

INK Board Minutes

Meeting Minutes
May 3, 2016

Opening

A meeting of the INK Board was called to order at 10:02 a.m. Tuesday, May 3, 2016 in 700 SW Harrison, 2nd Floor, Topeka, KS 66603 by Chairman Eric Rucker, representing the Secretary of State, with the following members present:

Chuck Knapp, representing Lt. Governor Colyer
Eric Rucker, representing Secretary of State Kris Kobach
Matt Billingsley, representing the Secretary of Department of Revenue
Scott Hill, representing the Kansas Bar Association
Phil Wittmer, Executive Branch Chief Information Technology Officer
Gregg Wamsley, representing Kansas Library Association

Others Present

Duncan Friend of INK, Phil Elwood of Goodell Stratton Edmonds & Palmer, Shane Myers, James Adams and Ashley Gordon of Kansas Information Consortium, LLC, Kathy Sachs of Kansas Secretary of State. Guests included Bob Sanders, General Manager, Arkansas Information Consortium, LLC, Deb Wiley – Kansas Department of Revenue, and John Thomson, Chief Executive Officer, Payit.

Consent Agenda

The consent agenda for the meeting included the April 2016 Board minutes, the April 2016 Network Manager report, contracts for approval, and a new item, a listing of Board expenses. An attachment was included in the Board packet that listed expenses approved and paid since the last meeting, as well as those not yet paid for approval by the Board.

As Chairman Rucker convened the meeting, he indicated that the first topic was the consent agenda and deferred to Hill who he said he understood might have a motion to make with regard to that agenda.

Hill started with a brief recounting of the background. He first assumed the role from the Secretary of the Department of Administration, Jim Clark, and, of course, Jim Hollingsworth was in place at that time. The process for approving INK expenses for Hollingsworth would be to review everything for appropriateness and then submit a report documenting the expenditures to Hill for approval. Hill said he considered his job to determine whether or not these were generally the board approved expenditures contacts etc... However, he did not consider it his job to determine whether or not the line items were appropriate. With Hollingsworth gone, he said that he is not sure that there is anyone looking at whether line items are appropriate. He stated that it seemed to him that they needed additional transparency and additional checks and balances. The initial thought was that it should be put on the consent agenda so that everyone can look at, and he would obviously be taking a close look at them. And, if anyone wants to critique any of those expenses they would certainly have the ability to do so. He initially thought that we would just put everything on the consent agenda, but then it dawned on him that maybe that is a little bit overkill. If one looks at the INK expense approval, there are a number of items that fall below \$1,000 that are reimbursements. For example, Friend bought coffee today and he shouldn't have to wait until next month for the meeting to get reimbursement.

INK Board Minutes

Action Taken: Hill motioned that the INK Treasurer have authority to approve ordinary reimbursement expense-type activities up to \$1,000 - excluding from that the customer refund reimbursement that may fall below or above \$1000. He noted that he thought the Board was dealing with those separately on maybe moving them back to KIC, but anything that is under \$1000 would follow the typical protocol. Hill could approve and get those expenses paid quickly. If he didn't approve something or it was above \$1000, it would go on to the consent agenda for approval the following month. Seconded by Knapp.

Amendment: Billingsley offered a friendly amendment to raise the amount to \$5,000, more in line with the state delegated authority. Motion seconded by Knapp.

Discussion: Wittmer asked what type of expense would fall into that range between \$1,000 and \$5,000? Billingsley noted Mize Houser (the accounting) was above \$1,000. Friend stated that they fall into two buckets – that of standard recurring expenses, like rent, most but not all under \$1,000, and then the ones that vary, like refunds which could be above that, but would unlikely be over \$5,000. There then are amounts like the audit, which is like \$20,000 and \$15,000 that is a contractual payment. So, he couldn't say that there was a lot falling in that range unless something nudged up occasionally over \$1,000. Hill said his intent would be to continue to only approve those items which do not have an hourly component to them. He gave the example of the accountants – since he's not the one working with them, he's not really in a position to speak to whether or not the work billed was done or appropriate. So, if the threshold is moved up to \$5,000, that amount might allow a few things through that are routine and should be approved, but he would still end up bumping some things to the consent agenda. Chairman Rucker stated that it was obvious that the Board members were making reference to the bills that not only have been paid but those that are on the consent calendar to be paid. With Friend's help, Rucker stated that they had created this sheet of information because he thought it would be good for the individual board members to come to a deeper understanding of the sort of bills that we are paying on a monthly basis and also to hold the board to a higher degree of accountability. He noted that we are the board members, so we need to know where the significant expenditures are as well as the de minimis expenditures are going. It is not a comment on any of the individual bills so much as it is a point of information for all of the board members can keep this as a permanent record for their own records. They can look back at the expenses that occurred for a monthly reminder. And, it is also a monthly reminder that, sometimes, the Board has significant monthly expenses.

Action Taken. The motion that the INK Treasurer have the authority to approve ordinary expenses and reimbursements up to \$5,000 without board approval on the consent agenda - excluding customer refunds regardless of amount and other expenses with an hourly component to them - was approved unanimously.

Continued Discussion of Consent Agenda

Chairman Rucker stated that, with regard to the bill by Goodell, Stratton, Edmonds, he held up paying these 2 bills for review. He recounted a previous role he had as Chief Deputy Attorney General for the State of Kansas that involved overseeing review of legal bills for the Tort Claims fund for about four years. At that time, they had hired a firm that would review billing hours by the firms they chose to use. In reviewing the legal bills on the consent agenda, he had some questions. They were personal in nature and he has not had the chance to talk with Elwood about them. He is not asking that the Board hold up the payment of these bills. And, he has checked with the Attorney General's Office and the practices being employed during in the past are no longer being employed by the Schmidt Administration – that is, they no longer have an outside vendor that is reviewing the bills. He emphasized that he was not necessarily suggesting a use of such service here, as the Board has only one lawyer and we can pick up the phone and

INK Board Minutes

ask if they have questions. But, as Chairman, he wanted to let the Board know that he may have questions from time to time about the expenses, not just legal ones. For example, he also has a question this month with regard to marketing expenses. He noted that, while one would think that a consent agenda would be handled quickly, asking if there are any questions, in this case, he wanted to put in the minds of the Board members that, with an 85/15 split with NIC/KIC, when we receive a bill for \$1,355 for marketing expense, he is trying to figure out who should bear the burden of marketing expense – the private vendor, or the INK Board.

The Chairman stated that the INK board has had an intense interest in marketing and this subject has sometime has been the subject of discussion of this board meeting, He was curious about how we had arrived at the point where the marketing bills were being forwarded to the board for payment when, at first blush, this seems like an expenditure that would more than likely be drawn from the 85% of the business equation. He asked Myers whether he might comment on that.

Myers responded to the Board, noting that, as they were aware, the business plan is a contractual requirement that is due December 1st and is a collaborative effort with - at that time - Jim Hollingsworth the Executive Director. They basically take that business plan and create the INK business plan off that. Then there is conversation on the business plan and the operations and how it lines up with the strategic plan. The budgetary items are a part of that. Over about the past 3 to 4 years, Myers said that there has been dialog that the board was interested in funding the conferences that KIC attends. He recalled that there was about \$15,000 dedicated last year, and 2016 it was about \$10,000 dedicated to trade shows or conferences that KIC attends to represent our product offering across the state. Rucker asked the Board if there were additional comments from the Board about marketing expenses. Hearing none, he asked if there was a motion on the consent agenda.

Knapp responded, that, if it was appropriate at this time, he would like to discuss the legal bills. He noted that he didn't have the hours or hourly amount in front of him, but it seemed high. He noted that he could see if for two consecutive months, so it looks as if that is what they may have been paying, but he was curious what this constitutes and if it is something that the Board normally does. Elwood asked to see the summary. In response, he noted that, particularly over the last two months, there had been a rush of contract work that they had been pretty intensely involved with, which he thought is probably what gives rise to this. He noted that he really should, but probably doesn't pay that much attention to the amounts involved, so he doesn't know whether these numbers represent a pattern that's been pretty standard, or whether it's reflecting a significant "push" that has been going on the last several months.

Knapp said that he believes that the Board budgeted \$72,000 for the year, which seems like a lot for a board of this size and for what the Board does. He continued that he knew the Department of Administration charges \$100 an hour, but he didn't know how many hours the \$72,000 represented. He is not suggesting we don't pay them, but he does think that it would make some sense to look in to it a little bit more closely. Billingsley asked Elwood if there had been an RFP done or had he just always represented the Board? Elwood said he started representation in about 1993. Chairman Rucker stated that there was currently a letter executed by Elwood on behalf of Goodell Stratton and Hollingsworth dated April 2015 – He asked Friend to confirm the date, who noted it was a little earlier in the year than that, but it was 2015 – at least the most current Friend had seen. Which is a contract of that is standard professional contract of billing rates, he believed, were \$220 for Mr. Elwood and his associate at \$180. For lack of a better term, it is a satisfaction contract in that it is terminable with appropriate time and appropriate notice. But, we can provide the letter that he believes was executed by both the INK board

INK Board Minutes

and Mr. Hollingsworth. Friend stated that from what he found it didn't have a board chair signature on it. Friend said that, as context, that represented about 70 hours in the last month at \$225 an hour, where, on average it had been 25 or 30 hours for about \$6,000 a month.

Hill stated that for these last 2 months he would say the bills are not a trend at least in his memory of review. He hadn't gone back and checked the documents, but certainly felt like they have fallen in line with what the Board's budgeted amount has been over the course of his approval. Wearing both his board member hat and his attorney hat, he said he felt like the burden on counsel over the last few months has been somewhat extraordinary in that we have asked them to do related to Hollingsworth's departure and other items we have asked of them. The numbers don't surprise me given the amount that we have asked of them. He did not have any reason necessarily to call the amount in question although he had not examined the line items. Chairman Rucker stated that perhaps in the future it might be beneficial for the education of the Board to see the line items, in other words, to see the bills. He stated that, through Friend, that can certainly be provided to each of the board members and make it part of the packets for discussion a week before on the phone conference as well as submission at the INK board meeting if that is the desire of the Board. Hill stated that, as he motioned earlier, we have approval to include the expense approval items on the consent agenda I think it is necessary that we provide everyone the supporting documentation for their review. I would certainly support that. Chairman Rucker stated that he thought it was just a matter of practice and as long as there was no opposition to that process, he didn't see that we needed a motion. Hill interjected to clarify – that detailed information was provided to him as Treasurer when he would go to approve an expense and my intent was to simply shift that over to the board approval so that anything that he would see they would see as well. Friend noted as the discussion was closing that the billing cycle closes on the 25th and we would not receive it, say, until the 29th, so while he could likely get the information out in advance of a Board meeting to members, from a time perspective, it would be difficult to meet the requirement for a week's lead time.

Chairman Rucker asked for further discussion on the consent agenda. There was none.

Action Taken: Hill moved to accept consent agenda, seconded by Wamsley. Motion carried unanimously.

The Board continued, taking up another item on the consent agenda, Contracts for Approval.

Chairman Rucker noted that the contracts had been presented to him for signature and asked if there was a motion. He noted that while these items were normally routine, as a point of information for the Board, the contracts for approval for all of them are for an "over the counter" service. One of the main thrusts of the INK Board was to use technological innovation to make electronic interaction with individuals and businesses and government easier. Over-the-counter strikes one as a step backwards as it is an emphasis of paper, not electronic transactions. The Board is signing contracts that are enhancing the over the counter service for a paper way of filing, doing business with the State of Kansas. Billingsley said he would defer to Deb Wiley from KDOR who was in attendance for further explanation of this contract and what "over-the-counter" as that may be a term that has been around KDOR for quite some time and may need to change. Ms. Wiley noted that KDOR does have a certain number of transactions that are conducted over the counter, some of those by choice of citizens who prefer not to use electronic means, for whatever reasons. And, there are also transactions where KDOR requires identification or some other type of documentation so they must be completed face-to-face.

INK Board Minutes

She continued that typically there are a couple of areas in the division where those face-to-face transactions are conducted, but they do not have the ability to allow them to use debit or credit cards. This is why they are trying to put in the over-the-counter transaction methodology so that people can use credit card and debit cards and be able to pay in electronic means. It is a little bit of a modernization for some of the transactions that KDOR does not have services for at this time.

Billingsley asked Wiley to confirm it was under KANPAY, and she said that it was. He then asked her to elaborate on the contract for reinstatement of driver's licenses. Wiley went on to explain that the reinstatement of the driver's license contract is similar to over the counter contact, but the difference is that it is an online portal where people who have a driver's license suspended for traffic violations or other driving infractions have the ability to go online and pay the reinstatement fees. She said that the biggest challenge that KDOR has with this particular portal – and they have been struggling with it for several years - is the methodology where if there is a debit card transaction, KIC fronts KDOR the money. However, if a transaction turns out to have insufficient funds, getting the reimbursement back to KIC from KDOR then pursuing the individual requires a great deal of manual effort on the part of KDOR. This contract would give access to an electronic means through KANPAY to conduct refunds which is much more efficient for KDOR staff.

Wiley stated that this is the modernization that has been accomplished with this contract. Wiley continued that KDOR has had the contract for years, and it had expired, so part of this was a renewal as well as a change to allow KDOR access to the portal that would allow them to conduct those refunds on the KIC side. Access to the administrative side of KANPAY is what is being sought there. Billingsley stated that the Director of Vehicles approved this along with the attorney that is assigned to Vehicles.

Chairman Rucker asked for additional comments or discussion. Knapp stated that he thinks the Chairman's point is a good one. He is not sure if there are situations that fit in to it. He noted that when he was in Oklahoma there was a rural water district where one was required to show up in person. He didn't know if that is the case with Atchison, but he hopes that both we and the people at the local level are looking for opportunities to drive people online.

Gordon said that she could speak to that. Should, for example, a water district prefer, there is now a component that they can have an online payment page and they can route people to that. Essentially, it is a recognition that some people will always want to come to the office and they have a service to accommodate that. Or, when due to some regulatory reason one has to present in the office to conduct his/her transaction. But, they also recognize that there is an equal number that want to drive people online and that is why they offer an online component.

Wittmer asked if this was one application to cover all four, or four individual applications. Gordon confirmed that this was KANPAY counter, their point-of-sale solution. It is a multi-tenant product that is supported at the corporate level across a number of portals. In this particular instance, it covers these, as well as the many, many, many over-the counter contracts that you see come through for approval. Myers followed up to indicate that three of the four were KANPAY counter and the other was KANPAY only. Wittmer asked what the approximate level-of-effort to implement was. Myers responded that it was minimal. Wittmer asked if it was less than forty hours. Gordon stated it is a turnkey solution so essentially the heavy lifting is on her business development managers to go out and build relationships, get people signed up for the product, and then her group can actually configure an instance of over the counter solution from the business side there is no interaction needed from the technology side.

INK Board Minutes

Billingsley then stated the one KANPAY or the over the counter has been 19 months out and that they, as a management team, decided to do something online and he asked Wiley about how many months out the driver's license reinstatement had been. Wiley indicated it had actually been expired for several years – but KDOR continued to work under it, and it hadn't taken that long to get that one done. Billingsley stated that they were now getting in compliance with their contracts with the INK Board.

Chairman Rucker asked if there was further discussion. Hearing none, he offered to entertain a motion to approach the contracts.

Action Taken: Knapp motioned to approve the four contracts listed, seconded by Hill. Motion passes unanimously.

Action Agenda

1. **INK Audit Status Update: Duncan Friend** – Friend stated that he knew that, by seeing the topic, the members might think that the auditors had come, but they haven't yet – he just wanted everyone to know how things are going since the kick off was more than a month ago. Our current status is slow moving, but we now have the information we need from the corporate part of NIC to our auditors to begin generating confirmation letters. Hopefully, things will start to pick up with more information and have letters for Chairman Rucker to sign to go out to those to be select for audit to start moving forward. As far as he knows, there aren't any open issues. They are going to be on site the week of June 6, so with the 7th being the next board meeting, he will have something to report back then.

Action Taken: None.

2. **INK Financial Approvals: Duncan Friend** - This is a continuation from last meeting. Previously, a letter had been distributed to the Board that had been submitted by Hollingsworth as he left about some financial approvals that could be seeded back to Kansas Information Consortium / National Information Consortium to do, as well as the refund process. Historically, they had performed these activities, then Hollingsworth had taken it over for a while, but he felt that there was minimal risk in giving it back. The board moved that they develop a policy related to that. A couple of weeks ago Hill, Elwood, and Friend had gotten together to talk that over. Friend stated that, in that conversation, it sounded as if the group might be heading in the direction of a contract amendment to do that. Since then, Elwood had issued a letter and it looked like the contract itself has a provision that allows us to delegate this kind of authority for refund and the disbursements that go daily from UMB.

Friend had sent an excerpt from the letter previously to Hill and assumed the next step was for them to get together to talk. Friend stated that, not to be presumptuous about the Board's position, the question for him was still whether or not they are still looking for a policy or - since the contract allows them to delegate the authority - is it just a board motion that is required? Their current charge is to develop a policy. Elwood said it's pretty clear that the Board can have KIC resume management of those funds. The Board would want to have procedures in place to oversee that protocol, but that would be a way the Board could deal with this without a lot of commotion. Chairman Rucker stated that the purpose of bring it to the board is to make absolutely certain that the board has the ability to air any concerns it might have now that Mr. Hollingsworth is no longer in the employment of the INK Board. And, how it is that the transfer of the responsibilities for the financials is taking place – and how it is going to be done in the future. He continued that counsel now having reviewed this with

INK Board Minutes

Friend and having no reservations about the course of action anticipated to be taken by Friend in executing these responsibilities through a reinstatement of the way that the financials were handled, and asked the Board if they had any reservations or questions about the way the financials will be approved in the future, and the conversation that has taken place before the Board members by Friend and Elwood.

Myers spoke, stating that he would like to have the opportunity to have a discussion with Elwood and his legal counsel on the particular area of contract that states that accordingly, as he has not been involved in that discussion to this point. Chairman Rucker asked Elwood and Myers to report back the following month with the way the process needs to take place and noted that if any problems are encountered, please contact Friend first, but then also him or any of the other board members. Chairman Rucker asked the Board if there were other comments. Hill stated that he thinks the direction that the Board was looking for was a policy on this issue and is not sure where we stand on that right now, whether there is still a desire for policy and procedures, or an acknowledgement and motion that allows this to happen – he wasn't sure. Elwood stated that he would like a one-page protocol that can be easily understood and regularly followed. Chairman Rucker stated that he thought that would be enlightening and summarized that the direction as he understood it was that there would be a meeting that would take place between Counsel and Myers, Friend, and Hill – if he would like to participate – and there will be promulgation of the policy to be presented to the Board at the next meeting. The Chairman asked for any further questions and confirmed that was the direction.

Action Taken: None.

- PAVS Update: Shane Myers** – Myers began his update with a summary. The members of the PAVS committee are Shane Myers, Ashley Gordon, Scott Hill, and Duncan Friend. The discussion at the last board meeting was relook at the charter and the deliverables for PAVS. The team has met twice since the last board meeting one was right before this meeting. We talked through those topics and planned to report to the board at the June meeting on these two topics - the charter and also the future direction of the PAVS committee. He also wanted to provide an updated on some other things. At the last Board meeting, they had also discussed the KDOR DMV fee proposal. At that point in time, he had reached out to KDOR and presented the proposal to them and had a collaborative discussion. Since then, he has received notice from them that they don't feel this is an appropriate time to do a fee increase. The fee increase is off the table for now, but not necessarily for the future. He will keep that as part of their ongoing dialog with KDOR as they continue to look at the analysis for the potential fee increases.

In reviewing the charter, the team also noted that there has been a lot of emphasis and time on policy creation. Those policies were probably established in 2011-2012 timeframe. The main key role that those policies were built around was the INK Executive Director role. The PAVS subcommittee was wondering what the future direction of that role is going to be. I know a committee has been formulated for that, but as we build out the roadmap for future deliverables of the PAVS subcommittee was looking for direction on that particular role to help shape and form our key deliverables in the future. Myers asked if there were any comments on the INK Executive Director role for the PAVS subcommittee. Hill asked if there was going to be a report sometime today on that committees' duties? Chairman Rucker responded not to his knowledge.

INK Board Minutes

Knapp asked Myers what he was looking for from the Executive Director. Myers responded that the policies that were created were around project acceptance, service assessment, and so on. Basically, it built the boundaries of the Executive Director of when they need to come to the INK Board for direction. Basically, the guidelines. So, the policy was put in play based on that role, raising the question of whether the role would continue to exist, or exist in a different form. The answer would mean whether they would have to adjust the policies when they look at the roadmap for the completion of the key deliverables. So, they were trying to get some guidance from the Board of what insight they could provide to help in laying out that roadmap. Right now, we have it slated more towards the end of the year to bring those back up and that might seem appropriate from that perspective, but they were just curious at this point in time if there were any other updates.

Knapp said that his view is we contracted with Kansas Information Consortium to manage the Network and in his view that includes giving the Board a proposal and then the board - maybe it's through the members on the PAVS Committee - to take first look at it at, that is, what your recommendation is. Then Myers can bring those recommendations to the Board from the PAVS committee on what those policies should or should not be. Hill thinks that is accurate, but these policies are based around certain activities of the Executive Director and if the Executive Director role is going in a different direction than what it has historically gone and those policies need to be recrafted with an understanding on what that role could be. Knapp asked for an example.

Hill began to respond but then suggested he should back up. He continued that one of the problems expressed with the model is that the Board "motto" had always been "saying yes to everything." No matter what, they don't really take a long term look at whether there is a benefit or detriment to it. So, the committee is trying to put some restrictions on what can be said yes or not to and what needs to be brought to the Board to look at. So, there are some policies and parameters placed around that about what the Executive Director can and can't approve. He stated that it's a matter of what that role looks like and whether or not there's a person there to do that. Knapp stated that his argument on having an Executive Director is that he/she may not have the ability to do that - he isn't sure that they can have a blanket policy because there are a lot of factors that go into decision on whether or not it makes sense. I know you are trying to come up with having criteria to help in that process. He stated that he didn't know why there couldn't be a recommendation from the Network Manager on whether to do it. Then in the in contract approval session of the board meetings, they would go through that. He knows we get a lot of contracts, but there may be some that the PAVS/KIC is going to question and it could just be addressed in the board meetings. He asked how many of those they thought there would be per meeting where KIC was not sure it made sense. Myers response is it depends. It can vary from quarter to quarter.

Myers then gave the example of WebFile. They had discussed the WebFile income tax application which he had met with KDOR on a couple of weeks ago on some concerns on the decline of the service. Which they both have concern about and they have seen that decline given the new rules and regulations that were put into place probably 2-3 years ago. Billingsley wanted to know if he was talking about tax policy - Myers said yes. Myers stated that they continue to see the decline from year to year. And, as they are coming up with a schedule push project meeting with Andy Coultis with KDOR to discuss the service, and successes and challenges this season to start planning for the next season. The dialog was that there are some hefty updates - in fact, it was more a rewrite than just hefty updates. Traditionally, there are 2,000 to 3,000 hours of work of rewrites. This is exactly what the PAVS committee was created for and the Executive Director played that role of the subcommittee

INK Board Minutes

to have those discussion of the yes or no project. Knapp asked if KDOR wants the WebFile updates done. Shane stated that yes, this was the discussion that we were continuing to maintain on a yearly basis. That is the purpose of the meeting in mid-May to discuss and gather more details and bring that topic back to the PAVS subcommittee for recommendations and then that would be brought to the Board.

Knapp stated that if he were Executive Director and he knew that KDOR would like INK to continue to do it, that seemed like a pretty easy decision since they provide 60% of INK's revenue. So, check the box, we need to do whatever we need to do. He didn't know if the Board needs an Executive Director to make that call. But that's probably an easy one, he was sure that they're not all that easy. I think the PAVS committee understands the difficult ones to be submitted to the Board. He isn't sure then, what kind of criteria the Board needs to give KIC/the committee. Chairman Rucker acknowledged his own lack of longevity on the board and asked for confirmation whether or not it was true that the answer had always been yes from the Board in the past. Sachs said that they had stopped doing that three or four years ago, so that was part of it, but PAVS was also created to look increasing the use of existing applications so that they aren't losing money and what would it take to get 40% instead of 20% to do analysis to see if it was a profit.

Knapp said that the other thing he thought that Myers could do was ask what some of his colleagues do because Kansas wasn't the only one that doesn't have an Executive Director. Billingsley pointed out that the Arkansas GM was here in the room. Knapp asked him what the process is. Bob Sanders (Arkansas General Manager) said that they have the same issue as they have been around for 18 years and generally say yes to a lot of things. He said that they do turn things down, they will make that recommendation. They also make recommendations a lot of times to scale back what is being asked or using existing technology to provide a subset for a fraction of the cost. Knapp asked which you handle at the portal level? Bob stated yes. Knapp stated again this goes back to originally what INK was, where the Board hire someone expertise to manage the portal and they do it. Knapp asked Sanders how often the Arkansas board met. Bob stated that they meet quarterly. Knapp stated that that's what he believes we want to get to – let them manage. He continued that the Board has to have the confidence that KIC can manage it, but that is what we need to get to and we went off track when we hired an Executive Director in the first place.

Hill directed a statement to Knapp, referencing his statements about making an exception that even if it is not profitable, anything Billingsley says we should do – he said he knows Knapp was exaggerating - but ultimately he feels those exceptions need to be made at the Board level, not at the PAVS level. If this has no ROI, and this is something that the Board wants to do for the sake of doing it – he thinks those decisions need to made here and not there. Knapp said the Board gets contract approvals on every board meeting agenda, so that's where the Board has the opportunity to say "Why are you doing this or why are you not doing this?" Maybe, the Board is presented with a list of contracts that are not suggested by the portal. He asked the Arkansas General Manager (Sanders) how it was done in Arkansas. Sanders stated that their board approves fees that they bring to them, they don't normally bring something to the board to say "is this OK if we say no to this?" Knapp stated that the other thing they could do would be, if the agency work was not approved by the portal, they could appeal the decision to the Board. Or, Billingsley said, the agency can go outside and do their own RFP - and that is not what the intent of what the INK process was. I think you are seeing some of this with agencies going out and doing their own thing, and that's not what it was intended for.

INK Board Minutes

Wittmer said he may have been confused, but he recalled that he had attended one meeting that was three Chief Information Technology Officers – Friend stated that that was for grants, that was the grant subcommittee. Knapp said that the Board didn't have to do that – Wittmer asked what went there vs. what came to the Board. Friend referred to Arkansas, stating that they did not have the 15% split – Sachs said that the specific answer is that if someone is asking for funding then they go to the committee, if they are asking for a service, they go to KIC. Friend continued, saying that that money goes for grants, and then the Board has a process with the three CITO's to evaluate its alignment with the state.

Myers stated that the evaluation process was built off the key insights that came from the PAVS committee – and, since that time, KIC wouldn't necessarily say no, but instead “we could, if you do ‘x’, like raise the fee to \$100 per transaction to make the ROI in a reasonable timeframe”. Knapp said that he didn't know if this would answer his question, but he would trust the PAVS committee to come up with policy suggestions outside of having an Executive Director.

Billingsley then stated that he could clear up why KDOR did recommend to raise fees. KDOR couldn't justify it. They couldn't justify it, for example, through the Legislative post audit that they could get. The government is not to make money at all so we don't have a reason to raise the fee then they just can't, they can't justify it. He noted that they did raise it in 2013, he believed, but it was for a specific ongoing program – he asked for help on the purpose from Wiley (KDOR). She stated that the fees were raised in 2013 on motor vehicle record sales. The purpose of that fee increase was to provide for a massive expansion of driver's license services. They enhanced and added staffing, additional hardware, network upgrades, and equipment for 4 new driver's license locations, including the first new one that had been opened since 1962, so that's what it funded – they had reason to use that for ongoing operations.

Knapp thinks that the network manager needs to a lot of input into this because KIC is seeing the whole scope of the projects for the coming year and that is why it is on the PAVS committee. He thinks they should make their recommendations based on what they think is best, not on whether or not there is an Executive Director. Billingsley noted that they should work with the agencies. Knapp indicated that they would do so, and that was the benefit of having a long-term partner that had worked with the agencies and saw what was happening in other states. Chairman Rucker asked whether there was any additional discussion on the PAVS update.

Knapp asked where things were on the District Court fee increase? Gordon said in terms of implementing the fee increase for District Court record search the status is that they are trying to find a contact within the District Court system who can help them accomplish this change. She recapped that they had originally approached the Office of Judicial Administrator in getting approval for the increase, but as the Board might recall, they had taken no position. So, KIC while that would have been the most logical way to help drive that, they have been attempting to find a person or organization with decision making power. Presently, they had reached out to their court contact at the Kansas Association of District Court Administrators, but she has exchanged phone messages off and on for several weeks with their president with no results. Shane has reached out to KIC's lobbyist to see if he can find out who their lobbyist is to determine if that is the right point of contact to start a conversation. Gordon stated that if anyone on the Board knew of a contact, she'd be happy to hear it.

Action Taken: None.

INK Board Minutes

4. Network Manager Report – Shane Myers. Myers began by addressing the Amber Alert program. They launched the Kansas Amber Alert program and had spoken to this at the February Board meeting, a press release went out by the AG’s office on Amber Alert Awareness Day. They spent about 1,000 hours redesigning the Amber Alert program in close collaboration with Bill Smith with the KBI. Adams had participated in the with Kansas Alert Amber Alert working group. Basically, they see a trend of more traffic to the mobile platform. The application was built many years ago, and it did not use responsive design nor was it focused toward mobile, yet every time an alert goes off people look at their phones. They then try to visit the website and it is not responsive to their device. KIC modified the look-and-feel to address that and also to increase the efficiency on the input of the Amber Alert information from a KBI perspective.

Myers continued. As it related to the 2016 Business Plan, there are national awards that they are constantly monitoring, and KIC is going to submit this application for the Digital Government Achievement Award in fact, it is due today, so they will be putting the finishing touches on that after the Board meeting. It is a well-established award. INK had won a few awards for Best of the Web which was another piece of that. In 2011, Kansas District Court Search application won the Digital Government Achievement Award. There are different categories that one can submit for and they chose the government-to-citizen category. The dollars saved, the cost avoidance, the innovation, and performance were all included in the submission. They worked closely with Bill with the KBI to craft the message appropriately to submit.

Myers also wanted to address something that had been talked about at the March meeting that he had heard at the January meeting about finding ways to standardize across different cases to gain efficiencies. Our technology group came back with a proposal of which they did a demo at the March meeting at the Kansas Service Center. What they are targeting is basically those search and retrieve type applications. What falls into that is the verification applications which equates to 10-15 legacy applications. So, they have officially kicked off this project which can be seen in the report. But, he wanted to call attention to it we are basically taking this effort to building a new platform that we showcased during the March meeting. We want to showcase the ability to easily build a verification suite one-stop-shop for verification applications on the web.

Action Taken: None.

5. Mobile Strategy: Shane Myers. Myers introduced the presentation. Gov2Go is the mobile platform that was built in Arkansas. Bob Sanders is with the Board today from Arkansas with our sister portal. He is going to give a vision into the Gov2Go platform and the long term vision from the mobile strategy. As the Board knows, KIC has been working on a Kansas installation of Gov2Go. The target date for implication is in June. They plan to bring it to the June board meeting before launch to give the Board a visual preview of the application.

Bob Sanders – Arkansas GM Gov2Go – Sanders provided some introductory remarks. In place of a complete summary of his remarks during the presentation, a copy of the presentation he gave is attached to the minutes. The application discussed went live in Arkansas last year and was a big part of several awards they recently won or were recognized in. **Significant exchanges follow:**

In a response to a question from Billingsley, Sanders confirmed that there were approximately 140,000 users of the Gov2Go application and that marketing in Arkansas was accomplished in a couple of ways -

INK Board Minutes

through cross marketing through existing service. You have an opportunity to do property tax and vehicle tag renewal online. They also have market campaigns on Facebook and things like that. Billingsley asked if Sanders is working with the Secretary of State also. Sanders said that they were working on election integration for later in May to have push notifications on information on where a citizen can go to vote. Wittmer wanted to know what kind of feedback they were receiving from users. Sanders said they are getting very positive feedback - which is tracked in Gov2Go. There is a screen that have three little faces smiling, frowning, and a neutral that a user can select. While he didn't have a number, there was a lot of positive feedback and they want more services integrated. For example, a contractor wanting to know when his license expires.

Myers stated that they have been working on this of Gov2Go since January of this year. They ported it from the Arkansas portal and moving it into the Kansas installation. As noted earlier, their target date is in the June timeframe. Myers showed some print screens of what would be available in June. They are starting small with one application. And, they will be asking the Board to help grow that population of services to use Gov2Go across the state agencies. He offered some ideas that they had: integration with tag renewals; corporate annual report filings; nursing license renewals; income tax filing refunds; and elections, traveling down a path similar to what Arkansas has done to take advantage of their best practices while keeping in mind the Kansas portfolio and what this would be appropriate for. He reiterated that his "ask" would be for their help in getting participation by those services outside of property tax. Knapp asked that if five agencies came to KIC tomorrow and said "sign us up", what would be the development schedule? "Can you deliver if we deliver?"

Adams said that if we would take those services to be integrated into the application depends on if it was developed with KIC or agency development. If it not something that KIC has have built or hosted, we would have to provide some kind of API into that system to be considered. Knapp suggested that if they wanted to start the process Monday, he didn't want to go out and recruit and then realize then they can't meet the need. Myers said it depended on who built it - if it was something they build like corp. filing, vs., say, tag renewals that was built by KDOR. If KIC didn't provide the processing technology, the timeline would vary. Knapp stated that he understood the variation, but wanted to make sure when they come to INK, they can say yes, that we can start looking at a timeline. Adams stated that it was a good question - some applications are harder than others and some are old, some don't lend themselves to having that kind of technology added to them. It would just take a little longer. Adams said that at this point, he didn't think they were saying "hands up" to anything - if people have machine-readable data the KIC can consume, they would love to have it. This is also carved out in our business plan and is something they are dedicating our time to. We would really appreciate your help with the additional services. Knapp wanted to know if there has been any inquires. Really, the only dialog that we had at this point is the tag renewals with KDOR, but the other ones listed - and also income tax filing at - KDOR - the other engagement has been very little or none at all.

There were no other comments by the Board.

Action Taken: None.

- 6. HB 2573 Update (Legislative Streaming) – Kathy Sachs.** Sachs stated that the bill did die in committee. She continued that she hadn't heard anything out of the Governor's office, but she will try to get an update next week to see if they want to go from here. Chairman Rucker reminded the Board that the topic here was to provide live streaming for the Legislative session. Knapp asked what

INK Board Minutes

exactly Sachs was looking for from the Governor's office – State of the State? Sachs responded State of the State to start with. Knapp stated that the legislative streaming is going to have to be the Legislative branch. Sachs stated that she felt they looked at the model being what happened for State of the State and then grown out, although the bill only asked about audio and she believes the audio is the better choice over the video streaming piece.

Action Taken – None.

- 7. OITS contract Renewal for Avamar backup: Duncan Friend.** Wittmer indicated that it had taken a little time to get up to speed on exactly the services being provided. Friend apologized to Wittmer if there had been any confusion on this. He thinks that we were in the middle of analyzing a few alternatives when Hollingsworth left. They came to consensus and this is the direction that they want to head. KIC seem satisfied at least as far as the backup, when he talked with Adams. There is going to be some investment and a little bit of the hardware to consider but he thought it would be ok.

Action Taken: None.

- 8. Kansas Business Center Update: Duncan Friend** – Friend will speak for the Kansas Business Center. He stated that we have contracts now and are prepared to be signed. There were some questions at the last meeting on the DA-146A. We have been through those cycles and Counsel has reviewed the contracts. He has copies of everything back. To refresh the Board, there is a master contract with Eventus who is our consultant who will help us put in Service Cloud Form, Finder, or what we have recently been calling Business Compliance Navigator. We have their actual statement of work to execute that, and we have the software license in order and master agreement in order that he believes is ready to sign by the Board chair. What will be done next is that they will contact Oracle and Eventus and see when folks can come in to have a meeting to fully plan out our next steps of where we are going and get a communication plan to start talking to the agencies. Chairman Rucker asked Counsel if he had any additional comments as it related to the process, or the result. Elwood confirmed that the process has been quite appropriate and that we are ready to go. Friend thanked Elwood for his help and patience in this matter.

Action Taken: None.

- 9. Executive Branch Information:** Phil Wittmer gave a presentation summarizing the Executive Branch Information Technology Strategy. See attachment for presentation.

Action Taken: None.

The board recessed for lunch at 12:10p.m. Reconvened at 12:35 p.m.

New Business: Overview of Processes for Planned and Emergency Maintenance.

Myers stated that with the departure of Hollingsworth and the INK Executive Director role, he had been having conversations over the last month with Friend about who should receive various communications that previous went to the executive director. One thing that has come up is “planned” maintenance and “emergency” maintenance and how they were handled. They thought it might be a good idea to bring the subject to the board so that everyone is clear.

INK Board Minutes

Planned Maintenance. As background, Myers discussed the process when Hollingsworth was here. As a contractual requirement of the business plan, NIC would provide a schedule for all the planned maintenance instances for the upcoming year. That was shared with Hollingsworth as well as Secretary of State and Department of Revenue for their feedback. Traditionally, what came out of that was to avoid the 15th of the month, end of the month for tag renewal, show caution around the tax filing deadline for WebFile. They then would provide that feedback to their corporate office and ETS. ETS was basically going through this process for all the portals out there and come up with a plan finalize list.

KIC then takes that list and incorporates into a weekly call where one of the agenda items on that call is the maintenance. They learn more, but as they go out throughout the year there are certain maintenance windows being planned that impact portals. There are other instances where the planned maintenance does not impact the Kansas portal. So, for example, if there were planned maintenance for this Sunday. When they get the details, Adams and his team sits on a phone call to gather details of what is being proposed for that particular instance. The hours of the planned maintenance are carved out and give details on the call. Say, they were going to do some maintenance on the TPE admin and on the OTC payment portal. KIC “socializes” that internally to understand if there is going to be downtime or not. They then route the information to Hollingsworth for awareness, to respond to questions, etc. In turn, he would then direct them to do outreach to both KDOR and KSSOS and get them comfortable with the planned maintenance that was going to occur. Once they had all the approvals then, they would give the green light to corporate that Kansas is good with maintenance.

Emergency Maintenance. Myers then noted that there were instances that were deemed “emergency” maintenance. For example, it may be something security related or might be something that they deemed critical in nature that cannot wait for a planned maintenance instance. That direction comes from the corporate entity at NIC, the ETS management. For those cases, they would go straight to the Executive Director to get it reviewed and approved, then the maintenance would be performed.

Myers continued that, now, with the absence of an executive director, he is interacting with Friend on the planned maintenance and emergency maintenance situations. The question has come up of how this will be approached. He stated that, contractually, all KIC has to do is notify the board of directors. The proposal he is making is that for planned maintenance and emergency maintenance, KIC would just notify the INK Board of Directors and not go through the additional exercise of notifying KSSOS and KDOR. That is the conclusion that they came to, but wanted to make sure before they moved forward that the board is comfortable with. Knapp asked about a recent issue in the last several weeks – he was uncertain of the timing – where it was either an emergency or planned maintenance and both Kansas Department of Revenue and Secretary of State requested that it be delayed when they were given notice.

Myers stated that, yes, when this first bubbled up, it was an emergency situation related to notifications of disbursement of funds and they deemed it critical. There was no allotted down time for the maintenance, but they deemed it as emergency. So, they followed their standard practice to notify the INK Executive Director – which, in this case, consisted of some dialog with Friend that resulted in us notifying the entire board of directors. What came out of that was feedback that ETS agreed to postpone it past tax season. However, that is not traditionally how that would work. Normally, they receive approval for emergency maintenance and, in this case, there was not even down time expected. Myers stated that, while they postponed that, there have been a couple of instances of planned maintenance instances since then where they followed the traditional practice. They switched it a little bit, reaching out to KSSOS and KDOR first, then notifying the Board of Directors based on some conversations with Friend. But, Myers is

INK Board Minutes

proposing this approach because both KDOR and KSSOS sit on the Board and he felt it would be best just to notify the board of these plans for both planned and emergency maintenance.

Knapp expressed that his concern would be that some other agency that doesn't sit on the board, say, the Department of Transportation, would have an application that would be affected. He wasn't sure that an executive director, even if there was one, could speak for them either. So, his question would be about those agencies – he liked the approach of going to them ahead of time, but wondered with Wittmer thought and his perspective on this. Wittmer responded that perhaps some kind of text blast could be used for the emergency maintenance notifications and asked what sort of lead time was usually provided. Myers said that an emergency notice could come today for tonight.

Friend interjected with a question to Myers – to be clear, per the contract, it was only by practice that KIC went and talked to people on the planned maintenance? Normally, it would just be “here is your annual schedule of maintenance” and then KIC would just go and execute it – so these notifications were just a practice KIC developed outside the contract. Then, in an emergency, KIC would go to a single point of contact and then go do it. So, this notification practice was of KIC's own volition, not something in the contract that was required, but it never really spread beyond KDOR/KSSOS even though the maintenance could have affected other agencies. Myers stated that this was correct. Friend stated that he wanted to emphasize that as the issue at hand here, as he knew people were highly sensitive to maintenance and wanted to make sure the right people get informed, but the issue here was that part of what they were doing was contractual, but all the other stuff was extra.

Knapp stated that, then, to follow up on what he had been saying his concern was, KIC would have to contact 100 agencies, so that doesn't make sense. Myers said that the previous process wasn't contractual, it was just a process they'd done to contact Secretary of State and Kansas Department of Revenue, but that was outside of contractual matters. The other point Myers wanted to make was that contractually they were allocated six hours a week to use and that is to basically maintain the network. Billingsley asked if it stated any time or specific times for maintenance. Myers said it does not state within the contract specific times, but the annual outreach on planned maintenance does specify the times and dates maintenance would occur. KIC gets more information in the internal meetings about what will occur during those windows.

Action Taken: Knapp moved that the Board accept Myers' proposal. Wittmer seconded.

The Chair asked for discussion, then asked Friend if he had additional comments. Friend restated the situation that would result from adoption of the motion to confirm acceptance. He understood that what would happen now under the proposal will be that no one but the KSSOS and KDOR will get notified and the only way that they will get notified, predominantly, will be through a message to the board and that will occur only under emergency maintenance (?) or emergency and planned (?) – Myers confirmed it would be under both. Billingsley stated that he would like to have the planned schedule of maintenance that's there. And, since he is the designee of the Secretary of Revenue, he stated that he would need to confer on some of this and these types of maintenance as he is concerned. He stated that he knew that KIC worked with KDOR on some of this, and he knew that Secretary of State had been concerned on some of this, too. To confirm, he asked if Myers was saying that he would just notify the board and that's it? Shane stated yes.

INK Board Minutes

Wittmer stated that he would request two things: One, that this process be communicated to all agencies who are customers, so that they are aware of it. Second, that in the case of emergency changes, there is some vehicle for communicating that to all the agencies, whether it be a text blast or email (or whatever).

Chairman Rucker stated that these smaller agencies need to be treated in a fair manner and given appropriate notice. He asked that in whatever communication be made to the board in satisfaction of whatever KIC believes its requirements are per the contract is that KIC talk to Friend as well, and that he codifies – actually creates a written record – of whatever he communicates when he contacts the agencies that are going to be impacted – if this is the wishes of the Board. Then, it is one way for the Board to know that it has an individual that is also making a contact to the individual agency as well.

Friend asked for clarification. KIC would contact them and he (Friend) would contact them? Or he would keep track of KIC's contacts? Chairman Rucker stated that he wanted to make absolutely certain that as a representative of the Board and as an employee of the Board (Friend) that when KIC sends out notices that Friend gets a notice as well (as the Board gets a notice). The continued that the Board wants to hear what the problems of that little agency was, from the Board perspective – not that KIC can't be trusted to tell how the event occurred from his perspective. However, any concerns from INK customers they may voice to Friend in a different way than they might to Myers, and he (Friend) has an independent obligation as an employee of the board to report back to the Board "this is the way in went down" – unless there is an objection of the Board to this approach, which, Chairman Rucker stated, is fine – this is only a suggestion.

Billingsley asked Myers to confirm that he was wanting to only go by the contract? Myers stated that, yes, this is the proposal we came to because there are so many gates – for example, who does he contact now, is it Deb is it Lisa? Chairman Rucker stated that if we are going to be contacting them under the terms of the contract, then the small agency who isn't represented on the Board (Billingsley noted this as well), could have a beef with the Board if the Board does not respond appropriately. Directed to Friend, he stated that Friend would be the conduit for an appropriate response – and as an "ear" to their concerns.

Friend stated that he understood and was also sensitive to that, but he wanted to make sure that before they/we left, he understood correctly the mechanics of how that would happen. What he heard Wittmer say was that there would be a procedure that would be communicated to all the customers so they will understand how all this works (?). Was that Friend to send that out, or KIC? Myers said, yes, it is important to have this dialog – from the conversation it was KIC, from KIC's proposal (which was only to follow the contract), it would be Friend (as that was outside it). Chairman Rucker stated that it would be after KIC had notified the Board that Friend's actions would be triggered. Friend asked to clarify further – indicating it also had an outage aspect. First, how the process works today – KIC would only notify the Board. Then, there is an obligation to notify all the customers that this is how the process works. And, if there is an emergency change – Friend asked Myers – was KIC planning to communicate that to all agencies? You don't have a vehicle by which you would do that. Myers indicated this was his confusion as well. Myers said he is comfortable with Wittmer's proposal to communicate the plan to all agencies, and he is comfortable with using a vehicle, which would most likely be email. Friend stated that once he did that, he could plug-in and piggy-back on it - with the email include information that tells agencies to contact Friend if there were issues? - Chairman Rucker noted complaints or other responses.

INK Board Minutes

Billingsley asked the representative from Arkansas what their approach was, especially as their board only met once per quarter. Sanders responded that all that communication goes through them – they don't have a position that does that. They have an alert system set up for this. Anytime anything happens, like emergency maintenance they can receive notice. If they (Arkansas) has planned maintenance that is more than a couple of hours, they generally like to give two weeks' notice. They put this service out and anyone from any agency can sign up – they can say specifically what services they want to receive notices about. Billingsley asked if that was a service that they were providing to the board. Sanders confirmed that it was. Billingsley stated that he thought that was a great idea. Friend confirmed that, if there was something like this, it should still indicate in the notice that they should get a hold of me if issues? Chairman Rucker confirmed yes, but noted that he didn't know how their contract read, but that the Board was being told how their contract reads.

Billingsley indicated that he wanted to table this issue until next board meeting and asked Myers to try to come back with a solution that meets the contract that is similar to what Sanders discussed –then asked “is that possible to do?” Myers said that they can talk through it, but the solution presented today did meet the contract. He stated that he can look at other avenues of alerts, of adopting what Arkansas is doing in Kansas. Billingsley said he didn't see why a motion was needed if they were going to go with the contract – it's already there, it's already written. He continued that Myers was invoking a section of the contract and that the Board had signed the contract, so...Myers indicated the presentation was only for Board awareness. Friend interjected – it is a change in practice that's fairly significant around maintenance, which everyone is concerned about. But, if you're going with that, then no one will be “pre-contacted” about these activities as it stands right now. Friend indicated he was fine if KIC did the two things that Wittmer had suggested and he was included on everything so that customers can get a hold of Friend if there are questions.

Chairman Rucker stated that KIC knows the concerns of the board, but reminded them that there was a motion and a second on the table. Billingsley asked why there needed to be a motion if it is in the contract and they are invoking a portion of the contract. Hill stated that he thinks they are offering more than the contract requires by providing more. But, if they are going to notify the customers, the board wants to make sure that's right. Myers agreed that this was the purpose, he was OK with the approach suggested by Wittmer and, while not contractually required, he was willing to provide that additional service.

Chairman Rucker stated that his concern is with Friend. If the Board can depend on KIC to fulfill the terms of the contract, and actually go above and beyond what is mandated by the terms of the contract, it is a matter of the minutes now about how he is going to process this out. Chairman Rucker continued that, independent of that, his suggestion that the board can accept or reject it, but that Friend has an obligation to the board upon his notification. In addition to the notification sent to the board members, KIC will also send the notification to Friend. Friend will be on that email. Then, Friend is triggered, and he will get his phone out and make a call to the individual agency impacted – either for the standard, or more importantly, the emergency maintenance – and Friend should let them know and if they have problems, find out what those problems are so that the Board does not fall down on its obligation to our clients.

Hill stated the problem with that is that one of the situations is going to affect a whole lot of agencies. Billingsley indicated that the planned maintenance should be distributed a year in advance, however. Chairman Rucker indicated he was less concerned about those. Friend asked Myers if he wasn't going to notify all the agencies under the plan that had been discussed?

INK Board Minutes

Myers stated that there is a couple of proposals flowing around and suggested that the motion be tabled and they come back and regroup. Friend suggested that, say, if there were 23 agencies and a notification was coming out from KIC and he was listed on it as a contact, then they could provide the feedback to Friend and he could let the Board know. Myers suggested that they follow the current structure and revisit it at the board meeting next month when Friend and Myers have more dialogue. Friend indicated he was happy to directly call or email the 23 agencies, he just wanted to confirm the approach. Chairman Rucker emphasized it was important for the Board to make sure the agencies knew this was happening- it could be done via email.

Billingsley asked about the planned maintenance schedule and asked if it went to all the Board members in January. Myers responded that it was communicated, he believed, through Hollingsworth. Billingsley stated that he had not seen anything. Myers continued that then KIC had followed up with it through communications to the Department of Revenue and Secretary of State.

Friend then stated that this gets into the subject of outages as well. When Myers gets a hold of him at 1am because the system is down, he doesn't get a hold of anybody, but if or when it starts to get outside the window, Myers gets a hold of a couple major partners, but Friend didn't know if he or we needed to get a hold of all major partners related to that. Myers stated that Friend was blending two issues now – but Friend indicated that he understood, but it was similar with regard to the notifications.

Chairman Rucker asked the Board what they wanted to do next on the motion. Table it?

Knapp stated that he would tend to think that if they have a process to notify all 187 then the board is covered because they have contracted with them to manage this information network – the board provides oversight, but it is ultimately their responsibility. He agrees with the Chairman that the small agencies should be notified – like they do in Arkansas – and when that communication goes out, it will be from the Information Network of Kansas and that will be sufficient. But, if you want a belt and suspenders, then he didn't know.

Wittmer asked a clarifying question. Whether it is planned or emergency, typically all of Kansas.gov goes down altogether, right? Myers confirmed that that this could be the case. It depends on the maintenance that is being done. It could only be payment processing and the applications that are still up. Or, it could be that payment processing is working just fine, but Kansas.gov is down. It all depends and that is the details that KIC gathers on the calls with ETS. Wittmer asked whether or not there had been maintenance performed where everyone was down. Myers stated that he didn't recall. But, they would have had those details communicated as far as what all services on the network were impacted.

Action Taken: Chairman Rucker stated if everyone would like to and the practice has been articulated is employed until then, minus their obligation to the board, then the board can talk about it again next month. Wittmer indicated that they could talk about it again, but it would be helpful – he is “visual” - to have either a flow chart or an outline of what it is we are proposing. The motion was not pursued.

Board member photos for updated INK Website: Friend asked Adams to provide the background on this. Adams stated that they are excited about the new INK website roll out. They would like to offer to the Board the opportunity to put their photos on the website – either they could take them or they could be supplied by Board members. Right now, there are no photographs out there.

INK Board Minutes

Other Business: Chairman Rucker stated that he wanted to make certain that all the board members knew that - if they had not been informed – that Joe Conner has resigned from the board. He thought it would be appropriate to send a certificate of appreciation of Conner’s good service to the INK Board, if there were no objections. He indicated he would move forward on that and was sure any individual communiques to him from board members about his service would also be appreciated.

Knapp noted that, along those lines, the Chairman had asked him to assemble the subcommittee to nominate some replacements. He indicated that they had three names to present to the Governor if approved by the Board. Ross T. Hendrickson with the Kansas Association of Insurance Agents; Karl Peterjohn is a Sedgwick County Commissioner with the Kansas Association of Counties; and Kelly Arnold is with the Kansas Association of County Clerks. These are all entities of a statewide nature.

Action Taken: Billingsley moved to accept the three name to forward to the Governor’s Office, seconded by Knapp. Approved unanimously.

Agenda for Next Meeting

Agenda for the next meeting was not discussed.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 1:14 p.m. The next INK board meeting will be at 10:00 a.m. on June 7, 2016, at 700 SW Harrison Topeka, Kansas, 2nd Floor Conference Room.

Minutes submitted by: Nikki Reed/Duncan Friend