Electronic Real Estate Recording Task Force
Minutes: 12 December 2002
As recorded by Bob Horton

Present: (Members) Jeanine Barker, Carmen Bramante, Jeff Carlson, Michael Cunniff, Larry
Dalien, Don Goedken, Bob Horton, John Jones, Secretary of State Mary Kiffmeyer, Cindy
Koosman, James Lawler, Gail Miller, Dennis Unger, Angela Burrs (via telephone), Joe Witt (via
telephone). (Guests) Bert Black, Luci Botzek, Ken Foanes, Lowell Haagenson, Greg Hubinger,
Beth McInerny, Bill Mori, Carmen Mulder, Pam Trombo, John Ware.

1. Call to order

Secretary of State Kiffmeyer called the meeting to order at 9.45.

2. Approval of 14 November 2002 minutes

The minutes of the November meeting were approved as distributed.

3. Project coordinator update

Beth McInerny reported on the progress made in the past month. The RFP for the business
analyst and XML consultant was completed and it will be posted this Friday. Proposals are due
at the LCC on 2 January. The Executive Committee will review the proposals.

The LCC is still working on the extension of the contract with BenNevis for review of the
Roseau proposal. Once the contract is signed, a meeting will be scheduled to review the
proposal. The committee members already have copies of the proposal and a score card to
evaluate it.

The project time line will be updated once the contracts with the pilot counties are signed.
McInerny distributed a spreadsheet describing the state of the project budget. The total projected
cost of the project is $1,119,474.03.

McInerny and Gail Miller attended the annual AMC meeting in Duluth and presented a well
received report on the project. Mark Monacelli attended as well and presented a well received
report on the national projects.

4. Pilot phase one project report

Beth McInerny noted that the Legal Subcommittee reviewed the questions raised by BenNevis's
final review of the schema. There are some additional issues to resolve. Chuck Parsons
recommended forwarding those to a joint meeting of pilot counties, vendors and other interested
parties.

There still remains some work to do to synchronize the ERERTF's schema and the PRIA DTD.
Pam Trombo noted that there are some differences between the number of required and optional
fields in the two standards. PRIA, as it is a national standard, does not require as many fields.

Trombo said that matching the Minnesota standard to the national standard means fewer required fields. The question arose whether an implementation guide could address this issue, even allowing for counties to require specific fields. Bert Black asked if it would be possible to require fields either in the standard or in the implementation guide and the answer was that either would be feasible. If the fields are required by state law, then they will have to be required in the standard. Another option suggested that if the field was required by routine practice; those issues should be implemented in back office procedures.

To resolve this, there should be some systematic effort to identify the data elements required by law in Minnesota. Bramante and Jones agreed that the national standard had to be modified to reflect what was required by state law, although they urged some limitations to extensive modification at the county level. Jeanine Barker said that this could demand some re-training at the counties to distinguish between what is required by law and what has been adopted to facilitate back office processes. Secretary Kiffmeyer said that we would be able to work out the possibilities in the pilots. The identification effort will be referred to the legal subcommittee. If there are any implementation issues, they will be worked out in collaboration with PRIA. What is required by state law will have to be required in the schema.

Jeff Carlson noted that the trusted submitters would have to address the unique communication protocols of individual counties, so that there will inevitably be some local concerns that affect a transaction. Jeanine Barker said that there would be changes over time, contingent on what happens in Minnesota's pilots, as well as in other states. Bramante said that PRIA would review state standards as they are created and update the national standard as necessary.

Pam Trombo distributed a handout mapping elements in Minnesota's schema to the PRIA DTD. She will send Beth McInerny a digital copy of the file for distribution to the task force. Mike Cunniff asked if the use of a schema would create any unnecessary additional costs or burdens to a customer using a DTD. The answer is no, as long as all the required elements are present; the differences will be addressed in the application.

5. Status of pilot county contracts

Greg Hubinger reported on the status of the contracts with the pilot counties. Hennepin has responded with some suggestions for revisions; these are under negotiation with the LCC legal staff. The LCC also received a proposal from Renville County on the morning of the meeting. Dakota and Lyon Counties indicated that they could accept the model worked out with Hennepin.

6. New business

The next meeting is scheduled for 9 January. Bert Black asked if the Executive Committee could make a recommendation on the responses to the RFP for the business analyst at that meeting. It might be difficult to schedule a meeting of the Executive Committee before then. The task force agreed to re-schedule its meeting for 1 PM on 23 January. It will review the day and time for the monthly meeting of the task force during 2003 then.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11 AM.