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Committee Members in Attendance:

1. Joe Kuebler (Chair) – GA
2. Harry Hageman – OH
3. Ron Hajime – HI
4. David Guntharp – AR
5. Charles Placek (ex-officio)
6. Paul Brown (ex-officio)

Guests:

1. Pat Mayne, NYS Parole
2. Mike DePietro, NYS Parole
3. Steve LaRue, PBPP

Staff:

1. Don Blackburn
2. Sheila Perry
3. Ashley Kenoyer
4. Mindy Spring
5. Kelli Price

- Meeting was called to order at 2:36 PM
- Motion to approve 2-27-04, 4-21-04, and 9-23-04 minutes was made by D. Guntharp, seconded by R. Haijme. Passed unanimously.
D. Blackburn reports the NACIS status. D. Blackburn reported that SoftScape received input from the JAD members in Phoenix, the Commission is developing a strategy for the next phase of the project, and project roles are being redefined.

D. Blackburn announced that S. Perry is working directly with the project engineers at SoftScape. Danna Erwin will be reviewing whether suggestions from the JAD are in the new BRT. The Commission is working on the next steps of training, planning, communicating with states, and deciding on time frames.

D. Blackburn announced that there will be a national tele/web conference the last week in January to inform the IT representatives in each state. It was suggested that there be 4 different meetings divided by region. Dates for Tech meeting will be January 25th and 27th. D. Blackburn suggested having the IT reps submit questions to the National Office before the tele/web conference. There will also be a Q & A session during the meeting via instant messaging.

D. Blackburn stated that they are expecting to complete the BRT in the next week.

J. Kuebler stated that the National Office will take care of training implementation and to prepare states. D. Blackburn noted that training dates will be decided when an implementation date for the system is decided on. Lexington would be an inexpensive location to train.

D. Guntharp questioned how many states were using the new forms. Since it was unknown it was suggested that a survey be sent to all states to find out what forms are being used instead of the official forms and why.

D. Blackburn stated that many states (specifically WA and NE) are refusing to send packets via email because of confidentiality issues. H. Hageman suggested that the Commission ask WA and NE for a copy of their statutes. C. Placek also noted that many email boxes are too small to receive packets. H. Hageman also noted that this will not be a problem with the new system, because everything will be transmitted through it.

R. Haijme stated that other challenges the Commission will face with the implementation of the new database system will be getting all of the states on the system by a certain date and also getting all of the offenders’ files into the system.

J. Kuebler suggested that equipment needs (such as scanners, etc.) should be discussed with IT reps so that attachments can be added to transfer packets. D. Blackburn suggested looking into whether attachments are necessary. J. Kuebler recommended that the Commission look at having paperless transactions.

H. Hageman suggests that states be responsible for level 1 support and level 2 support will be assessed by the Compact Office.

**Old Business**
- The IT Committee is working out the timelines of the database system project.
- The IT Committee is addressing the issues of transfer packets.
- The Commission is evaluating the results of the NACIS questionnaire.

New Business
- The next Technology Committee meeting will be scheduled for February 3, 2005.

Adjourn
- The motion to adjourn the meeting was made by D. Guntharp at 3:35 pm EST.