

Technology Customer Council Meeting
Minutes of April 28, 2008

10:30 a.m.

Hoover, B Level, Conference Room 3 or via Conference Call

Final

Present: Steve Mosena*, Kevin VandeWall*, Joel Lunde*, Rich Jacobs, Gary Kendell*, Lesa Quinn*, Larry Murphy*, Greg Wright, Evelyn Halterman*

Absent: Mark Brandsgard, Keith Greiner, Roberta Polzin

Guests: Mollie Anderson*, Michael Tutty, Patsy Tallman, John Gillispie, Mark Uhrin, Laura Riordan, John Hove, Diane Van Zante, Lorrie Tritch

* Participating by phone

1. **Call to Order** – Greg Wright.

Greg Wright, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:36 a.m. It was noted that a quorum of members was in attendance.

2. **Approve Minutes of October 9, 2007** – Greg Wright.

Larry Murphy moved approval of the October 9, 2007 meeting minutes; Gary Kendell seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously approving the minutes as written.

3. **Discussion of New Utilities** – Michael Tutty.

Three items are being discussed as potential utilities -

a. SOA Shared Infrastructure

The purpose of a shared infrastructure is to establish a shared gateway for services to be provided. Individual agencies would be able to trade data with each other, which also results in greater transactional flexibility. This infrastructure serves as a building block for the rest of the SOA initiative and provides one place to authorize services to be published out. Council members were generally supportive of a SOA shared infrastructure.

At present, the cost has not been determined, but a work group has been established to help identify costs. There are many unanswered questions. If we are able to share the data power boxes that are already in existence elsewhere on the complex, the overall cost would be greatly reduced. If that does not occur, worst case scenario is no more than \$500,000, with about \$200,000 going to purchase a couple of data power boxes. We may apply for pooled technology funds. ITE has done some initial number crunching, however the result depends upon the requirements.

Has there been any discussion about asking agencies what services they see as potential utilities? To date, most of the utilities have come from DAS and ITE. DAS Director

Mollie Anderson responded that each year, the councils are encouraged to make recommendations. Also, due to legislation which passed this session, oversight for customer councils is moving to the Department of Management.

b. Authentication and Authorization Utility

We would like to take the existing A & A function that ITE offers today, make it a utility, expand some of the functionality, and make it a standard for future applications and one of the center pieces of SOA. Comments from the large agencies indicate that they support this, but want to ensure that there is adequate behind-the-scenes support, such as a more robust help desk. Is an e-mail address required? Yes and it must be unique. Many Department of Human Services' customers do not have an e-mail account. We may need to be more flexible with the accounts, such as creating an account that would be transaction oriented. It would not be specific to a person, but could be used by multiple people, if desired. While there is a need to be more flexible, there are also security concerns associated with such an account.

What is the purpose of presenting the utilities at this time? ITE is presenting potential utilities to get feedback to make a decision about how to proceed. We want to ensure we have the support we need to be successful. Discussion is purely for input; there is nothing to vote on today.

c. E-Payment Utility

ITE currently offers an electronic payment gateway. The conversion to a utility would require some changes to the existing service. ITE would like to move to more of a shopping cart format. The agency would not have any of the data for the credit card transaction itself, so would not be held to PCI compliance standards. The transaction would still integrate with I/3 and the Treasurer's Office. Will all agencies be required to pay (regardless of use) or only those that want to use the payment engine? Comments from the large agencies indicated that a common process would be good for the state. Some agencies do not accept payments, they make payments. Several council members favor a distribution formula wherein only agencies that use the service pay for it. Are we going to insource or outsource? Responsibility would reside within ITE, but portions of it might be outsourced. Are we speaking about credit card payments for things like licenses and payment of taxes, etc.? Yes. What effect would this have on DNR and the contract it currently holds? Michael was unable to comment on this situation, as he was not familiar with the DNR contract. If E-Payment were to become a utility, it would be effective in FY10. There are a large number of agencies who collect payments, so this would be of value; there are also a large number of agencies who don't, so it is important to determine a fair denominator. It will be difficult to price the service properly. Breaking it up into a support versus usage model is a possibility. Another thing to remember is that if you have an agency that is federally funded, there could be cost recovery issues.

4. **Approve Rate Methodology for Utilities for FY10** – Greg Wright.

Prior to setting utility rates for FY10, the Council is asked to revisit the existing rate methodology and determine if it wants to consider an alternate method. Last year, there was

a motion to retain the status quo methodology, acceptance of an allocation formula based on FTEs. Rich Jacobs moved adoption of the status quo (acceptance of an allocation formula based on FTEs). Lesa Quinn seconded the motion. An oral vote was taken, unanimously supporting continued use of the existing rate methodology.

5. **Wrap-Up and Next Meeting Date** – Greg Wright.

Laura Riordan reported that legislation passed which transfers the responsibility for customer councils to the Department of Management on July 1st. In the interim, they have asked the councils to continue with the rate setting process.

The next meeting is scheduled for May 13 at 1:00 p.m.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:13 a.m.