

Iowa County Recorders Association “Solutions”, Inc.

Maintenance and Support

Meeting Summary

February 20, 2008

Participants

Deb Winke, Allamakee County Recorder
Liz Kenison, Worth County Recorder
Megan Clyman, Davis Co. Deputy Recorder
Sue Vande Kamp, Story County Recorder
Joyce Jensen, Cass County Recorder
Joan McCalmant, Linn County Recorder
Sue Meyer, Clayton County Recorder
Denise Meeves, Crawford County Recorder
Marilyn Dopheide, Carroll County Recorder
Dwight Reiland, Wright County Recorder
Deb Roberts, Floyd County Recorder

Scott Williams, Marshall County IT
Greg Davis, “Solutions”, Inc.
Alison Herman, “Solutions”, Inc.
Jared Baker, ABC Virtual
Phil Dunshee, Enterprise MidAmerica
Lisa Sinclair, Enterprise MidAmerica

Welcome

The meeting was reconvened by Joyce Jensen, ESS Coordinating Committee Chairperson. Alison Herman and Greg Davis were asked to make opening comments.

Participants referred to “Exhibit A: Scope of Work” and “Exhibit B: Specifications and Performance Standards” throughout the meeting.

Additional Fees for Additional Programming

Participants discussed possible additional programming issues. The Project Team does not want to be prescriptive in deciding what changes service providers need to make to the base software. If it is determined that changes are beyond the scope of work, service providers will be asked to cost the changes and the Coordinating Committee will then decide whether or not to move forward with the changes.

Solutions commented that Exhibits A and B are contradictory in places. The Management Office will write a cross-reference section and limit redundancy on page 7.

It was noted that the blue highlighted passage on page 3 indicates a change to the document made after the Tyler agreement was finalized. The Management Office wanted Solutions to be aware that the service provider’s responsibilities had been narrowed.

Timeframe for Installing a Required Major Synchronous Upgrade

The Management Team has not intended to penalize or lay liability on service providers for not installing updates in a timely manner. Solutions asked that “best effort” language be used and to understand that they are always working to complete work as soon as possible.

Reports

The Management Office has requested that Solutions provide reports in order to learn about systemic issues. Reports are beneficial in indicating trends or issues, determining work flow and identifying escalated issues.

Solutions explained their constant automation of all counties and indicated it would be a lengthy process, but possible, to separate the Recorders' information. They believe that problems are usually solved quickly and do not recur therefore reports are unnecessary.

Concerning the "Periodic Service Provider Meetings/Conference Calls" section, page 7, Participants agreed to add "to the best of their ability" following "Service Provider shall."

Client Recorder Responsibilities

Solutions agreed to change all references of "Client Recorder" back to "Service Provider" in the technical sections of Exhibit B.

Fees

Fees for service are addressed in the agreement and not the scope of work. The Management Office explained the reasoning behind the suggested amount, \$2,000 per county whether indexing and imaging or indexing only.

Solutions has requested to be paid \$2,000 per indexing client and \$1,000 per imaging client. These amounts are greater than those negotiated with other service providers. Negotiations with ACS and Cott have not been finalized but representatives from both companies have indicated they would agree to terms agreed upon by other service providers.

The Management Office recommends paying service providers similarly and requested guidance from the Coordinating Committee.

Solutions has requested to be evaluated on their work only and not to be compared with other service providers.

Effective Date of the Agreement

The Acceptance Agreement process was explained. The Solutions Acceptance Agreement is dated January 9, 2006. Participants discussed the dates of the various agreements with Solutions. A three month contract date discrepancy would impact the ESS current budget if the Coordinating Committee agreed to pay Solutions the extra three months in question.

After discussion, Solutions proposed to begin the new Maintenance Agreement on April 1, 2008.

Form of the Agreement

Solutions requested a contract similar in form to the Tyler contract.

Miscellaneous Amendments

Under "County Recorder Support" on page 5, Participants agreed that "affect and" should be added as highlighted.

Reciprocal Notice

Solutions has requested that ILR be required to report to them as noted in highlights on page 6. The Coordinating Committee agreed.

ICRA/Solutions Working Relationship

The Coordinating Committee, Management Office and Solutions agreed the working relationship between the groups was satisfactory.

Closing with Solutions

Solutions was thanked for their participation in the meeting and will be notified about the amount of fees to be offered once the Coordinating Committee has made a decision.

The Management Office has attempted to negotiate the best deal for the ICRA and recommended re-examining other service provider agreements if Solutions is given their

requested fees. The Coordinating Committee was asked for guidance on how to continue with the Solutions negotiations.

Participants discussed the service provider fees and agreed that all service providers should be treated similarly. The meeting time ended before a final decision could be reached. Coordinating Committee Members were asked to continue considering this issue and be prepared to vote during a conference call to be scheduled on a future date.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:02 p.m.