and appropriate...*

As stated before each state is different. They have different audiences, missions, and priorities. A gap analysis can be done to analyze how to bridge any gaps from one state to another and how to adapt the model. To highlight some differences between states, the following slides give examples of what some of the partner states have been interested in so far during this project.

### *Goals: California...*

During initial meetings with California, interest was expressed about developing a core schema to foster data sharing. Authentication, a method to validate information was important... *(At this point, Michele interjected with a discussion about the Uniform Law Commission (ULC)... Michele is a member of the Uniform Law Commission, which writes and proposes uniform laws at the state level. After working with the American Association of Law Librarians (AALL), the ULC created a study committee on the authentication and preservation of online state legal materials. Michele served as the chair of the study committee, Diane Boyer-Vine of California served on the committee, and Bob served as an observer, on behalf of both the Society of American Archivists and the Council of State Archivists. The study committee recommended moving forward with the drafting of a uniform law on the topic, and the ULC approved the project at its 2009 annual meeting in Santa Fe. The concept of the law is to draft legal standards for the authentication and preservation of online state-level legal materials, and create a proposed law that could be adopted in every state. Michele is hoping to be appointed the chair of the drafting committee, and she expects the project to take several years, with a first reading in summer of 2010 and a second reading in summer of 2011. This topic has*

*been widely recognized as being very important by NDIIPP project partners interviewed thus far.)* California is also interested in web harvesting technology and Minnesota will work with them to help test their web crawler, Heritrix....Creating the optimal conditions for preservation may involve developing content creation standards, so when the materials arrive at the archives, they are already in a format suitable for preservation.

*Goals: Kansas...*

Kansas, like California, is interested in the development of core schema, to help share content.... Kansas has a great interest in E-Democracy and wants to build a statewide network between libraries, television stations, schools... that would allow access to government participation to anyone anywhere. This demands a comprehensive and sophisticated system. Kansas is developing a modular system that can be implemented piece by piece. (KEEP- Kansas Enterprise Electronic Preservation). Policies will be very important as well as standards.

*Goals: Vermont...*

Vermont is interested in a core schema, as well as standardized metadata and XML. Policy issues such as authentication and accessibility, retrospective digitization standards, preservation vs. storage (disaster recovery operations), and web harvesting were also of interest.

*Goals: Mississippi...*

Methods for data sharing, including a core schema, was important. Recordkeeping metadata standards, policy issues, preservation, and web presentation were also important.

*Next Steps...*

- Review of technology
- Legislative perspective
- Your interests and environment

*[end of Bob's PowerPoint]*

We watched a preview of the NDIIPP podcast.

*Questions and Discussion...*

Q: How long is this project for?

A: The grant is set to expire in 2011. Explanation of the project followed [discussed in more detail in Shawn's PowerPoint].

Q: Do you have legislative support/leadership on this project?

A: We are working with the Revisor's Office and Legislative Resource Library here in Minnesota. We are getting information about our project out to a variety of legislators with the help of NCSL. Getting the word out to legislators from a variety of creditable sources is very valuable. Our goal is to educate along the way. Access to digital

materials is important. We would like to build a system that helps with access and preservation of legislative material.

Michele confirmed that two current buzz words for the legislators include public access (they know how important access is to their constituents) and security (computers and private data). Authentication is a component to the security issue. Disaster recovery has also been on people's minds, ever since Hurricane Katrina. Areas of Minnesota were affected by flooding, and just yesterday the tornado in Minneapolis.

Bob stated that because technology and standards change so frequently, we are taking an incremental approach, continually try to better as we go, and above all must be practical in our solutions.

*[break, followed by technologies presentation]*

### **Minnesota's NDIIPP Project: Technologies, Shawn Rounds**

*(Shawn stated that this presentation is more an exchange of ideas, if you have any questions, comments, or want to discuss anything as we move along, please say so...)*

#### *Minnesota's NDIIPP Project...*

Multi-year project on how to provide enhanced access to legislative records in a trustworthy environment. Goal is to create a model that is stable, sustainable, and able to handle change in technologies. We cannot require too many things of partners such as high costs, and extra staff. We also need to develop a way to test compatibility with other states. Utilize tools to adapt model to other states; build a similar system, but specific to each state's needs.

#### *Project Deliverables...*

Research on a variety of topics including authentication, retrospective digitization, digital audio/video, and government data mashups. More and more people want access to government data and want to take it, reuse it, and repurpose it. Having access to bulk data, not just database searches, is a service to patrons. Our pilot project utilizes eXist and is currently in development, with a prototype scheduled to be complete by the end of the year. We will also develop an online toolkit addressing all issues from the project.

#### *Access Pilot...*

Centered around eXist, an open-source native XML database. It is nonproprietary and therefore low cost. We chose eXist, because we were interested in XML as a format, XML works well with structuring data, and the Minnesota Revisor's Office uses XML in their bill drafting system. Some other features include: text is indexed upon ingestion in eXist; searches can be preformed across multiple collections; eXist can point to outside resources; a web interface can be developed (the US State Government has a website that uses eXist. <http://history.state.gov>).

In the first phase of pilot development we will bring in XML data from the Revisor's Office and then hope to add contextual information into the system. We had our first meeting with our consultant yesterday (August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2009) to work on the system architecture.

*Proposed Access Pilot Workflow...*

In this example, MHS would act as the trusted intermediary, as the agency that receives information and then provides access to the information (any agency could be placed here). Submitted information is received from various sources and may also be harvested from the Web or requested from outside sources. All of these materials are then gathered by MHS (trusted intermediary) who will push the information out to users. One method uses the eXist system which can output both human and machine readable information. The display of external information will also need to be addressed. For example, we may find useful information harvested from the web using the Heritrix web crawler, but because the file format is WARC, it cannot be directly ingested into eXist. However, eXist can pull information from Heritrix and display the results with the eXist search results. We also hope to develop an FTP site for batch downloads of data. As we are also interested in preservation, we will be testing one available option for preservation with the California Digital Library (CDL). As all of these pieces are modular, they can be implemented at different times and with different resources.

(A discussion about contextual information and getting information from external sources ensued. It was agreed that being able to have access to committee hearing meeting minutes or audio and video files within this system is attractive. However, if these pieces of contextual information are being pulled from external sources, you will not have control over them. Links may change, sites may go down. You don't know how long you will have access to it. The ideal is that you will be able to ingest the contextual data into your own system, ensuring continued access to the data.)

(Also talked a little about the company Granicus, and how it is being used in the Tennessee Legislature video recording procedures.)

This model can be adapted to whatever you need... it is a proof of concept for MN but we hope to be able to generalize it and look at what do you need to customize for you... These components are very modular; you can pick and choose what is most important in your situation.

We have had training on the system and determined that it would be a good investment to have a consultant build templates that can be modified and adapted to individual cases or different collections of data. Education is key. Our toolkit will include information on the educational process we went through during all phases for this project, including planning and developing.

This model, could also provide opportunities for partnerships within a state or across state lines. For example a group of states could develop individual state collections but allow

constituents from other states access to the data and develop a search tool that searches across all collections.

Contextual Information... We have studied what people want and would like to develop a sort of one stop shop for research needs. Contextual information provides additional value.

To learn more about XML native databases in general, we will be sharing a white paper on the topic shortly. XML is being use a lot more, there are XML based systems even with Microsoft programs.

#### *XML Wrapper for interchange....*

We are also working on an XML wrapper to help facilitate data exchange. The wrapper is composed of metadata, XML source, HTML rendition, and attachments. [see slide] The metadata is a key piece, and it describes the document itself. This metadata allows users to determine if the document will be useful to them, it also can allow for indexing, and provides an avenue for tracking changes to the document over time.

#### *Metadata Scheme... Metadata Crosswalks...*

The metadata scheme was developed two fold – to provide a common set of terms used to describe legislative documents as well as with the intent of being used with the XML Wrapper. The metadata schema is deliberately small, as we didn't want to create a burden on the record creator. This set was created for legislative bills, however a smaller subset can be used to describe other legislative materials. The schema was developed by comparing three main metadata sets; the Minnesota Recordkeeping Metadata set (for management), Thomson Reuters metadata set, and the Minnesota Revisor's Office metadata set. It also crosswalks with Dublin Core. We tried to keep it generic, as the more elements that can be agreed upon the more likely and easier data can be shared. It is still in draft form, and we are working on testing the XML wrapper with data from the Minnesota Revisor's Office.

#### *Metadata Element...*

13 elements, 7 required; shown on slide.

[hand-out given that describes each element in more detail]

#### *Toolkit...*

The toolkit we are developing will address the project background, policy framework, legislative content selection, preservation, technologies, and information on the access model.

### **General Discussion...**

Bob asked each state to talk about their first impression of the project, what they were doing in their states...

#### *Arkansas...*

Mary stated that the majority of older materials are microfilmed, which does not provide access to a large number of people. Only current information is online. Interested in how to make the materials more accessible. Believe that Legislative Research is interested in this project. The Office of Information Technology should also be aware of the project, as all technology decisions for state projects are made by them.

Lynn views this as a good opportunity to learn more about access. The History Commission also has microfilm holdings of legislative records. Full text search-ability would be wonderful. Also interested in the conversion of older records. Information from this project could help facilitate such a project.

#### *North Dakota...*

Ann discussed audio and video concerns. There are decades of audio tapes that have their own issues and she can't see converting to digital formats. Today public access television provides live access to full sessions, but the recordings are not retained online. You can call (for an unknown time period) and get copies. Ann expressed that as a smaller state, North Dakota is looking for ways to learn more about options for providing access and preservation.

Marilyn is concerned with preservation. She would like to see more online access of older bills, voting results, and committee hearings. The plan is to place 2009 standing committee meeting minutes online. We would also like to see minutes from 1997 up to 2009 placed online as well. The North Dakota legislature has signed a contract with Propylon to develop a new system for all legislative processes.

## **Friday August 21, 2009 Meeting Summary**

Today's meeting provided a chance to get to know more about the new partner states and their situations. Bob asked each representative to talk generally about what they were interested in, what steps Minnesota can take to work with them, to describe their environment such as audience, mission, priorities, initiatives, capacity and resources.

### **Arkansas**

Mary:

Arkansas State Library. Brief history of the library... As a division of the Department of Education the mission of the Arkansas State Library is to serve as the information resource center for state agencies, legislators, and legislative staffs by providing guidance and support for the development of local public libraries and library services, support services to institutional libraries, and to providing the resources, services, and leadership necessary to meet the educational, informational and cultural needs of the citizens of Arkansas. The agency administers state and federal funds appropriated for libraries and library development. We have a staff of about fifty.

Our state also has a Legislative Reference Library, but we also function as a service provider to legislators, which we work very closely with. We are legislatively mandated as the State Documents Depository and Clearinghouse; we are also the Regional Depository for federal documents.

We subscribe to the OCLC Digital Archive (about 5000 documents in the collection). Although we collect state documents historically, we are not the State Archives. This is the responsibility of the Arkansas History Commission.

The Bureau of Legislative Research is interested in learning more about the project. The Bureau is responsible for research for the General Assembly, staff committees, maintains computer services, bill drafting, reviewing rules and codification of laws. The Bureau has some current, not archival, House and Senate bills and reports online. Archival materials are on microfilm, with no public access. I do not know the software/hardware of the online documents.

The Office of Information Technology approves projects for state agencies, so they may be a department to bring into the project. Legislative staff may also be interested.

The General Assembly now meets every year (it was every two years). The sessions start in January and will run to about March, pending special sessions.

Lynn:

The Arkansas History Commission has been around since 1905. The agency history is online. There have only been 4 directors over the years, and I have been here since January 1976. There is very little turnover at the state archives. The archives is governed by a governor appointed board. Developed a branch archive system in 2005; currently have a SW regional archives, and are in the process of building a NE regional archive.

Arkansas did their first digital project in 1999-2001, with a photo scanning project available online. The Catalog of Arkansas Resources Archival Treasures (CARAT) is the name of the online catalog where digital materials can be found. There are currently 12,500 images online documenting Arkansas. We utilized the resources shared by the Denver Western Photo Project. We are in an OPAC with the State Library. We have been collecting materials for many years; currently we are working on the manuscript collections. We are in the process of making paper finding aids digital using the Archivists Toolkit. Our users find this very easy to use as they are used to the Windows environment. The Archivists Toolkit converts the finding aids to EAD (version of XML). To utilize search capabilities, we hired a web designer to develop a search function.

We have been microfilming since 1957, and have 4 staff members for this. We still view this as a better method of preservation over digital. Digital is viewed as a method of access.

As the access and technology archivist, I am interested in the access issue. It would also be wonderful to have all legislative records in one place.

*Discussion about document types available in Arkansas...*

Mary:

Mary stated the only item received by the library is the published version of the Acts of Arkansas (published by West Law). The library previously received committee meeting minutes, but they stopped sending them around 1990. Current minutes are being put online. Interim study reports are also being put online, however older copies are still only available on microfilm. Bill tracking is available online, but may be by subscription.<sup>4</sup>

Lynn:

We have Acts on film from the Territorial period to 1967; Senate journals on film through 1981. We do not have audio or video. We do not have records management program. We created a general records schedule but it does not apply to the General Assembly or Senate as they are exempt. It is the responsibility of each agency to follow the record schedule.

Bob asked if Arkansas was looking at collecting born digital information.

There is a heavy presence with paper records. Don't see the capability to do so at the moment. Both agencies are lacking the IT staff necessary. The Department of Information Services would be better set up for digital preservation, as it serves all branches of government.

List of Partners for Arkansas:

Arkansas State Library, Arkansas History Commission, Bureau of Legislative Research (Legislative Library and IT staff), Information Services, Office of Information Technology

*Of interest...* Bills are currently in PDF on website. It would be interesting to learn what they are using to generate the bills and information on the website. What applications are in use. Also found the Electronic Records Study Commission committee, it will be interesting to see what they do overtime.

## **North Dakota**

Ann:

---

<sup>4</sup>Arkansas Bill Watch: <https://www.ark.org/billwatch/index.php> (subscription); Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce: <http://www.statechamber-aia.dina.org/legupdate/default.php>

North Dakota State Historical Society is directed by a board represented by the head of the Department of Transportation, Department of Tourism, the Secretary of State, the State Treasurer and others as appointed by the governor. The historical society includes a museum division and there is a museum in the Historical Society building. Another division is the archaeology collections. Historic Preservation (SHPO) is in charge of the national register, including archaeological sites. People research these collections often. The office of the state Paleontologist as well as the geological specimens are also part of the Historical Society. The Education and Communication division is in charge of outreach, publications, and programs and kits being sent to schools. The archives includes a division of 56 historical sites, a microfilming department (state law to film daily and weekly papers – we have kept the paper copies for future use), have a large photo collection, collect manuscripts, we are a federal and state repository.

Records management is under the technology department [?]. When new schedules are proposed by the state agencies it must go to the state auditor, state archivist, and a third person [?].... the archives has the right of first refusal before disposal. There are no retention schedules for legislative materials.

Our website is new this year and not everything is transferred over yet. Some things are linked and cataloged in the archive and manuscript collections online. There are minimal descriptions available.

So far, all records are paper. The Legislative Council produces House Bills, constitution, petitions, resolutions, House and Senate standing committee meeting minutes, budget requests, bill analysis reports, constitutional convention files. The meet every other year starting in January and meet for 80 days.

Some other state agencies are starting to create born digital materials, so we are being to address this issue.

Marilyn:

Library users include legislators, lobbyists, the legislative council, fiscal analysts, attorneys, and the general public.

The office is undergoing a top to bottom change with the computer system. Currently we can look at bills, journals and budget documents, but only current versions. Revisions made before 1997 need to be looked up manually.

Many floor sessions are broadcast live, but they not really archived. Community access television films the House one week and the Senate the next. Archived copies maybe available directly through the source.

Legislative history records are organized by bill number, on disk and microfilm, hope to get them online... We also do legislative histories, and having access to changes or being able to link from bill to bill would be very helpful.

### **North Dakota partners:**

State Historical Society, State Archives, Legislative Council, State Library (collect electronic state docs), ITD (records management), Supreme Court Library

## **Discussion about Security and the Revisor's Website**

Michele showed the Revisor of Statutes<sup>5</sup> website and how older versions of session laws are linked in the history notes to the statutes. She would like to do this next with the Administrative Rules. Michele discussed security concerns, and pointed out that the website was a 'https' site not 'http'. She also showed how to view security certificates on the webpage by clicking the lock box at the end of the address line. The Revisors Office is working towards securing each document individually; to eventually replace manual notarization of documents. Some reasons the Revisor's Office is being asked to notarize laws include adoption, marriage dissolutions, for incarcerated people, and litigation purposes. Currently Utah and New Mexico are using hash-marks to authenticate document by document. The GOP is testing a pilot project using PKI technology (like hash-marks, but dual level security with a public key number that relates to a private key number behind a firewall of some sort) for authenticating documents individually. These methods allow for public access to certified copies. A problem with using PKI technology is being able to maintain the keys, if checksums and hash-marks are used, they are internal to the document, so you don't need to worry about outside authorities (hashmarks, being internal make it easier to use for archival purposes, the hash-marks may also be able to be used as the record-id).

## **Next Steps**

To learn more about what our next steps should be, Bob asked what interested Arkansas and North Dakota participants over the past two days.

North Dakota: Preservation of audio and video is a concern. Access. Authentication. Enhancing value. Developing a compelling argument for funding; a business case. Having procedures and policy models to follow.

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.revisor.leg.state.mn.us/>

Bob stated that Kansas is working with the same vendor, and it would be a good idea to keep information flowing between Kansas and North Dakota as plans in both states develop.

Arkansas: Access and preservation of older materials. Making older copies available online. Working with vendors to set up a digitization projects (possibly with microfilm). Cost-Benefit analysis. Authentication (which others within the state have been discussing lately). Sharing of content.

Both: Interested in learning more, but need to know how to make any technical solution easy to understand (Windows Environment). Like practical examples of working systems. Collaborations between groups is a concern. How will the model run, how will it be supported, by who? Would like to have a understanding of the behind the scenes aspect of how to collaborate. How do you get people to work together? Sometimes, the site visits have been a good catalyst for conversations.

Where do we go from here:

We plan on working on this project through 2011. In 2009, we signed contract with a developer to build a system and deliver a working model to us by December 2009. This working model will demonstrate the framework shown in Shawn's technology slide.

2009. Schedule site visits to talk with partners again, if desired.

2010. All partners meeting in mid-January in Sacramento, CA. The purpose of this meeting will be to demonstrate what we have done with the pilot project.

2010. February-October. Identify how we can adopt and modify the pilot project for use in CA and KS.

2010. October. Conference for ALL NDIIPP state projects and other NDIIPP partners. Have all states represented. To be held in Phoenix.

2011. Refinement, evaluation, products, policies, toolkit, cost benefit analysis,

2011. Before December. Another round of site visits to each partner state.

#### **Discussion on Site visits:**

Late October early November might be best for Arkansas. Keep in mind Arkansas has computer training lab.

North Dakota will be available after October 26<sup>th</sup>.

#### Debriefing...

Everyone was pleased with how organized the meetings were and were very happy to be invited to join the project. Collaboration is the key and this is an exciting opportunity. It was stated that when working with such a diverse group, we need to try to define acronyms better. Officially announced head contacts for each state. All information will be posted on Basecamp.