



MINUTES

Technology Committee Teleconference Meeting Thursday, April 21, 2005 12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. Eastern

I. Welcome and Introductions

Tim Blevins (Kansas), Committee Chair, called the meeting to order.
The following members participated in the call:

NAME	STATE/ORGANIZATION
Joe Randall	Idaho
Steve Wilson	Idaho
Mary Scro	North Carolina
Gordon Smead	Tennessee
Debbie Peterson, Vice-Chair	Texas
Sandy Hurley	Washington
Susan Ribe, Antonio Soto	Multistate Tax Commission

II. Public Comment Period

There were no members of the public present.

III. MTC Technology Priorities

The committee discussed options for MTC project selection and prioritization. Mr. Blevins suggested that StateNet, which is intended to comprise several information sharing components, should have allocated funds for upgrades to the existing system. He raised the possibility of having third-party contract(s), on a time and materials basis, for this work. Debbie Peterson identified the importance of oversight for MTC technology projects, particularly in order to successfully manage multiple projects at the same time. She raised the possibility of having an additional person at the MTC for this purpose.

Mr. Blevins asked that MTC staff prepare a “top 10 list” of potential cost saving IT projects, that is, projects that would save staff time and/or money. The list should include an estimate of time and

cost savings that could be expected. He suggested that this list could be used to calculate a projected return on investment for each project, which could then be used to select projects for implementation. These would be relatively small projects with relatively high ROIs.

Mr. Wilson provided two comments for the committee's consideration. He concurred with the previously stated need for the committee to receive clarification as to what the Technology Committee is expected to oversee, i.e., what is and is not included in the budget that this committee reviews, should it review any work that is not in that budget, and should the expense of the budget be changed. He also concurred that the MTC should try to undertake multiple technology projects at one time.

IV. FY 2004-2005 Budget Review

The committee reviewed expenditures to date for fiscal year 04/05. It was noted that expenditures are significantly below projected expenditures for the current fiscal year, with only approximately two months remaining in the year. Mr. Blevins noted that these low expenditures reflected, or were consistent with, a low level of progress on the projects covered by the budget. Ms. Ribe stated that expenditures on the combined electronic registration system (CETR) traditional registration system (TRS) for the remainder of the fiscal year would be not more than \$80,000 and probably significantly less. It was also noted that money for the TRS reflected in the budget had come from funds that had been made available for development of a Streamlined registration system. The group discussed that it has recently become apparent the MTC will not develop the Streamlined registration system.

Mr. Blevins attempted to begin discussion of budget projections for fiscal year 05/06. However, it was not possible to pursue this discussion because information about costs was not available to the participants. Ms. Ribe stated that the person who might have such information, MTC IS director Naresh Verma, was not available for this meeting. Ms. Ribe indicated she would request that Mr. Verma prepare estimates of costs of potential items for the budget and make them available to the committee.

V. Other Items Related to the Work of the Committee

The committee discussed funding for support and maintenance of existing and planned projects. Debbie Peterson stated that she would provide to the committee a document outlining the division of support responsibilities between MTC and the States for the CETR

TRS. She would also work with the CETR committee to provide estimates of support and maintenance costs for the system.

Mr. Blevins asked that the MTC staff prepare support and maintenance cost estimates for all IT projects. He explained that some costs would be hard costs, such as software licensing fees, and some would be soft estimates, such as staff's time to provide support. It was also noted that no support or maintenance costs are currently reflected in the enterprise automation budget.

It was noted that the enterprise automation budget (the budget that is generally reviewed by the Technology Committee) does not include all MTC IT expenses, but rather the development costs of specific projects. Mr. Blevins expressed concern about this division of the technology budget into multiple budgets. He asked for clarification on what is and is not included in the budget, and how this budget becomes integrated with the overall MTC budget. Ms. Ribe indicated that the overall budget is maintained by MTC administrative officer Bill Six.

VI. Adjournment