

Portal Authority Board of Directors

MINUTES

Portal Authority Board of Directors Special Meeting

January 5, 2006

1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Legislative Services Building

200 E. 14th Ave.

Hearing Room A, 1st Floor

Denver, CO

I. Call to Order: 1:41 p.m. Chairman Cadman

A. Roll Call

Attendees: Arrowsmith, Rep. Cadman, Dennis, Jenik, Marroney, Sen. May, Picanso, Williams, T.

Excused: Cooke, Feingold, Sobanet, Wells

Absent: Groff

Quorum was not established until later in the meeting.

Notes transcribed by Angie Onorofskie, Statewide Internet Portal Authority

B. Introduction of Audience

Senator May brought greetings from Donetta Davidson. Senator May and Representative Cadman had the opportunity to meet with Donetta while they were in Washington D.C. Senator May reported that Donetta is doing very well, and she says hi to all of the Board members.

II. Committee Reports

A. Business Committee, Michael Cooke

No report.

B. Contracts Committee, Richard Westfall

Richard Westfall, SIPA Legal Counsel, stated that he had favorable news to report. The EGE is nearly complete. There were a number of issues with the initial EGE Agreement. The Contracts Committee finally met with the Controller's Office, as the committee felt it was important to address the Controller's concerns while maintaining independence as an Authority. Nolan Jones, former CIO of the Department of Revenue, was very involved in the EGE process. There were still a few outstanding issues with Controller's Office

and the Department of Revenue, but after a long meeting last night, all of the issues are resolved. The final agreement will be prepared in the next couple of days for signature. It has been a long process, but there were a lot of contract issues that had to be worked out.

Don Ravenscroft added that the meeting yesterday was very good, and the EGE is finally ready to go.

Richard Westfall stated that when a quorum is established, an amendment should be approved - with respect to revenue share - to master contract between NIC and SIPA.

Chairman Cadman asked if in the case a quorum is not established at the meeting today, if there would be issues with delaying approval.

Richard Westfall stated that the amendment could be signed with subsequent ratification from the Board. Richard Westfall also added that he would check what the minutes reflect, as the Board may have already contemplated that the dollar amount can be filled in on the contract.

Representative Cadman suggested that a tentative Board meeting be scheduled prior to the February Board meeting for approval of the contract amendment. If it turns out that the meeting is unnecessary, it can be cancelled.

ACTION ITEM: Richard Westfall will check the minutes and if they do not contemplate that the dollar amount can be filled in, Angie Onorofskie will set up a special meeting of the Board of Directors prior to the February meeting.

C. Finance Committee, Henry Sobanet

No report.

D. Personnel Committee, Representative Cadman

No report.

III. New Business

A. SIPA Executive Director Update, Don Ravenscroft

Don Ravenscroft stated that a lot of advances have been made over the last month in regards to operating procedures in the office.

1. Operating Procedures

- a. Operating Account -Henry Sobanet, SIPA Board Treasurer, gave permission to open a SIPA operating account, which will probably be completed tomorrow. This means that SIPA will begin to operate from the self-funded model.

- b. Annual Business Plan - SIPA and CI reviewed the comments from SysTest. Don Ravenscroft thanked SysTest for the comments, as many of them were very valuable. All of the comments have been resolved to the satisfaction of the SIPA office and CI. There are no outstanding issues, and there is a plan for addressing concerns. Don Ravenscroft would like to ask for approval of the Annual Business Plan next month.
- c. Annual Report - The Annual Report is in final editing stages, and it will be distributed to the Board of Directors and the Legislature.
- d. SysTest Task Order Extension – An Extension for SysTest Task Order 2 has been approved through February 15, 2006. The extension is at no additional cost, and it will allow time for SysTest to complete the financial gap analysis. The gap analysis is needed to establish rules for annual review of CI's financial transactions.
- e. Office Location - The SIPA office will stay at 1600 Broadway right now. It is financially a good place to be at least for a year or so. A one-year lease will probably be signed.

2. *Projects*

Rich Olsen, General Manager of Colorado Interactive, will give a report later in the meeting.

3. *Issues*

There are no issues at this point.

4. *Policies*

Don Ravenscroft stated that he has been working on policies, which are essentially an interpretation of guidelines

- a. Reimbursement Policy (SIPA -001) – approved by the Board a long time ago. As soon as an account is established, reimbursements will occur much faster.
- b. Revenue Sharing Policy (SIPA -002) – captures agreement over the last several weeks with CI and the Business and Finance Committees.
- c. Compensation Adjustment Policy (SIPA-003) – establishes a policy for adjusting compensation for SIPA employees.
- d. Banking Account Policy (SIPA-004) – establishes where the accounts are, who has signatory authority, and how much can be

withdrawn. There will be two accounts, including: an operating account and a reserve account.

- e. Compensation Adjustment Policy (SIPA-005) – very similar to the compensation adjustment policy. This policy is related to guidelines for adjustment of compensation for the Executive Director, as opposed to employees.
- f. Program Management Office (PMO) Policy (SIPA-006) – talked to many Board members about this over the last couple of weeks. This policy outlines guidelines for executing program management and IV&V roles. The SIPA Board received a briefing from Bob Feingold awhile back. Don Ravenscroft modified the document, taking into consideration the contract award to CI and SysTest, which resulted into a consolidated policy that is more workable.

Discussion:

Don Ravenscroft suggested that the Board begin discussion today regarding the policies, and formal approvals could be made during the February meeting.

***Greg Jenik, SIPA Board member, arrived and a quorum was established.**

Chairman Cadman recommended that at the conclusion of the Executive Directors' presentation, the Board should take action since quorums are sometimes fleeting.

5. Action Items

a. Revenue Sharing Policy

Don Ravenscroft asked Richard Westfall, SIPA Legal Counsel, to read the wording in the contract in regards to revenue share.

Richard Westfall hand-marked the revenue share section in the contract so that all the Board members could see the correct wording.

Don Ravenscroft explained that the Finance and Business Committees met to discuss this in detail to lay out foundation for Don Ravenscroft and Henry Sobanet to negotiate with CI. The final agreement for the revenue share is a fixed amount plus a percentage of net revenue. Net revenue equals fees charged minus statutory fees. This is simply a pass-through, as all of the statutory fees will be allocated to the appropriate department. There are stipulations if SIPA's share begins to grow too large, and the SIPA Board would then decide the appropriate action to be taken.

The actual amount to be allocated to SIPA each year from CI is \$450,000.00 base plus 2 percent of net revenue. This number is based on the operating budget, and it allows plenty of operating capital, while not building a large reserve.

Discussion:

Senator May clarified that this would be allocated to the SIPA office.

Don stated that as soon as the account is established, CI would deposit the appropriate amount into the SIPA account.

Senator May asked if the money would be deposited monthly.

Don affirmed that the money would be deposited monthly. In determining the revenue share amount, the committees utilized a planning figure based on the first month of revenue. If it turns out that there is a surplus above the SIPA operating expenses at the end of the year, the Board would determine how to invest the surplus back into portal services.

Senator May asked what system would be utilized, and he clarified that this is outside of Treasury. He also asked to make sure that part of the money goes back into the departments.

Don Ravenscroft stated that there are two kinds of fees including, service fees and statutory fees. The statutory fees are simply pass-through, and they will go directly from CI back to the departments. The non-statutory fees go back to CI, and SIPA gets a share of the revenue. The proposal is that SIPA will set up an account at CHASE Bank under the signatory authority of SIPA members.

Tambor Williams asked how the non-statutory fees would be decided.

Don Ravenscroft stated that the Board of Directors and Executive Director would determine what fees to negotiate and the necessity of fees in general.

Tambor Williams asked if a service already requires a statutory fee (for example, electrical and plumbing licenses at DORA) if there would be an additional fee added.

Don Ravenscroft stated that there might be an additional fee. If there were a fee, it would be negotiated based on the service.

Gerald Marroney asked if there was a definition of what net revenue.

Don Ravenscroft stated that it is defined in the policy.

Rich Olsen added that it is also in the contract.

Gerald Marroney stated that he wants to make sure that it's not an issue.

Richard Westfall, SIPA Legal Counsel, stated that the definition is in the Master Contract, and he read the following definition:

“Net Revenue” means Total Fees less Statutory Fees and merchant fees required to process credit cards and Automated Clearing House (ACH) transactions.

Gerald Marroney asked if Net Revenue included statutory fees.

Richard Westfall stated that Net Revenue excludes statutory fees.

Gerald Marroney asked (in regards to Tambor Williams' question earlier) if the fee that the department receives benefit from is decided by SIPA, CI, and the department.

Don Ravenscroft stated that fee would be decided exclusively by the department.

Richard Westfall added that SIPA was designed to maintain transparency so as not to encounter TABOR issues. The fee that would be negotiated by SIPA, CI, and the department is a convenience fee. The convenience fee is something that people can choose to pay or not to pay. The portal is an additional means to do business, which adds convenience. So, a person can still do business traditionally and not incur a convenience fee.

Gerald Marroney stated that the department determines the cost recovery.

Jack Arrowsmith stated that he had two assumptions. First, he assumes that the revenue share is renewable annually.

Don Ravenscroft stated that it is not renewable annually. This number would remain throughout the duration of the contract.

Jack Arrowsmith asked what would happen if it turns out that the number is not appropriate.

Don Ravenscroft stated that the number is open to discussion, if necessary. During negotiations, the annual renewal was removed as it was deemed unnecessary.

Richard Westfall added that just as the Board is doing with the first amendment, in terms of language, etc., there would be subsequent amendments to the contract. With six or more votes, the Board (with cooperation of CI) can amend this number. It can be done at any monthly meeting or special meeting. It was Richard Westfall's understanding that Brad Bradley (NIC) didn't want to have it in the contract that it had to be re-negotiated each year. Rather he preferred to have the number negotiated only as necessary. This is not cast into stone.

Jack Arrowsmith also assumed that as SIPA negotiates with other departments, the convenience fee would be negotiated as a part of the EGE.

Don Ravenscroft stated that Jack Arrowsmith's assumption is true. However, actual fees are negotiated on a service-by-service basis, and the EGE doesn't cover specific services. The convenience fees will be upfront and clear to the department.

Senator May stated that not all fees are statutory.

Richard Westfall agreed with Senator May. However, he stated that, per the Master Contract, Statutory Fees are pass-through.

Rich Olsen, General Manager of Colorado Interactive, stated that the EGE simply says that the department and SIPA are willing and ready to work together. After the EGE is in place, a separate work order is done. The work order outlines fees, etc. CI would never surprise a department with a fee. Rather, they would talk with the department and discuss what other states charge, the going market fee, and then CI wouldn't go forward until the department makes the decision.

Greg Jenik asked if the revenue share amendment is applicable to common services.

Don Ravenscroft stated that some services do not carry a fee.

Greg Jenik clarified then, that this amendment only applies to those services that do carry a fee. He also noted that it seems unusual not to negotiate the cost or bring up for vote on an annual or periodic basis. He asked Rich Olsen if this is a common practice in other states or if it is generally brought up each year.

Rich Olsen answered that it is very typical to have it changed periodically, especially since eventually there will be a new Board that may have a different political direction. It gives protection.

Senator May asked who is responsible for the asset management of equipment.

Don Ravenscroft stated that CI is responsible for asset management.

Senator May asked what happens to the assets if CI pulls out of the contract.

Don Ravenscroft stated that if CI pulls out of the contract before the end of the contract, SIPA has to buy out the equipment including licenses.

Senator May asked if there is an asset management plan in place in the event that CI leaves.

Don Ravenscroft stated that there is not a plan in place, but we can include it in the strategic plan – the strategic maintenance for how assets will be maintained. If CI stays until the end of the contract, SIPA will get all of the equipment. Otherwise, SIPA has to buy out.

MOTION: Gerald Marroney made a motion to approve the amendment to the contract, but he would modify the definition of Net Revenue to include regulatory, charters, ordinances and other fees.

He also made a motion to approve the November and December minutes.

Discussion:

Tambor Williams stated that if the current Board were inflexible, it would be unfair for the upcoming Board. Lack of flexibility for the upcoming Board could cause it to collapse. We can't say that this is what we decided and hand it to them. Tambor Williams added that she feels very strongly that we make sure each Board looks at this and has the opportunity to review.

Don Ravenscroft stated that we couldn't force the contract amount to be rewritten each year.

Tambor Williams stated that she is only concerned with the fees.

Don Ravenscroft asked if it would suffice to change the policy.

Richard Westfall, SIPA Legal Counsel, stated that it was his understanding that this is part of the Annual Business Plan. If the amendment is adopted as proposed, it will be clear to everyone as part of the review of the IABP each year. It would be evident if there were a disconnect between the contract and the Annual Business Plan, and action would have to be taken. There were a lot of things that came about during negotiations, in terms of SysTest's comments, etc., and the Negotiation Committee made sure that the Annual Business Plan spelled out specific defined fields. If the Board looks at a draft of a future Annual Business Plan, and the Board sees a disconnect, action would be taken. Review of Annual Business Plan would necessitate a review of the revenue share amount.

Tambor Williams stated that it may not be necessary to amend the amount each year, but as a Board member, it is necessary to be reminded to review each year. This is especially important because the Board members are very busy, and the Board only meets once per month. There is no real motivation or reason, as a Board member, to review the revenue share number. It is necessary to guide future Board members to make sure that they can have meaningful understanding. Realistically, Tambor would want to amend the motion to make a reference in the contract to the business plan. The cross reference could state

that a review of the revenue share amount (including fee assessment) would take place each year along with the review of the Business Plan.

Gerald Marroney stated that a certain number of people will not be here after elections, and therefore it makes sense to change it.

AMENDED MOTION: the SIPA Chairman will be allowed to sign the amendment to the contract with regard to the revenue share amount, based on the understanding that the Annual Business Plan will be reviewed and the fees will be assessed annually.

Marroney/ Williams

Discussion:

Richard Westfall stated that the amendment to the motion changes some of the discussions that have occurred with CI. Before approving the motion, he recommended discussing the matter with CI.

Rich Olsen, General Manager of Colorado Interactive, stated that amendment is satisfactory because a yearly assessment would be adequate.

Representative Cadman added that if the annual review determines the revenue share number to be adequate, then it would be unnecessary to negotiate. If it the number is unfit, it will help to have the assessment.

Gerald Marroney added that the annual assessment gives protection to both sides (SIPA and CI).

Chairman Cadman clarified that if the Board approves this, he would sign the amendment as Chairman.

Rich Olsen stated that a review of the Annual Business Plan is planned each year anyway, so this assures that the review of the revenue share number is also completed.

Chairman Cadman stated that everyone seems to be on the same page.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION: to approve the November 3, 2005 and December 1, 2005 Meeting Minutes

Marroney/Williams

Discussion:

Senator May noted two typos, one on page 13, 4th paragraph down and the other on page 15.

Senator May stated that he had no problem approving the minutes with changes, but some of the action items and issues should be addressed.

APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

b. Approval of the Annual Business Plan (IABP)

Don Ravenscroft stated that SIPA and CI have reviewed all of the comments from SysTest to determine the actions required. There are no outstanding comments. Some comments have been disregarded, some agreed, some modified. However, there are no significant issues in the Annual Business Plan that the SIPA office or CI feel would be detrimental to the portal. SysTest's comments were very good. They shed a lot of light on what is being done, but many of the comments address issues that may not necessarily be included in the business plan.

Discussion:

Chairman Cadman added that any issues could be changed, as needed, at any frequency.

Senator May stated that he wants to see how the comments are addressed in the business plan.

Don stated that he's not sure what the timeline is for implementing the comments.

Rich Olsen stated that they could be implemented by the end of second quarter.

Don Ravenscroft stated that the Board would receive change pages rather than an entirely new document.

Gigi Dennis stated that she has comments that she didn't get to Don Ravenscroft. She would also like to see comments from other Board members.

Chairman Cadman asked what the integration plan is for all of the comments. He added that his comments are mostly typos.

Don Ravenscroft stated that the Board can have meetings separately or as a group.

Gigi Dennis would like to meet before approving the plan.

Don Ravenscroft suggested that the Board wait until next meeting to get all of the comments before approving the Annual Business Plan.

Gerald Marroney stated that he would like to see comments from other Board members, especially from Bob Feingold.

Don Ravenscroft stated that SIPA has received no comments to date. Bob Feingold gave a suggestion as to how to address comments, but he didn't actually submit comments.

Gigi Dennis asked for a new contact sheet.

ACTION ITEM: Angie Onorofskie to distribute an updated contact list.

Greg Jenik stated that he already sent comments, but he will send them again.

Senator May requested that the Board receive the minutes at least one week in advance.

ACTION ITEM: Angie Onorofskie will make sure that the minutes are distributed to the Board at least one week prior to the meetings.

6. Upcoming Actions

a. Policy Review and Approval

The proposed policies (002,003,004,005, and 006) will be e-mailed to committee chairs. At the discretion of the committee chairs, the policies will be distributed to the committees. After the committees review the policies, they will be sent to the rest of the Board.

Discussion:

Chairman Cadman suggested determining whether or not there are existing committees that would be appropriate to review the policies or if a new committee should be created. They are very important documents.

Don Ravenscroft stated that he would distribute the policies out to the committees and target for approval next month.

Senator May requested that he be added to the distribution list.

Chairman Cadman stated that if the policies were e-mailed directly to the Board, then the committee structure would not be utilized. Committees only meet if there is an issue. Chairman Cadman would like to see what the issues are to address, and which committees need to see the policies.

Don Ravenscroft asked if the evaluation could be done over e-mail or if it is necessary to hold meetings.

Tambor Williams stated that it would be up to the committee to decide whether or not a meeting is necessary.

Greg Jenik suggested that the policies be distributed to all of the board members, as many Board members serve on multiple committees. If a special meeting is necessary, then action can be taken at a meeting. It will be much quicker this way.

Don Ravenscroft stated that he would put the policies in the realm of the committee for review.

b. Creation of Reserve Account

Within the next 30 days, the reserve account will be created.

Discussion:

Senator May stated that he would like to see a financial report each month, including liabilities, etc. He suggested that the monthly package to the Board could include: agenda, minutes, financial statements, and action items.

Senator May added that he would like to have an executive summary of the contract amendment. Perhaps it could be included in the minutes.

Executive Summary of changes to the Contract:

Two amendments were made to the contract:

1. The amount to be paid to SIPA monthly will be \$37,500 and 2% of Net Revenue. The Annual Business Plan will be reviewed each year and at the same time, the above amounts to be paid to SIPA will be reviewed.
2. Changes to the definition of Third Party Beneficiary to include Eligible Government Entities that are parties to an Eligible Government Entity Agreement as explicit Third Party beneficiaries of the contract.

ACTION ITEM: The amendment will be reflected in the minutes and in the policy SIPA-002.

B. Colorado Interactive (CI) Update, Rich Olsen

Rich Olsen, General Manager of Colorado Interactive, reported that a lot of great things are happening, and revenue is stable.

1. Highlights

- CI hired two additional employees, including a designer and a developer. They now have seven employees, and they continue to look for an office manager and another designer.
- CI has secured a permanent office space at 17th and Welton.
- CI has been working on getting the infrastructure up and tested. The Governor's office wanted a service up by January 12, and they selected a couple of services, including:
 - Three ought to be a law

- Colorado.gov live help.

2. *Project Report*

- Colorado.gov transition – moving Colorado.gov onto new infrastructure. Colorado.gov has been on the new servers for about a week and a half. CI is on testing and security, and OIT is helping with the process.

Discussion:

Senator May asked how CI makes sure that the links are correct.

Mark Church, CI Director of Development, replied that CI could review broken link logs.

Rich Olsen stated that at this point, only Colorado.gov itself is moving to the new servers. The other departments will soon follow. If someone does find a broken link, CI would appreciate if those were sent along so that they can be fixed. Colorado.gov should go live on Tuesday, but there is a back up plan.

Project Report (continued):

a. Live Help

Colorado.gov Live Help is the service that the Governor's Office chose first. Instead of calling somebody on the phone, a citizen can type in a question. CI partnered with AskColorado for the project. AskColorado is a service done through the Department of Libraries of Colorado, and it is a 24/7 service. Live Help is interfaced with AskColorado. If there are any questions about the portal- they will be directed to the staff. Their original purchase (AskColorado) can be utilized as a back up, and the librarians will still answer over 6,000 questions per month. CI assured the Board that the Governor would not be let down.

John Thomas presented the process a person might go through when utilizing Live Help.

John Thomas stated that Brenda Bailey-Hainer, Department of Libraries, has helped with the process a lot. He went on to explain that the first page shows a simple question a person might ask. For example, what is the state flower?

The Live Help icon will be situated next to the search button on the main page of Colorado.gov. The person is asked to enter some basic information and submit the question.

After the person submits the question, it awaits recognition by the provider. When the provider accepts, the utility presentation

changes. If the inquiry requires a document, Live Help can directly send the document rather than the person having to search for it. It is a very robust utility. CI is very positive about the service. If a nightmare occurs between now and Monday, CI has a back-up plan.

[Colorado.gov Live Help \(screen shots\)](#)

Discussion:

Tambor Williams asked when someone completes an inquiry, if the inquiry is saved or lost.

John Thomas answered that the inquiry is saved, and the user can request a transcript.

Tambor Williams asked how long the records are kept. For example, if every fifth grader asks the same question, will they get the saved answer?

Brenda Bailey-Hainer stated that the inquiries are kept for ninety days.

Gigi Dennis asked what the purpose would be of requesting a transcript.

John Thomas answered that that a user may want to use the transcript for reference.

Gigi Dennis asked if the transcript is delivered by e-mail.

John Thomas affirmed that the transcript is delivered by e-mail.

Rich Olsen added that the “Ask the Librarian” interface was not the same as the new look and feel. However, the librarians changed the interface so that it is now seamless, and there are no concerns about branding or look and feel.

John Thomas also added that this is simply a demo. The live version of Live Help will be much more polished.

b. There Ought to be a Law

Rich Olsen stated that the application, “There Ought to be a Law”, was introduced to the Governor of Indiana. It is a very successful application in Indiana. The application gives citizens the opportunity to suggest legislation to the legislators. However, before it is posted, it goes through a process to make sure it is appropriate and it is not vulgar. The application is currently being tested, and it is stable. If the Governor chooses, he can use this application as a part of his State of the State address.

c. Payment Engine

The payment engine is going very well. CI has been working with the Treasurer's Office. Reconciliation is always difficult, but it is progressing.

Discussion:

Jack Arrowsmith requested that CI change county payment engine to counties/municipalities payment engine.

ACTION ITEM: Rich Olsen will change the county payment engine to counties/municipalities payment engine in the General Manager's Report.

In regards to other projects, Rich Olsen stated that there is a lot of data gathering happening.

3. *Portal Metrics*

Rich Olsen reported that hits to Colroado.gov decreased in December. They are not sure why this happened.

4. *Financial Report*

Revenues from bulk motor vehicle records for the month of November were \$419,886.00. The SIPA revenue share is based on Gregg Rippy's original budget. Year-to-date, net income is positive. Last month, net revenue was negative, and from here on out it should be positive.

Discussion:

Jack Arrowsmith asked how the current revenue number compares to other states.

Rich Olsen stated that Colorado is doing fantastic. Generally, it takes at least eight months to operate with positive net revenue. Revenue from bulk records has been 30 percent more than expected. The Department of Revenue was unable to track this before, but now it can be tracked.

5. *Project Cost*

Rich Olsen stated that this section would be very useful when there are more services. When an application is brought up, this shows the production costs. It is very quantifiable and shows that there is no chargeback to the state.

Old Business/Other Discussion

Gregg Jenik asked, when working with the Governor's Office and Henry Sobanet, if CI knew if they would play any kind of commercial or highlight SIPA at the State of the State Address.

Rich Olsen stated that he has been told that during the State of the State, the Governor will announce that Colorado.gov has been improved. After that, there will be press releases, but we don't want to steal thunder from the Governor.

Don Ravenscroft thanked CI, as they received the request from the Governor about three weeks ago. CI has worked very hard to complete the request.

Senator May suggested that next month, CI could present more about the credit card payment engine.

ACTION ITEM: CI will present more information about the credit card payment engine

Rich Olsen added that the Board might also like an update on content management. The hardware and software have been ordered and delivered to the CI office. At this point, content management takes second place to setting up Colorado.gov on the new servers. Next month, CI will begin to install the content management, however.

Richard Westfall, SIPA Legal Counsel, stated that it is very important that the approval of the Annual Business Plan (IABP) is the vehicle by which the Board exercises its duties. This is where the rubber hits the road. This is very serious, and Board members to make sure that they come ready, willing, and able.

Gigi Dennis stated that she had a concern after discussions with her IT staff, where it seemed that the true portal expenses are actually at cost of the departments. Essentially, departments have to bake the cake, and CI gets to put on the frosting. There is a lot of work that goes on before it gets to the portal stage. This is something that impacts the Department of State. Perhaps there are other things that are quicker and faster for the public.

Chairman Cadman stated that a typical person doesn't know who SIPA is. This is simply the conduit. All the public sees is that this is a service from government. There is no such thing as SIPA or CI to the public. The names SIPA and CI are only needed for relationship purposes. All the marketing puts the face on the departments. We need to make sure that departments understand that they are part of the solution.

Gigi Dennis stated that this idea may be an obstacle for counties and cities.

Don Ravenscroft stated that this may be the case with pre-existing applications or services, but there is also the case that we do the work on their (department, city, county, etc.) behalf. There will be both in the future. We do work on their behalf and get it onto the portal, or they do the work and we get it onto the portal.

Mike Monkman, Office of State Planning and Budgeting, added that one of the plausible uses of the reserve funds could be to help the departments in building utilities online so that they don't have that burden.

John Neraas, SysTest Labs, added that if an agency or department has something already, the portal could simply provide a common way for people to navigate to that site through the portal.

Rich Olsen (to Gigi Dennis' comment) stated that putting up a new website is certainly a lot of work. The portal will help a lot, but there will still be man-hours and cost. However, he would hope that CI does more than put icing on the cake. For example, the content management system is one of those products that is completely up to the departments as to whether or not they want to use it, but make it will make it a lot easier for the department to keep the website up to date.

IV. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

- Discussion and approval of the Annual Business Plan
- Credit Card Payment Engine Presentation
- Content Management Update
- Discussion and Approval of SIPA Policies 002-006

Next meeting is scheduled for:

Thursday, February 2, 2006
1:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Legislative Services Building
200 E. 14th Ave.
Audit Hearing Room, 1st Floor
Denver, CO

V. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.