Report of the Task Force
on
Local Government Information Systems

November 24, 2003

SUPREME COURT OF MISSISSIPPI
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF COURTS
POST OFFICE BOX 117
JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI 39205
TELEPHONE (601) 354-7406
FAX (601) 354-7459

November 25, 2003

Mr. David L. Litchliter, Executive Director
Department of Information Technology Services
301 N. Lamar Street, Suite 508
Jackson, MS 39201

Dear Mr. Litchliter:

On November 24, 2003, the Task Force on Local Government Information Systems authorized release of the report to the Department of Information Technology Services required by H.B. 992.

Sincerely,

Kevin Lackey, Chairman
Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Based upon recommendations made by PEER in its report, "A Review of County Information Systems," the Legislature created the Task Force on Local Government Information Systems. Pursuant to H.B. 992, the Task Force is responsible for preparing a report to the Department of Information Technology Services (ITS) that provides: (a) a description of information technology services available to the public in the offices of the chancery clerks, circuit clerks, tax assessors, and tax collectors; (b) recommendations on the hardware and software needs to create user-friendly, uniform systems for public access to public documents maintained by chancery clerks, circuit clerks, tax assessors, and tax collectors; (c) recommendations or comments regarding the statewide voter registration system being developed under the authority of the Secretary of State's Office; (d) recommendations or comments on any initiative to establish and implement a uniform Geographic Information System (GIS); (e) recommendations on methods of funding software, hardware, and telecommunications acquisitions necessary to comply with the task force recommendations; (f) recommendations for the use of world wide web-based systems for accessing the public information systems referenced in (b); and (g) recommendations on the hardware and software needs necessary to comply with homeland security requirements. ITS is to review the report and make recommendations to the Legislature regarding legislation necessary to implement the recommendations of the Task Force.

The Task Force formed subcommittees to address the different elements of the report and to draft a proposed Vision Statement. The Vision Statement adopted by the Task Force includes five areas of focus:

- Communication Access
- Collaboration/Coordination
- Standardization
- Fiscal Responsibility
- Governance

Subcommittees

The subcommittees met separately to draft proposed reports and recommendations to present to the Task Force for discussion and approval.

Framework

The Framework subcommittee determined that multiple strategic initiatives were currently progressing at various levels of state government. To ensure a more efficient implementation of these initiatives, the Task Force recommends that the repealer in H.B. 992 be extended to June 30, 2005, to allow for a more precise and thorough strategic coordination of these initiatives and that the

membership of the Task Force be reviewed to ensure appropriate representation of all statewide initiatives underway.

Survey Data

The Survey subcommittee assessed the data available from previous surveys conducted by various state agencies regarding the status of county information systems and developed several new survey forms: (1) an application survey (**Exhibit A**) sent to the county government offices; (2) a hardware survey (**Exhibit B**) sent to the vendors serving county government; (3) a state agency survey (**Exhibit C**); and (4) a municipal government survey (**Exhibit D**).

The application survey has been completed and the results (**Exhibit F**) show that at least 85% of the tax assessor and tax collector offices have automated their tax rolls, homestead exemption, unpaid taxes, automobile tags, and land sales. The Boards of Supervisors accounting programs and the Justice Court records are the next most automated at the 75-85% level. Automation levels for the Chancery and Circuit courts are reported at the 40-50% level. Law Enforcement Dispatch is automated at the 50% level with arrest records and offense records at a lower level of automation.

Only ten counties were found to have any kind of automated records available via the Internet, but twenty-three counties do have terminals available for use by the public to access records.

ITS also provided a report on the number of access points between state government and county locations. (**Exhibit E**) The report indicates that there are currently 684 data circuits supporting the county locations of state agencies such as the Department of Human Services, the Department of Health, the Tax Commission, the Department of Transportation, and the Mississippi Employment Security Commission. This number does not include data circuits used by law enforcement which has yet to be summarized. Consolidation of these access points would offer potential cost benefits.

The hardware, state agency, and municipal government surveys should be completed sometime in October with the results to follow in an amended report to ITS to be filed at a later date. Once all the data has been compiled, the Task Force expects to find, as PEER did in Report #430, that the independent development of information systems across state government fails to take advantage of economies of scale and impedes the transfer and accessibility of data.

Until all the survey data has been collected and analyzed, the Task Force will not make specific recommendations regarding hardware, software, or world wide web-based systems needed to create uniform, user-friendly systems for public access to documents. The general consensus of the Task Force, however, is that any recommendations should be based on an open architecture and solutions that are not tied to any specific vendor.

Funding

The Funding subcommittee discussed opportunities for reducing the cost of new and current services and ways for generating revenue for state and local government technology initiatives. In forming its recommendations, the funding subcommittee looked at how other states were funding technology services. Some states established technology funds based on filing fees and other state models are based on subscription services and/or convenience fees. With regard to funding, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

- Initial funding of projects should be provided by the Legislature or by local government user fees with common criteria established for receipt of funds;

- Reoccurring operating costs should be covered by "end user fees" either by subscription or per incident;

- An optional program similar to the fee structure used by the Local Government Records Committee could be established to fund the maintenance of information systems in local government;

- A significant amount of federal funds are available for the purchase and maintenance of hardware and software necessary to comply with homeland security requirements which could also be used as a base to network state and local governments; and

- The planning and development districts could be used as regional hubs for the transmission of information and data which could be accessed through a central facility.

State and Local Government Initiatives

Statewide Voter Registration

The Statewide Voter Registration Advisory Committee and the Secretary of State's Office have been working on establishing a single statewide voter registration list required by the Help America Vote Act (HAVA). The Secretary of State, as the state's chief election official, will maintain a single, centralized voter file. The voter database is to be managed by the county elections officials with software provided by the state. The database and software will be maintained on a centralized server and accessed through a secure network by the counties.

The statewide voter registration project is on schedule and once HAVA is fully funded, the Secretary of State should be in a position to procure and implement the system as required.

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

H.B. 861 created the Mississippi Coordinating Council for Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems which is responsible for the coordination of remote sensing and geographic information system activities and the establishment and enforcement of standards that will make it easier for users to share data and to facilitate cost-sharing arrangements to reduce data acquisition costs. The coordinating council's authority covers local, regional, and state governmental agencies except for the institutions of higher learning.

The coordinating council also provides direction and oversight of ITS's development and maintenance of the GIS data warehouse and of Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality's management, procurement, development, and maintenance of the Mississippi Digital Earth Model (MDEM) which will include seven core data layers of a digital land base computer model of the State of Mississippi, and provide the basis for a uniform GIS in each county.

The Task Force recommends that the coordinating council, as it carries out its statutory mission, continue to coordinate with the Task Force and other statewide technology initiatives.

Homeland Security

The Mississippi Emergency Management Agency (MEMA) has obtained a user license and plans to work with selected counties to evaluate the Disaster Management Interoperability Services (DMIS) system. DMIS is a recent initiative of the Department of Homeland Security that will enable responders, government offices, and authorized non-government organizations to share emergency management information. DMIS plans to make use of existing databases and applications with minimal intrusiveness in local incident management systems. Key to its development is an open, distributed object approach using interoperable tools and functionalities that can be re-shaped as requirements evolve.

Recommendations

Based on the reports of the subcommittees and in conjunction with the Vision Statement, the Task Force makes the following recommendations:

(1) **Development of a Governance Structure**

- Extend the repealer in H.B. 992 to June 30, 2005, to allow a broader, more focused coordination of the multiple strategic initiatives developing independently across the state.

- A governance structure should be created to guide the development of information

systems to assure accessibility, accuracy, consistency, and utility of the information captured by assisting in the coordination and collaboration among local governments on common application systems and on procurement of common technologies.

(2) **Develop Enterprise Infrastructure to Achieve Shared Benefits of Technology**

• Resources should be focused on development of a standard telecommunication network for the efficient communication of information and reduction of unnecessary costs. Currently, 684 data circuits are being used to support the county locations of state agencies. This number does not include the data circuits supporting law enforcement. Economies of scale could be realized through shared access of a single broadband connection that would serve multiple purposes.

(3) **Encourage Collaboration Through Sharing of Common Data, Processes, and Transactions**

• The Task Force should determine where there is a duplication of efforts requiring expenditure of funds including, but not limited to, a duplication of systems, duplication of data collection, and duplication of processes.

(4) **Develop Technical Standards to be Implemented Across All Levels of Government**

• The Task Force should develop policies and standards for state and local government information systems.

(5) **Emphasize that Government Must Become More Conscious of Opportunities to Control Spending**

• The Task Force should identify ways to minimize costs through economies of scale and by utilizing enterprise information systems that meet the information needs of state and local governments.

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 20, 2003, the Governor signed H.B. 992 creating the Task Force on Local Government Information Systems. *See* Appendix A. H.B. 992 provided for the membership of the Task Force, prescribed its duties, and directed the Department of Information Technology Services (ITS) to review all recommendations of the Task Force and to propose legislation to implement those recommendations.

PEER recommended the creation of the Task Force after conducting a study of county information systems. *See A Review of County Information Systems*, PEER Report # 430. In its study, PEER evaluated the county information systems currently being used in seven counties. PEER sought to determine the status of the systems including voter registration and other data management, the ability to meet state-level reporting, public accessibility, and alternatives for development of efficient, uniform systems which would be compatible among county and state level systems.

PEER discovered that each county developed its system independently choosing what information to include on its system and how that information was to be stored. PEER found that the lack of uniformity impeded public access and hindered the ability to share information among the counties or at the state level. PEER also noted several other ongoing independent initiatives to develop information systems being conducted by the State Tax Commission, Office of the State Auditor, Administrative Office of the Courts, and Secretary of State's Office, as well as, the development of local geographic information systems across the state.

PEER concluded that ITS should oversee and coordinate the development of information systems that provide accurate information to the public in a user-friendly environment and further improve the economy of local system development and implementation by developing and hosting shared information resources. A statewide Task Force was to be created to provide recommendations to ITS on policy development and standards.

II. H.B. 992

In response to PEER's report, the Mississippi Legislature created a statewide Task Force on Local Government Information Systems. The membership of the Task Force includes twenty-two members most of whom represent state agencies and local government representatives involved in state/local government information systems, as well as, two members of the Legislature and two citizen members. *See* Appendix B.

H.B. 992 requires that the Task Force develop a report to be delivered to ITS no later than October 1, 2003. The report, at a minimum, shall address the following:

(a) A description of the current condition of information technology services available to the public in the offices of the chancery clerks, circuit clerks, tax assessors, and tax collectors of the State of Mississippi;

(b) Recommendations on the hardware and software needs to create user-friendly, uniform systems for public access to court records, land records, tax records, and all other public documents maintained by chancery clerks, circuit clerks, tax assessors, and tax collectors in all counties of the state;

(c) Recommendations or comments regarding system compatibility and economy of those systems being developed under the Secretary of State's authority to develop and implement a statewide voter registration system, as required by Congress in Public Law 107-252;

(d) Recommendations or comments on any initiative to establish and implement a uniform Geographic Information System (GIS) in each county of the state;

(e) Recommendations on methods of funding software, hardware, and telecommunications acquisitions necessary for each county to comply with the task force recommendations;

(f) Recommendations for the use of world wide web-based systems for accessing the public information systems recommended in paragraph (b) of this section; and

(g) Recommendations on the hardware and software needs necessary to comply with homeland security requirements of the federal government relating to state agencies, counties, and municipal government.

Upon receipt of the report, ITS is to review the report and make recommendations to the Legislature no later than December 15, 2003, regarding legislation that would be necessary to implement the recommendations of the Task Force.

III. THE TASK FORCE

At the first meeting, the Task Force decided to adopt a Vision Statement to better define its goals. A subcommittee was formed to draft a proposed Vision Statement and the Task Force adopted the final draft at its August 26th meeting. The final draft reads as follows:

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems
Vision Statement

Mississippians, both corporate citizens as well as individuals, see the state as a single entity rather than the levels and segments of government that we, as public employees, see. State of Mississippi entities from the lowest levels of local governing authorities to the largest state agencies must consider the public's perception of Mississippi government and focus on the delivery and exchange of information using standard processes, policies, and architecture that take advantage of cost efficiencies and minimize redundant use of resources while recognizing the disparities that exist among these different levels of government.

- The Task Force vision includes these areas of focus:

  - **Communication Access**
    The Task Force should encourage single-point access to the State's shared network infrastructure. Enterprise connectivity will improve government communication and responsiveness by reducing the costs of public services and enhancing the quality of service delivery.

  - **Collaboration/Coordination**
    The Task Force should encourage collaboration among state and local entities through sharing of common data, processes, and transactions. Collaboration at all levels of government will facilitate smooth interaction, cost reduction and greater efficiencies.

  - **Standardization**
    The Task Force should encourage the creation of technical standards to be implemented across all levels of government. The development of a statewide technical architecture will serve as a catalyst for the elimination of redundant networks and related platforms as well as for the implementation of information interchange and interoperability standards, as well as other policies.

  - **Fiscal Responsibility**
    The Task Force should emphasize our recognition that government must become more conscious of opportunities to control spending in areas where unnecessary or duplicative expenditures are occurring. Studies show that these duplicative Information Technology expenditures are occurring at significant levels in Federal, State, and Local Government. This Task Force, in focusing on a shared vision for Communication Access, Collaboration/Coordination, and Standardization, will focus on recommendations for the deployment of enterprise solutions as a means for reducing acquisition and support expenditures across the enterprise.

  - **Governance**

The Task Force should recommend a governance structure representative of all parties that will ensure that statutes proposed, as well as, policies and rules developed and implemented consider the needs and requirements of all involved entities.

Although PEER's report did not encompass a study of municipal government information systems, the Legislature included municipalities when drafting H.B. 992. It is the intent of the Task Force to include municipalities in any references to local government.

With the Vision Statement in mind, the Task Force formed subcommittees to address the required elements of H.B. 992 in preparation for its report to ITS. In addition, several members of the Task Force also serve on the advisory committee created to assist the Secretary of State in developing statewide voter registration systems and the Mississippi Coordinating Council for Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems. These members agreed to serve as liaisons to those committees on behalf of the Task Force.

IV. REPORT FROM FRAMEWORK SUBCOMMITTEE

TASK FORCE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS SUBGROUP FOR FRAMEWORK DEVELOPMENT

September 5, 2003

Upon convening, the Task Force members became aware of the multiple strategic initiatives progressing currently in the State at various levels of government. These active strategic initiatives vary in scope, breadth, impact, and enabling entity. Certain initiatives are enabled via executive order, others by legislation, and still others are grass roots initiatives. The recognition that multiple strategic initiatives were developing independently suggested that a broader, more focused coordination needed to occur to ensure efficient implementation of these strategic initiatives.

To accomplish a more thorough and precise strategic coordination, the Task Force is recommending that the repealer in House Bill 992 be extended to June 30, 2005, that the legislative charge be modified to address the need for this overall coordination and that the membership of the Task Force be reviewed to ensure appropriate representation of all statewide initiatives underway that include significant information technology components. These statewide initiatives include, but are not limited to:

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems (HB 992, 2003 Regular Session)
Statewide Centralized Voter System (HB 2366, 2002 Regular Session)
Mississippi Coordinating Council for Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems (HB 861, 2003 Regular Session)

Statewide Interoperability Executive Committee (Executive Order 874, February 5, 2003)
Homeland Security Coordination (Coordinated by the Mississippi Emergency Management Agency)
Automated Financial Audits (Coordinated by the State Auditor)
Integrated Justice System (Coordinated by the Administrative Office of the Courts)
Motor Vehicle Tag and Title System (Coordinated by the State Tax Commission)

V. REPORT ELEMENTS

(A) Report from Survey Subcommittee

REPORT TO MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES
BY
TASK FORCE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS
SUBGROUP FOR SURVEY INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT
September 30, 2003

The Subgroup for Survey Instrument Development was formed to develop mechanisms for providing the description required by Section 1. (a) of House Bill No. 992:

> (a) A description of the current condition of information technology services available to the public in the office of the chancery clerks, circuit clerks, tax assessors and tax collectors of the State of Mississippi.

Actions Taken to Date

The subgroup compiled a body of data from previous surveys and published studies, in an effort to focus on the known issues about local government information systems and their viability for data sharing and mutual communications. The bodies of data utilized for the focus were:

- Administrative Office of Courts survey conducted in 1997-1998 which assesses capabilities of the chancery, circuit, county, youth, municipal and justice courts, and the tax collectors' and tax assessors' offices, (i.e. the CourtCom Associates Study);
- Mississippi Association of Planning and Development Districts survey on Statewide Infrastructure Needs, conducted in 1999;
- Office of the Secretary of State survey of counties for the voter registration project, conducted in 2001;
- Data compiled for the Criminal Case Management Information Sharing System in conjunction with the Tri-County Automated System Project.

Assessments were made of additional survey instruments as follows:

- A survey instrument used by Texas to assess the needs of their state agencies for inbound local government data was evaluated.
- An online survey of municipalities designed by the Mississippi Municipal League (MML) was evaluated. The MML is planning to administer the survey in October 2003

The subgroup concluded that the CourtCom Associates data was too old for the Task Force's purposes, but that the survey instrument used for the project could be adapted for our purposes. The instrument for conducting this survey, the "application survey," is included in this report as **Exhibit A**. The survey focuses on:

- Whether specific applications of interest are automated in the Chancery Clerk offices, Circuit Clerk offices, Tax Collector and Tax Assessor offices, the Justice Courts, the Sheriff Departments, and the Board of Supervisors Offices;
- The number of staff terminals and the number of publicly accessible terminals in each of the aforementioned offices;
- Whether any of the records are viewable via the Internet in each of the aforementioned offices;
- Whether a new system is planned and when in any of the offices.

The subgroup also concluded that the Mississippi Association of Planning and Development Districts data was too old for the Task Force's purposes, but that the survey instrument used for the project could be adapted for our purposes. This survey instrument, the "hardware survey," is included in this report as **Exhibit B**. The survey focuses on:

- Server computer types and models;
- Communications capabilities with other computers;
- Accessibility to the Internet;
- Networking capabilities and specifics;
- Security capabilities.

The hardware survey is being conducted by the subgroup through the computer vendors who provide services to the counties. Compilation of this data is expected by October 24, 2003.

The subgroup adapted the aforementioned Texas survey to be administered to State agencies. It will be administered during the month of October 2003. Compiled results will be available November 30, 2003. This instrument and the cover letter associated with it are included as **Exhibit C**. The focus of this survey is on the specifics of reports and forms transmitted to State government from local government.

The subgroup decided to ask the Mississippi Municipal League to share the results of their online

technology survey once concluded. The instrument is included as **Exhibit D**. The survey focus is on the municipal level of government, seeking the following types of data:

- Type of computer used;
- Internet capabilities;
- Age of computer;
- Electronic transmission capabilities to other levels of government (county, state);
- GIS capabilities.

Results to Date

Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services' current knowledge of access points between state government and county locations was assessed to give an idea of economies that could be achieved by consolidating network infrastructures in the State. The report from Information Technology Services indicating the number of data circuits in use between State Government and the county locations of the Department of Human Services, the Department of Health, the Tax Commission, the Department of Transportation, and the Mississippi Employment Security Commission is included as **Exhibit E**. The grand total of data circuits supporting the county locations of these agencies is 684, offering much potential for consolidation and savings.

The "application survey" (**Exhibit A**) was conducted by the staff of the Harrison County Chancery Clerk. Results from this survey are shown in **Exhibit F**.

The most highly automated offices at the county level are the tax assessor and tax collector offices. These offices have tax rolls, homestead exemption, unpaid taxes, automobile tags and land sales automated at the 85% level or above. Board of Supervisor Accounting and Justice Court Records are the next most automated at the 75-85% level. The Chancery Court and Circuit Court automation levels are reported at the 40-50% level. Law Enforcement Dispatch is automated at the 50% level with arrest records and offense records at a lower level of automation.

Of very high significance for the Task Force is the fact that only 10 counties have any kind of automated records available via the Internet. However, all but 23 counties do have terminals available for public access to records.

Expected Results

As documented in the PEER Report #430, "A Review of County Information Systems," the lack of coordination among county governments in the development of information technology and systems has fostered an environment of competing technologies, development guidelines, hardware, software, and infrastructure. This fractured and uncoordinated environment has enabled the growth of information and technology silos across the state.

With the advancement of information technology into all facets of life, government at all levels must become more concerned with the development of systems that provide efficient, effective, and accessible information to the citizens of Mississippi. Specifically, cooperation at the state and county level is a requirement for the advancement and realization of economies of scale for the development of statewide information and telecommunications systems. As stated in PEER Report #430, "governing development and setting minimum standards for the creation and operation are important to the state because of the current duplication of effort that is occurring statewide on many different projects."

Using the PEER Report as a resource, the Subgroup for Survey development sought to develop strategies in conjunction with the Task Force's vision statement to address the known issues about local government information systems and their viability for data sharing and mutual communications. The Strategies outlined below are high-level recommendations that will bear more detailed work once all survey data is collected and analyzed.

Strategy 1

RECOMMEND THE DEVELOPMENT OF A GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Goal: The Task Force should Encourage Formalized Coordination of State/Local Information System Development.

⇒ Upon convening, the Task Force members became aware of the multiple strategic initiatives progressing currently in the State at various levels of government. The recognition that multiple strategic initiatives were developing independently suggested that a broader, more focused coordination needed to occur to ensure efficient implementation of these strategic initiatives.

⇒ To accomplish a more thorough and precise strategic coordination, the Task Force is recommending that the repealer in House Bill 992 be extended to June 30, 2005, that the legislative charge be modified to address the need for this overall coordination and that the membership of the Task Force be reviewed to ensure appropriate representation of all statewide initiatives underway that include significant information technology components.

Goal: The Task Force should Encourage Formalized Collaboration of State/Local Information System Development.

⇒ The Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services should be used to guide development/evolution of systems and assure accessibility, accuracy, consistency, and utility of the information captured by assisting in the coordination and collaboration among local governments on common application systems and on procurement of

common technologies.

Strategy 2

DEVELOP ENTERPRISE INFRASTRUCTURE TO ACHIEVE SHARED BENEFITS OF TECHNOLOGY

Goal: The Task Force should Encourage Access to the State's Shared Network Infrastructure.

⇒ The Task Force should focus resources on development of a standard telecommunication network, in order for local government and state entities to efficiently communicate information and reduce unnecessary costs. Further economies of scale could be realized through shared access of a single broadband connection that would serve multiple purposes.

Strategy 3

ENCOURAGE COLLABORATION THROUGH SHARING OF COMMON DATA, PROCESSES, AND TRANSACTIONS

Goal: The Task Force should Determine where Current Information Systems are being Duplicated in County and State Systems.

⇒ Currently, state and local governments have implemented many different computer systems; at times these systems overlap. Currently, there are many state agencies working to develop systems for their own needs, which encompass county data. The Task Force should encourage collaboration and coordination of common data, processes, and transactions among local governments and the State.

Strategy 4

DEVELOP TECHNICAL STANDARDS TO BE IMPLEMENTED ACROSS ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

Goal: The Task Force should Develop Policies and Standards for the Implementation of a State/Local Information System.

Strategy 5

EMPHASIZE THAT GOVERNMENT MUST BECOME MORE CONSCIOUS OF OPPORTUNITIES TO CONTROL SPENDING

Goal: This Task Force should Develop Recommendations for the Deployment of Enterprise Solutions as a Means for Reducing Acquisition and Support Expenditures across the Enterprise.

⇒ The Task Force should identify ways to minimize the cost of the separate development of information systems by utilizing a universal information system that meets the information needs of the state and local governments. The Task Force should determine if economies of scale will work to accomplish a statewide information system rather than having independent development without coordination occur in the state at all levels of government.

(B) Hardware and Software Needs

Until all the survey data has been collected and analyzed, the Task Force will not make specific recommendations regarding hardware, software, or world wide web-based systems needed to create uniform, user-friendly systems for public access to documents. The general consensus of the Task Force, however, is that any recommendations should be based on an open architecture and solutions that are not tied to any specific vendor.

(C) Report on Statewide Voter Registration System

At the request of the Task Force, the Secretary of State's Office provided the following report on the status of the statewide voter registration system:

Mississippi Secretary of State's Office

Report on the Statewide Voter Registration System

September 8, 2003

The voter registration database is the cornerstone of election integrity. The Secretary of State's Office is committed to election integrity and to the implementation of a centralized statewide voter registration system. During the 2002 Legislative Session, SB 2366 was passed to mandate that the Secretary of State implement a statewide voter registration system. In November 2002, Congress passed the Help America Vote Act which requires all states to create a statewide voter registration system and will provide federal funding. The federal HAVA Act mandates that the "chief elections official of the state" - - the Secretary of State in this case – shall make the final decision on the acquisition of the statewide voter registration system.

Currently, official State voter registration records are created and maintained at the local jurisdiction level. Local election officials update and separately maintain voter registration records for their jurisdiction, with all 82 jurisdictions using customized systems.

The state does not have a "single, uniform, official, centralized, interactive, computerized

statewide voter registration list" required by HAVA. Moreover, information gathered and maintained on state voters does not uniformly include driver's license numbers or partial social security numbers, as required by HAVA.

The state legislation creates an advisory committee of interested stakeholders that has been appointed and will work with the Secretary of State on file format structure. Members of the committee are provided as an attachment to this report. The committee and the Secretary of State's Office have been in contact with the counties to make sure that their functional requirements will be met. A survey was sent out in May to poll the counties on their needs for the system. A summary of that survey is attached to this report.

In a centralized system, the state's chief election official will maintain a single, centralized voter file. The county election officials will manage their voter registration database with software funded through the HAVA legislation. The database and software will be maintained on centralized servers and accessed through a secure network by the counties.

Functionality provided by a centralized statewide system will include:

- Real-time synchronization with other state data sources (e.g., "motor voter" registrations, death records, disenfranchising convictions)
- Real-time ability to identify and eliminate duplicate registrations among counties
- Access by less wealthy counties to the same state-of-the-art technology as wealthier counties
- Data in all counties configured according to same format and style, normalizing data for purposes of redistricting, provision of data to third parties, and processing data against National Change of Address databases in conformance with the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA)

When HAVA is fully funded, the Secretary of State's Office will be in a position to procure and implement the system as required.

The Secretary of State's Office has long supported the idea of standards that will allow state and local government entities to share information and resources. AS our office implements this federally mandated initiative, we look forward to continued participation in the Task Force on Local Government Information Systems and sharing our results with other agencies that are interested in shared information between state and local government.

STATEWIDE VOTER REGISTRATION SYSTEM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Honorable Eric Clark
Secretary of State, Chair

The Honorable Lucy Carpenter
Circuit Clerk, Marshall County

The Honorable Lee Westbrook
Circuit Clerk, Madison County

The Honorable Ann Watts
Election Commissioner, Lauderdale County

The Honorable Sam Ely
Election Commission, Sunflower County

Mr. David Oswalt
Mississippi Association of Supervisors

Mr. Keith Smith
Stennis Institute of Government

Mr. David Litchliter
Executive Director, ITS

The Honorable Webb Franklin

Mr. Melton Harris
Chair of Democratic Executive Committee, Jackson County

SURVEY RESULTS
Statewide Voter Registration County Software System Survey
Conducted by the Mississippi Secretary of State's Office

July 1, 2003

The Statewide Voter Registration Advisory Committee and the Secretary of State's Office sent this survey to the counties to gain their input of county software functionality. We believe their involvement and input is critical to the success of this project and in order to procure a system that meets the needs of the county election officials.

The items listed below are major components and do not include all of the functional requirements that will be included in the final specifications.

As of May 30th, 2003, we had received results from 71 of the 82 counties. Their responses have been tabulated and are indicated below. This report will be sent to a representative of the circuit clerks for their assistance in prioritization of items on this list. That list will then be used in preparation for the functional specifications of the Statewide Voter Registration System (SWVR) request for proposal (RFP) from vendors.

My system currently does this	**I wish my system did this**	**No answer given**	**1. Voter Entry Functions** * New requirement based on HAVA.
6	57	8	1.1 *Provide immediate notification of duplicate registrations on a statewide basis.
3	54	14	1.2 *Provide identification of name and driver's license number with Mississippi Department of Public Safety (MDPS)
5	47	19	1.3 Provide electronic transmission of NVRA voter registration files from MDPS and other agencies. Notify county election officials for processing of NVRA registrations.
52	14	5	1.4 Security that will allow only the authorized county election officials to change and/or edit the files
32	35	4	1.5 Automatically assign voter to precinct
53	11	7	1.6 Maintain voter history
10	49	12	1.7 Compare all voter data with change of address files, death files and criminal files and notify county election officials of possible changes.
12	43	16	1.8 * If no driver's license or SSN is given, generate unique voter registration number on statewide basis.
16	42	13	1.9 Automatically generate all verification, confirmation, rejection, etc. correspondence from the system as required by NVRA.
36	25	10	1.10 Ability to track inactive voters and to reactivate as needed.
20	37	14	1.11 Abililty to flag poll book for specific classifications like first time voter, absentee voter, inactive voter, etc.
39	17	15	1.12 Provide access to the system for authorized users, 24 hours a day/seven days a week
47	14	10	1.13 On demand query and printing by county election officials of all data and poll books

13	35	23	1.14 Integration of barcodes and scanning for easy entry of information.
My system currently does this	**I wish my system did this**	**No answer given**	**2. Jury Management Functions**
45	12	14	2.1 Selection for jury wheel using multiple selection criteria
40	16	15	2.2 Ability to add additional names to annual jury wheel
58	8	4	2.3 Print jury summons
45	17	9	2.4 Maintain jury history for individuals
17	37	17	2.5 Ability to record jury excuses
20	24	27	2.6 Reporting for jury management
26	33	12	2.7 Calculate jury pay
16	38	17	2.8 Create payroll vouchers or payroll export files
25	28	18	2.9 Full query and reporting capabilities for local and federal jury management.
My system currently does this	**I wish my system did this**	**No answer given**	**3. Mapping and Redistricting Functions**
14	46	11	3.1 Provide mapping features through GIS using county data including streets, precincts, districts and voters.
30	32	9	3.2 Create new precincts and districts
30	29	12	3.3 Alter assignments of precincts to districts
26	30	15	3.4 Alter street segment assignments to precincts
29	30	12	3.5 Report on new districts, precincts, streets with voter counts
20	35	16	3.6 Transfer new districts, precincts, streets to live data at scheduled time
23	38	10	3.7 Automatically notify voters with new precincts and districts
24	34	13	3.8 Full query and reporting capabilities
My system currently does this	**I wish my system did this**	**No answer given**	**4. Absentee Voting Functions**
7	48	16	4.1 Automatic preparation of permanent absentee materials
9	45	17	4.2 Identify other absentees - overseas, out of state, military
14	43	14	4.3 Collect requests for absentee applications
8	39	24	4.4 Print request information on poll book
21	33	18	4.5 Add information to voting history

10	41	20	4.6 Full query and reporting capabilities
My system currently does this	**I wish my system did this**	**No answer given**	**5. Polling Place Management Functions**
23	36	12	5.1 Maintain a list of all polling places with contact information
8	39	24	5.2 Maintain polling place accessibility information based on individuals with disabilities requirements
10	42	19	5.3 Maintain information on directions to each polling place
3	40	28	5.4 Maintain equipment purchase information and serial numbers by polling place
7	35	29	5.5 Full query and reporting capabilities
My system currently does this	**I wish my system did this**	**No answer given**	**6. Poll Workers Management Functions**
4	47	20	6.1 Maintain a pool of available poll workers
3	41	27	6.2 Assign poll workers individually or in groups
4	38	29	6.3 Designate poll worker job assignments and permanent precinct and poll assignments
1	37	33	6.4 Designate performance ranking system
1	35	35	6.5 Track work assignments, attendance and test scores for poll workers
2	35	34	6.6 Allow for entry and tracking of high school election workers if program is administered by county
3	45	23	6.7 Calculate poll workers pay
3	40	28	6.8 Create payroll vouchers or payroll export files
4	40	27	6.9 Full query and reporting capabilities
My system currently does this	**I wish my system did this**	**No answer given**	**7. Lists/Labels/Data Extraction Functions**
25	34	12	7.1 Allow for selective creation of queries and reports (list or labels) or extracted data files (for import into Excel, Access, etc.). This would include the ability to report on certain precincts and voting districts as well as previous voting history.

(D) Report from GIS Subcommittee

Recommendation for Coordination of

Local Government Geographic Information Systems

During the 2003 session, the Legislature passed HB 861, which created the Mississippi Coordinating Council for Remote Sensing and Geographic Information Systems. The coordinating council is responsible for "coordination of remote sensing and geographic information system activities within Mississippi." It is mandated to establish and enforce policies and standards that will "make it easier for remote sensing and geographic information system users around the state to share information and to facilitate cost-sharing arrangements to reduce the costs of acquiring remote sensing and geographic information system data." The coordinating council's authority covers all local, regional, and state governmental agencies in Mississippi except for institutions of higher learning.

HB 861 charges the coordinating council with the following specific responsibilities:

- Establishing policies and standards to guide Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services (ITS) in the review and approval of state and local government procurement of both hardware and software development relate to remote sensing and geographic information system;
- Establishing standards (to be implemented by the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality) for the procurement of remote sensing and geographic information system data by state and local governmental entities;
- Preparing a plan, with proposed state funding priorities, for Mississippi's remote sensing and geographic information system activities, including development, operation and maintenance of the Mississippi Digital Earth Model;
- Designating Mississippi's official representative to the National States Geographic Information Council and to any other national or regional remote sensing or geographic information system organizations on which Mississippi has an official seat;
- Establishing and designating the members of an advisory committee made up of policy level officials from major state, local, regional and federal agencies, including, but not limited to, the National Association of Space Administration, the Mississippi Institute for Forestry Inventory, the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks, the Mississippi Public Utilities Staff, the Department of Marine Resources, the county E911 coordinator, the State Health Officer, the Commissioner of Agriculture and Commerce, the State Tax Commission, the Council of Consulting Engineers and the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, as well as members of the private sector;
- Creating a staff level technical users committee, in which any public or private sector entity in Mississippi interested in remote sensing and geographic information may be allowed to participate;
- Coordinating with the State Tax Commission to assure that state and local governmental entities do not have to comply with two (2) sets of requirements imposed by different organizations.

In addition, the coordinating council is mandated to provide direction and oversight of ITS's development and maintenance of a warehouse for the state's GIS data and of MDEQ's management, procurement, development, and maintenance of the Mississippi Digital Earth Model (MDEM). MDEM will include the following seven (7) core data layers of a digital land base computer model of the State of Mississippi, and will provide the basis for a uniform GIS in each county of the state:

- Geodetic control;
- Elevation and bathymetry;
- Orthoimagery;
- Hydrography;
- Transportation;
- Government boundaries; and
- Cadastral. (With respect to the cadastral layer, the authority and responsibility of the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality, Office of Geology and Energy Resources shall be limited to compiling information submitted by counties.)

The coordinating council has the following members:

- The Executive Director of the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality;
- The Executive Director of the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services;
- The Executive Director of the Mississippi Department of Transportation;
- The Executive Director of the Mississippi Emergency Management Agency;
- The Executive Director of the Mississippi Development Authority;
- The Secretary of State;
- The Executive Director of the Mississippi Forestry Commission;
- The Director of the Mississippi State Board of Registered Professional Geologists;
- A representative from the Institutions of Higher Learning, appointed by the Commissioner of the Institutions of Higher Learning;
- One (1) mayor, serving a municipality, appointed by the Executive Director of the Mississippi Municipal League;
- The Executive Director of the Mississippi Municipal League or his designee;
- One (1) county supervisor appointed by the Executive Director of the Mississippi Association of Supervisors;
- The Executive Director of the Mississippi Association of Supervisors or his designee;
- A member of the Tax Assessors/Collectors Association, to be appointed by the president of that association;
- A representative of the Planning and Development Districts, appointed by the Governor;
- A Senator, as a nonvoting member, appointed by the Lieutenant Governor; and
- A Representative, as a nonvoting member, appointed by the Speaker of the House.

The Task Force on Local Government Information Systems recognizes that the Legislature has established the Mississippi Coordinating Council for Remote Sensing and Geographic Information

Systems to coordinate remote sensing and geographic information systems activities for state and local governmental entities. It recommends that the coordinating council, as it carries out its statutory mission, continue to coordinate with the Task Force on Local Government Information Systems and with other statewide technology initiatives.

(E) Report from Funding Subcommittee

An Overview of Funding Ideas and Recommendations

Opportunities for reducing the cost of new services:

- Standardization
- Joint/Group Purchases
- Volume Discounts
- Use of Enterprise Solutions and Infrastructure

Opportunities for reducing the cost of current services:

- Utilization of existing state contracts
- Joint/group procurements and renegotiation of existing contracts
- Sharing of resources
- Consolidation/Coordination of standards

Opportunities for generating new revenue for State and Local Government Technology Initiatives:

Local

- Filing fees for local government services to generate funds for technology fund (See Attachment 1)
- Convenience fees from automated services (See Attachment 2)
- Subscription fees for access to certain automated information (See Attachment 2)
- Better coordination and leveraging of Federal grants and other Federal funds
- Better coordination of county and municipal funds on similar technology needs

State

- Earmarked general funds to be used for the development of a common, shared infrastructure
- Better coordination and leveraging of federal funds
- Better coordination and sharing of common infrastructure
- Consolidation of multi-agency funding for similar purposes

Recommendations

, Certain aspects of this project are for information that would be transparent to the public. Therefore, a portion of the initial funding of projects should be provided either by the legislature in the form of a block grant or by local government user fees. In order to maintain a consistency in creation of these systems, there should be common criteria established for receiving of the funds.

, Reoccurring operating costs should be covered by "end user fees." Whether the fees would be by subscription or by per incident would be established by the local governing board.

, Mississippi has established through the Local Government Records Committee a fee structure for the funding of records restoration and retention. There could be a similar optional program initiated for the establishment of a fee structure to fund the costs to maintain the information system in the local government.

, There is a significant amount of federal funds available for the purchase and maintenance of hardware and software that is necessary to comply with the homeland security requirements of the federal government. This hardware and software could also be used as a base to network the state and local governments.

, The State of Mississippi is divided into ten planning and development districts. Each of these districts could be a regional hub for the transmission of information/data. This information could then be accessed through a central facility.

Attachment 1

An Overview of Technology Funds in Iowa, Louisiana, and Tennessee[1]

With contracting state budgets and an increasing demand for Information Technology (IT) to be integrated into the way that government functions, states are seeking novel and innovative means of funding IT initiatives. Some states have created technology funds as an innovative way of funding government agencies in their efforts to use IT and digital government projects to function more efficiently and provide better services to citizens. This overview describes the technology funds of three states: Iowa, Louisiana, and Tennessee. Each fund has unique attributes regarding how it is funded, how it dispenses its funds, and the types of projects that it supports.

Iowa's Pooled Technology Fund

[1]The thought, effort, and credit for this research belong to the National Association of State Chief information Officers (NASCIO), www.nascio.org. For the purposes of this document, the research was modified as deemed appropriate.

Iowa's Pooled Technology Fund was created in May 2000 through an appropriations bill to support Iowa's IT initiatives.[2] It is funded by reversions of unencumbered or unexpended appropriations from the prior year together with monies remaining in an underground storage tank liabilities fund.[3] The legislation creating the fund provided that, at the end of the fiscal year of its creation, the division of information services could not deposit additional monies into the Pooled Technology Fund without the legislature's reauthorization and that all unencumbered funds at the end of the fiscal year would revert back to Iowa's general fund.[4] The following year, the legislature allowed direct cost savings from the state IT Department's rendering of services to state agencies to be placed into the Pooled Technology fund. The legislature also provided that unencumbered monies in the fund from the prior year could remain in the fund.[5]

The Information Technology Department administers the fund.[6] Funds are allocated below the total projected cost of a project in order to stretch funds and facilitate the combining of like projects. To apply for funding, agencies must submit a Return on Investment (ROI) Program Application, which measures the benefits of IT investments. The ROI Application describes the proposed project, provides a financial analysis, details the technology to be used, including any data elements for proposed databases, and identifies metrics or measures against which the project will be audited after it is implemented.

Projects supported by the Pooled Technology Fund go through a detailed review process. Preliminarily, the Information Technology Department's Enterprise Quality Assurance Office reviews the applications for completeness. Next, an internal review group within the Information Technology Department, with the assistance of a subgroup of Iowa's CIO Council, scores and ranks the project applications. The Information Technology Council[7] then scores and ranks the projects using the same criteria. The results are forwarded to the agencies for comment and then to Iowa's Department of Management, to the Governor, to the Legislature and to the public. The Governor then reviews the projects and makes recommendations to the Legislature as to which projects should receive Pooled

---

[2]2000 Iowa Acts SF 2433 § 5, <http://www.legis.state.ia.us/GA/78GA/Legislation/SF/02400/SF2433/Current.html>. View the Line-Item Veto accompanying this legislation at: <http://www.legis.state.is.us/GA/78GA/Session.2/SJournal/01400/01460.html>.

[3]Iowa General Assembly, Legislative Service Bureau, "2000 Summary of Legislation-Appropriations," SF 2433, <http://www.legis.state.ia.us/GA/78GA/Session.2/Summary/appr.htm>.

[4]2000 Iowa Acts SF 2433 § 5.

[5]2001 Iowa Acts HF 719 § 4.

[6]2000 Iowa Acts SF 2433 § 5.

[7]The Information Technology Council oversees the Information Technology Department and executive branch agencies' information technology activities. Its membership includes the Director of the Information Technology Department, representatives from all three branches of state government, and five persons who are knowledgeable about IT and are appointed by the Governor. See ITC's website at: <http://www.state.ia.us/government/its/ITC/index.html>.

Technology funds. Finally, the Legislature decides which projects to fund, subject to the veto power of the Governor.[8]

Louisiana's Technology Innovation Fund

The Louisiana Technology Innovation Fund (LTIF) was created in 1997 as an incentive to accelerate the implementation of e-government and to encourage state agencies to pursue technology innovations that benefit citizens.[9] LTIF "supports innovative and exemplary projects that can serve as models for using information technology in state government." LTIF provides "seed" money for innovative single or multi-agency IT projects and is intended to work as venture capital by encouraging innovators within state agencies to compete for funding. The fund is a "dedicated" fund that requires annual appropriations by the state legislature. State agencies compete for funds on a year-round basis.

Projects can be funded for up to two years and can receive up to $1,000,000 in total. Projects are only eligible for LTIF money if other funding cannot be provided for the procurement of IT and telecommunications systems and services.[10] Projects funded through LTIF must emphasize new insights into the use of information technology and the application of technology to address specific public needs. High priority is given to the following types of projects: (1) interactive, Web-enabled initiatives that are user-friendly and extend services to the public, business or other government entities (2) partnerships between or among agencies (3) initiatives that improve the state's IT infrastructure (4) innovations that could be used as models for other state agencies and (5) projects extending services to under-served areas.[11]

When project proposals are submitted, the Office of Budget first reviews them to ensure that funding does not already exist for such technology. Next, the proposals are reviewed by the Division of Administration regarding each proposed project's functionality and technical specifications and the applicability of each project's proposed hardware, software, and contracted services. The Louisiana Technology Innovations Council then evaluates each proposed project. The Council is comprised of the President of the State Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Commissioner of Administration, the State Department Undersecretary or Deputy Secretary, and a Governor's appointee from the Council of Information Service Directors.

---

[8] View Iowa's Pooled Technology Fund application for FY 2004 at: <http://www2.info.state.ia.us/roi/FY2004/ROI_Program_Funding_Application.dot>.

[9] State of Louisiana, Louisiana Technology Innovation Fund, October 24, 2002, <http://www.state.la.us/ltif/index.htm. View SB 1253, which created the Louisiana Technology Innovation Fund, at: <http://www.info.state.ia.us/transitionteam/appendix_D/Louisiana%20senate%20bill%201253.htm>.

[10] State of Louisiana, Technology Innovation Fund Guidelines, February 18, 2002, <http://www.state.la.us/ltif/guideline.htm>.

[11] Ibid.

Tennessee's Systems Development Fund

The State of Tennessee has a Systems Development Fund, which is a mechanism for funding large application development projects and large equipment purchases.[12] The Systems Development Fund was created by a one-time appropriation of $10 million dollars. The Systems Development Fund provides loans to state agencies that must be paid back within a time frame that normally is not in excess of five years. Generally, this funding is only available for projects of $100,000 or more.[13] The funds are allocated by Tennessee's Information Systems Council based upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of Finance and Administration.[14] Normally, each year's appropriation bill gives the Commissioner of Finance and Administration the authority to put any available agency savings into the fund if the Commissioner so chooses.

Most projects funded are for software, personnel, and related costs. If a project will generate sufficient savings to fund the loan's payback, then the payback does not begin until the project has been implemented. However, for projects that are not expected to generate savings sufficient to fund the loan's payback, then the loan will not be made until an agency has approximately one-fifth of the total amount of the loan in its existing budget. The Systems Development Fund also can fund hardware acquisitions. Tennessee's IT department purchases hardware and then leases it to state agencies. The sale of bonds is an alternative source of funding for hardware purchases when the Systems Development Fund does not provide sufficient funding. Interest accrues on loans for hardware acquisitions to offset the cost of acquiring such hardware.

Agencies must provide a Cost-Benefit Analysis in order to receive funding. The Cost-Benefit Analysis has five components: (1) a financial summary with project cost summaries, the year of payback, and all funding sources (2) an initial cost assessment, estimating project costs during the planning, construction and implementation phases and the confidence level, percentage-wise, of the accuracy and the completeness of cost estimates (3) an operational cost assessment, including project costs after the project's implementation phase (4) a risk assessment that considers such factors as the impact on the agency's main business objectives and goals, the project team and project manager's experience, user support, the existence of a clear business plan, and the system's complexity and then classifies those risks as "high" or "normal," and (5) a benefit assessment, including such factors as enhanced service benefits, enhanced financial benefits, increased agency revenue, decreased costs, increased state revenue, cost redirection, and cost avoidance.[15]

---

[12] State of Tennessee, Information Systems Planning Process, <http://www.state.tn.us/finance/oir/prd/ispprocess.pdf>.

[13] State of Tennesee, Cost Benefit Analysis Methodolgy, revised February 2002, <http://www.state.tn.us/finance/oir/prd/cbaguide.pdf>.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

Tennessee's funding system has encouraged agencies to create a strong business case for new system projects and ensures that they will result in savings. The state's quality assurance division monitors funded projects to make sure they stay on track. Examples of projects funded through the Systems Development Fund are a project that monitors compliance to professional licensing requirements and a consolidated tax collection system.

Attachment 2

Florida – MyFloridaCounty.com

Launched in February 2002, MyFloridaCounty.com is an integrated local electronic government website.
Unveiled during ITFlorida's Annual Tech Days @ the Capitol in February 2002, MyFloridaCounty.com's first service enables citizens and businesses to order copies of Official Records, including civil judgments, marriage certificates, and property records from Clerks of the Court throughout Florida via a consolidated website. In addition to electronic government services, MyFloridaCounty.com provides links to state and local government homepages and other resources.[16]

The portal is produced by the Florida Local Government Internet Consortium[17], which includes the Florida Clerks of Court and Florida Tax Collectors, in partnership with the Florida Association of Court Clerks Services Group and the E-Government firm, NIC.[18]

Subscription Service

This model used by MyFlorida.com is a subscription service. A subscription offers citizens and businesses unlimited access to MyFloridaCounty.com services. Subscribers enjoy discounted service fees compared to the same service offered to non-subscribers. In addition, the convenience fee for Official Records is $2.00 per document. Subscribers log into the services using passwords. A subscription offers logins for up to 5 "users." The annual subscription fee is $120. You may request logins for additional users for $10 per user per year. The account will be billed for the total of all transactions made by its users during the month. You may choose to pay by check or auto-account withdrawal. You may add and delete users at any time from your account. You may also change user passwords at any time. Online financial and management reports enable you to easily reconcile your accounts.[19]

---

[16] See News Release, "Florida Local Governments Launch the Nation's First Integrated eCommerce Website at www.MyFloridaCounty.com," <http://www.myfloridacounty.com/news/mfc_launch.shtml>.

[17] For more detailed information on the Florida Local Government Consortium, see: <http://www.itflorida.com/resources/gov_local.aspIbid>.

[18] NIC delivers Web-enabled government solutions. Through partnerships at all levels of government, NIC manages transactions for over 1,000 state & local agencies that serve more than 49 million people in the United States. Recent news releases and other information are on NIC's website at: <www.nicusa.com>.

[19] See News Release, "MyFloridaCounty.com Offers Discounted Fees and monthly Billing for Subscription Customers," < http://www.myfloridacounty.com/news/subscriptions.shtml>.

(F) Report regarding Web-based Systems

As noted in subsection (B), the Task Force will make recommendations regarding how world wide web-based systems may be used to provide access to public information systems until all the survey data has been collected and analyzed.

(G) Report regarding Homeland Security Needs

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems
Homeland Security Information Technology Status Report

Presented for approval by the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality

October 2, 2003

Mississippi's state agencies have worked together to create partnerships and strengthen ties with municipal and county governments in many areas related to "Homeland Security."

One area of particular concern is information technology and information systems. These systems, if properly organized and connected, would offer direct data transfer between state and local agencies. At times, data transfer is site specific; an example would be during an actual or threatened terrorist/Weapons of Mass Destruction incident. Other examples are "day to day" operations related to Homeland Security, conducted between state and municipal or county governments.

In each case, a multi-tasked system, with a centralized hub would need to be set in place, that allows:

- User-friendly access;
- Protection from outside sources, including cyber terrorism, "hacking" and electrical impulse;
- Transfer of digital and data information; ie., photographs and data;
- Password protection;
- An alert system for all participants; and
- Redundant safeguards and back up capability.

Some obvious needs at all levels of government include computer upgrades, network system hardware and software, cable and data transfer lines, database collection, and training for participant Agencies.

A recent initiative by the Department of Homeland Security to address some of the issues discussed above is the Disaster Management Interoperability Services (DMIS). DMIS provides the means to bridge the gap across the digital divide that sometimes prevents emergency management information systems from interoperating with one another. At full maturity, DMIS will enable responders, government offices, and authorized non-government organizations to share emergency management

information seamlessly. Defense Reform Initiative Directive 25 mandates establishment of a program to (1) "coordinate and integrate DoD's capabilities to support local, state, and federal consequence management response to weapons of mass destruction (WMD) events;" and (2) "enhance local, state and other federal agency access to military capabilities and expertise." It is DMIS' objective to provide that needed coordination by enabling digital interoperability among the nation's response community. Since the intent is to leverage existing databases and applications extensively, an overarching enterprise architecture that takes a distributed approach to both applications and data is needed. DMIS will be designed to provide an interoperable suite of tools that organizations can use to obtain needed capability, information, and seamless connectivity to other stakeholders in the incident response community. DMIS should provide a robust set of opportunities to plug and play interoperable tools at all levels in a dynamic incident environment, and enable re-shaping of functionalities as requirements evolve. Design decisions will be driven by stakeholder requirements. Other key principles of the approach to developing DMI-Services include: (1) open, distributed object approach; (2) design to change; (3) methodology intensive; (4) leverage existing capabilities vice reinvent; and (5) minimal intrusiveness in local incident management systems. DMIS provides a suite of functionality that falls into three major categories:

• Tactical Information Exchange – Situational awareness services, incident reporting information, secondary responder requirements, and other services that enable an organization or a Collaborative Operations Group (COG) to share information about a specific incident with other organizations.

• Expert Reference – Convenient access to information repositories. These are "library-like" services that provide DMIS operators a means to find information that is stored in multiple government and non-government databases.

• Disaster Management Tools – These services consist of a consequence management digital tool kit that will contain a set of tools that COGs can use as best fits their particular organization. The objective is to include access to both government and commercial tools.

DMIS is available to all local and state governmental agencies. Mississippi Emergency Management Agency (MEMA) has obtained a user license and plans to work with selected counties to evaluate the system. A web site, www.cmi-services.org/services.asp, is available to obtain additional information concerning this system.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In carrying out its directive, the Task Force focused on the five areas incorporated in its Vision Statement: (1) Communication Access; (2) Collaboration/Coordination; (3) Standardization; (4) Fiscal Responsibility; and (5) Governance.

Communication Access

The most compelling statistic reported to the Task Force is that there are currently 684 data circuits being used to support the county locations of state agencies such as the Department of Human Services, the Department of Health, the Tax Commission, the Department of Transportation, and the Mississippi Employment Security Commission. This number does not even include the data circuits supporting law enforcement. The Task Force encourages consolidation of network infrastructures and use of single-point access to the State's shared network infrastructure. Enterprise connectivity would ultimately reduce costs and enhance the quality of service delivery.

Collaboration/Coordination

The Task Force determined that a broader, more focused coordination was needed to ensure that the multiple independent initiatives currently underway across the state were implemented more efficiently and cost effectively. As state and local governments seek to transmit more data electronically and the public seeks more ready access to public documents via world wide web-based systems, the number of information system initiatives will only increase in number. State and local governments seeking to implement new systems would benefit from the sharing of common data, processes, and transactions. The Task Force recommends that the repealer in H.B. 992 be extended to June 30, 2005, that the legislative charge be modified to address the need for this overall coordination, and that the membership of the Task Force be reviewed to ensure appropriate representation of all statewide initiatives underway that include significant information technology components.

Standardization

State and local governments would also benefit from established standards and policies. The development of a statewide technical architecture would help eliminate redundant networks and related platforms and assist in the implementation of information interchange and interoperability standards. Once established, these standards should reduce the time spent on developing new systems and improve the ability to transfer and share data.

Fiscal Responsibility

The independent development of local government information systems without any coordination is costly and inefficient. Government should seize any opportunities to control spending and eliminate unnecessary or duplicative expenditures. The Task Force recommends the deployment of enterprise solutions as a means for reducing acquisition and support expenditures across the enterprise such as utilizing a universal information system that meets the needs of state and local governments. The Task Force could also establish methods to better coordinate and leverage federal funds, to better coordinate and share common infrastructures, to better coordinate county and municipal funds on similar technology needs, and to better coordinate and consolidate multi-agency funding for similar purposes.

Governance

The Task Force recommends the creation of a governance structure comprised of both local and state government representatives. The governing body should, with guidance and recommendations from ITS, develop standards and policies, as well as, assist in the coordination and collaboration among local governments and/or state agencies on common application systems and on procurement of common technologies.

APPENDIX A

MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

2003 Regular Session

To: Appropriations

By: Representative Stevens, Bowles, Clarke, Frierson, Horne

House Bill 992

(As Sent to Governor)

AN ACT TO CREATE A TASK FORCE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS; TO REQUIRE THE DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES TO REVIEW ALL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE AND TO PROPOSE LEGISLATION TO IMPLEMENT THESE RECOMMENDATIONS; TO PROVIDE FOR THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE TASK FORCE AND TO PRESCRIBE ITS DUTIES; TO REQUIRE THAT CERTAIN STATE AGENCIES PROVIDE STAFF SUPPORT TO THE TASK FORCE; AND FOR RELATED PURPOSES.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI:

SECTION 1. (1) There is created a Task Force on Local Government Information Systems, hereinafter referred to as "task force." The task force shall develop a report to the Department of Information Technology Services to be delivered no later than October 1, 2003. This report shall address at a minimum:

(a) A description of the current condition of information technology services available to the public in the offices of the chancery clerks, circuit clerks, tax assessors and tax collectors of the State of Mississippi;

(b) Recommendations on the hardware and software needs to create user-friendly, uniform systems for public access to court records, land records, tax records and all other public documents maintained by chancery clerks, circuit clerks, tax assessors and tax collectors in all counties of the state;

(c) Recommendations or comments regarding system compatibility and economy of those systems being developed under the Secretary of State's authority to develop and implement a statewide voter registration system, as required by Congress in Public Law 107-252;

(d) Recommendations or comments on any initiative to establish and implement a uniform Geographic Information System (GIS) in each county of the state;

(e) Recommendations on methods of funding software, hardware and telecommunications acquisitions necessary for each county to comply with the task force recommendations;

(f) Recommendations for the use of world wide web-based systems for accessing the public

information systems recommended in paragraph (b) of this section; and

(g) Recommendations on the hardware and software needs necessary to comply with homeland security requirements of the federal government relating to state agencies, counties and municipal government.

Upon receiving the report of the task force, the Department of Information Technology Services shall review the report and make recommendations to the Legislature no later than December 15, 2003, regarding legislation that would be necessary to implement the recommendations of the task force.

(2) The membership of the task force includes the following members:

(a) The Executive Director of the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services or his designee;

(b) The Executive Director of the Department of Finance and Administration or his designee;

(c) The Executive Director of the Administrative Office of Courts;

(d) The Executive Director of the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality;

(e) The Secretary of State or his designee;

(f) The Chairman of the State Tax Commission or his designee;

(g) The Executive Director of the Mississippi Automated Resource Information System;

(h) The State Auditor or his designee;

(i) The Commissioner of Public Safety or his designee;

(j) The Executive Director of the Mississippi Emergency Management Agency;

(k) The Executive Director of the Department of Archives and History or his designee;

(l) One (1) member of the Mississippi Chancery Clerks' Association, appointed by the president of that association;

(m) One (1) member of the Mississippi Circuit Clerks' Association, appointed by the president of that association;

(n) One (1) member of the Mississippi Association of Supervisors, appointed by the president of that association;

(o) One (1) member of the Tax Assessors' and Collectors' Association, appointed by the president of that association;

(p) One (1) member of the Mississippi Sheriffs' Association, appointed by the president of that association;

(q) One (1) member of the Mississippi Municipal League, appointed by the president of that association;

(r) Two (2) citizen members, appointed by the Governor;

(s) One (1) member of the Mississippi House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House;

(t) One (1) member of the Mississippi State Senate, appointed by the Lieutenant Governor; and

(u) One (1) member appointed by the Mississippi Association of Planning and Development Districts.

No appointed member of the board shall have a material financial interest in any business that sells, distributes or manufactures computer software, hardware or any telecommunication services.

(3) The Executive Director of the Administrative Office of Courts shall serve as the chairman of the task force. A majority of the members constitutes a quorum. All members must be notified of all meetings, and such notices must be mailed at least five (5) days before the date on which a meeting is to be held.

(4) Any member of the task force who is also a state employee may not receive per diem compensation for attending meetings of the task force, but may be reimbursed in accordance with Section 25-3-41 for mileage and actual expenses incurred in the performance of the duties. Legislative members of the task force will be paid from the contingent expense funds of their respective houses in the same amounts as provided for committee meetings when the Legislature is not in session.

(5) To carry out the responsibilities provided for in this act, the task force may establish a liaison with the advisory committee created to assist the Secretary of State in developing statewide voter registration systems. The task force may establish a liaison with any statewide task force that may be established to devise or recommend standards for the implementation of statewide geographic information systems.

(6) The task force may utilize staff employed by the agencies affected by this act and any other assistance made available to it.

(7) This section shall stand repealed on June 30, 2004.

SECTION 2. This act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Appendix B

Membership of the Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

Members	Designees
David L. Litchliter, Executive Director Dept. of Information Technology Services	
Margaret H. Hill, Director Dept. of Finance and Administration	Cille Litchfield Chief Systems Information Officer
Kevin Lackey, Director Administrative Office of Courts	
Charles H. Chisolm, Executive Director Dept. of Environmental Quality	
Eric Clark Secretary of State	Cliff Davidson Director of Information Technology
Ed Buelow, Jr., Chairman State Tax Commission	Cheryl Crawford Chief Systems Information Officer
Paul Davis, Executive Director Mississippi Automated Resources Information Systems	
Phil Bryant, Executive Officer State Auditor	Bennie Nutt Director of Information Technology
David Huggins, Commissioner Dept. of Public Safety	Will Spann Chief Systems Information Officer
Robert R. Latham, Jr., Executive Director Mississippi Emergency Management Agency	
Elbert R. Hilliard, Executive Director Dept. of Archives and History	Bill Hanna Local Government Records
John McAdams Harrison County Chancery Clerk *Appointed by the President of the Chancery Clerks' Association*	
Terry Watkins Lowndes County Circuit Clerk *Appointed by the President of the Circuit Clerks' Association*	
Joel Yelverton, Assistant Executive Director Mississippi Association of Supervisors *Appointed by the President of the MS Association of Supervisors*	
Joe Young Pike County Tax Assessor *Appointed by the President of the Tax Assessors' and Collectors' Association*	
Sheriff Andrew Thompson Coahoma County Sheriff's Dept. *Appointed by the President of the MS Sheriffs' Association*	
Sam Atkinson, Deputy Director for Special/Technical Projects Mississippi Municipal League *Appointed by the President of the MS Municipal League*	
Mike Horan Attorney *Appointed by the Governor*	
Dr. Diane E. Wall Associate Professor of Political Science Mississippi State University *Appointed by the Governor*	
Representative Cecil Brown *Appointed by the Speaker of the House*	
Senator Tommy Dickerson *Appointed by the Lieutenant Governor*	
F. Clarke Holmes, CEO Central Mississippi Planning and Development District *Appointed by the MS Association of Planning and Development Districts*	

EXHIBIT A

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

FUNCTION	Computerized? Y or N	# Of Computers In Use By Staff	# Of Computers For Use By Public	Records Viewable Through Internet? Y or N	System Hardware (List each system once by the organization where it is housed) i.e.: IBM AS/400, Server Based, etc	Software Name and Vendor	Imaging? Y or N	New System Planned? Year?	Website Address
Tax Assessor/ Collector									
Tax Roll									
Homestead Exemption									
Unpaid Taxes									
Car Tags									
Land Sale									
Other Applications (list below)									
Sheriff									
Dispatch/911									
Arrest Reports									
Offense Reports									
Other Applications (list below)									
Board of Supervisors									
Accounting/Finance									
Board Minutes									
Other Applications (list below)									

EXHIBIT A

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

County of _____ **APPLICATION SURVEY**

FUNCTION	Computerized? Y or N	# Of Computers In Use By Staff	# Of Computers For Use By Public	Records Viewable Through Internet? Y or N	System Hardware (List each system once by the organization where it is housed) i.e.: IBM AS/400, Server Based, etc	Software Name and Vendor	Imaging? Y or N	New System Planned? Year?	Website Address
Chancery Clerk									
Land Records									
Chancery Court									
Office Accounting (including fees)									
Other Applications (list below)									
Circuit Clerk									
Circuit Court									
Marriage Licenses									
Office Accounting (including fees)									
Other Applications (list below)									
Justice Court									
Court Docket									
Other Applications (list below)									

EXHIBIT A

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

FUNCTION	Computerized? Y or N	# Of Computers In Use By Staff	# Of Computers For Use By Public	Records Viewable Through Internet? Y or N	System Hardware (List each system once by the organization where it is housed) i.e.: IBM AS/400, Server Based, etc	Software Name and Vendor	Imaging? Y or N	New System Planned? Year?	Website Address
Geographic Information System									
GIS									
OTHER COUNTY APPLICATIONS									

EXPLANATION OF THE COLUMNS ON THE APPLICATION SURVEY

Computerized Y OR N

Put Y in the column next to the function if that function is automated on a computer. Put N in the column if it is not automated. For example, if the "Land Records" at the Chancery Clerk's office are handled on a computer, put Y next to "Land Records".

EXHIBIT A

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

# of Computers for Use By Staff

List the number of PC's or terminals available to the staff for use.

# of Computers for Use By the Public

If a computer is available to the public to look up information, put the number of such computers next to the function. For instance, if a publicly accessible computer is available to look up "Land Records" at the Chancery Clerk's office, put a 1 next to "Land Records." If no publicly accessible computers are available to look up "Office Accounting", put a 0 next to "Office Accounting".

Records Viewable through Internet Y or N

If the data in the application is viewable via the Internet, put Y in the column. If not, put N.

System Hardware

We are trying to determine how many computers are supporting county government. So, if the Chancery Clerk and the Circuit Clerk are both using the same AS400 system but the system is located at the Circuit Clerk's Office, put AS400(S) next to the Chancery Clerk's Office, but put AS400(L) next to the Circuit Clerk's Office. S stands for shared, and L stands for located. If it is necessary to write an explanation to make this more clear, feel free to.

Software Name or Vendor

Provide the name of the product being used for automation of each function, or the vendor's name, e.g. Delta, Data Systems, etc.

Imaging (Y or N)

If the function is supported by imaging put a Y. If not put an N. For example, if "Land Records" are viewed as images in the computer, or entered as images with a scanner, put Y next to "Land Records" in this column. If not, put N in the column by "Land Records".

New System Planned?

Enter Y or N response. If the answer is Y, please ask what year the system is planned for.

Website Address

Exhibit B

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

HARDWARE ASSESSMENT

County/City_____

Information Systems Manager_____

Define data processing programs: (ex. Car tag system, land records, etc)_____

Systems Vendor Name, Address and Phone Number_____

Computer System Type(s) _____ Model_____ OS Release_____

Computer System Type(s) _____ Model_____ OS Release_____

Is current system IP ready _____

Ethernet Y/N_____ Token Ring Y/N_____ Operating System_____

With whom do you communicate? (ex. state offices, other county offices, etc.)_____

Communications Type: _____Modem* _____Wide Area Network** (FR, point to point, etc.)

*Modem Brand_____ Model_____ Speed_____

**Router Type (if applicable)_____Model_____

Circuit Provider_____

Type of Circuit_____Speed_____

Do you have a firewall? _____Brand_____

Do you have a Local Area Network? Please list type of switches and/or hubs:

Brand_____Model_____Speed_____

Brand_____Model_____Speed_____

Network System: (if applicable) Novell NT UNIX LINUX Other:_____

Do you have Internet connectivity? If so, (1) is it provided through your existing wide area network or modem connection, or (2) do you have a separate connection. _____

Exhibit B

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

Can your entire network access the Internet? Can someone from the outside of your network access information on your main server through the Internet? _____

Do you have email? ____ If so, do you manage the system or is it outsourced? _____

If it is outsourced, who is the provider? _____

Do you have a web site? ___ If so, do you manage the page site or is it outsourced? _____

Do you run DNS locally? _____

What security systems/measures have you implemented? _____

Please indicate the number of users on the existing systems_____

Exhibit C

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

October 1, 2003

Xxxxx
Xxxxx
Xxxxx
Xxxxx

Dear <executive director>:

The Task Force Subcommittee for Surveys is responsible for data collection. One of the areas of focus identified by the Task Force and referred to this Subcommittee is the need to collect information regarding various reports that local governing authorities (locals) are required to submit to one or more State Agencies. In some cases, the locals are required to send some of the same information in varying formats to multiple State Agencies. In others, information is being reported in mistake-prone, thus costly fashion. In still others, there is no way or no need to audit the current processes to ensure full compliance, and in some cases, the data is still being required even though the reasons for doing so are now meaningless due to other changes. The attached survey attempts to address what is being required in an effort to analyze those requirements and make appropriate recommendations regarding them.

This survey is applicable only to reports "in bound" to the various offices, bureaus, or divisions of your Agency. Please note that this survey should be completed for **each "in bound" report** by the contact person in the business unit responsible for processing the report once received.

An electronic version of the survey (Excel spreadsheet) can be downloaded from www.mssc.state.ms.us/AOC/Survey03.zip.

Please distribute this survey to all business units within your agency. The survey forms are due not later than close of business, **October 31, 2003**. Survey results will be posted at www.mssc.state.ms.us/AOC/SurveyResults.html not later than **November 30, 2003**. Survey forms should be submitted to Cille Litchfield, Chief Systems Information Officer, Department of Finance and Administration. They may be faxed to her attention at (601) 359-6551 or emailed to her at litchc@dfa.state.ms.us.

If your agency does not require submission of reports/forms from any local governing authorities, please sign the attached form and return it as noted on the form.

The Task Force appreciates your cooperation in this important matter.

Sincerely,

Kevin Lackey
Director

Enclosures (3 The Task Force Subcommittee for Surveys is responsible for data collection. One of the areas of focus identified by the Task Force and referred to this Subcommittee is the need to collect information regarding various reports that local governing authorities (locals) are required to submit to one or more State Agencies. In some cases, the locals are required to send some of the same information in varying formats to multiple State Agencies. In others, information is being reported in mistake-prone, thus costly fashion. In still others, there is no way or no need to audit the current processes to ensure full compliance, and in some cases, the data is still being required even though the reasons for doing so are now meaningless due to other changes. The attached survey attempts to address what is being required in an effort to analyze those requirements and make appropriate recommendations regarding them.

Exhibit C

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

This survey is applicable only to reports "in bound" to the various offices, bureaus, or divisions of your Agency. Please note that this survey should be completed for **each "in bound" report** by the contact person in the business unit responsible for processing the report once received.

An electronic version of the survey (Excel spreadsheet) can be downloaded from www.mssc.state.ms.us/AOC/Survey03.zip.

Please distribute this survey to all business units within your agency. The survey forms are due not later than close of business, **October 31, 2003**. Survey results will be posted at www.mssc.state.ms.us/AOC/SurveyResults.html not later than **November 30, 2003**. Survey forms should be submitted to Cille Litchfield, Chief Systems Information Officer, Department of Finance and Administration. They may be faxed to her attention at (601) 359-6551 or emailed to her at litchc@dfa.state.ms.us.

If your agency does not require submission of reports/forms from any local governing authorities, please sign the attached form and return it as noted on the form.

The Task Force appreciates your cooperation in this important matter.)

Exhibit C Task Force on Local Government Information Systems
State of Mississippi
State Agency Survey

Please attach completed copies of all forms/reports as a sample for review, as well as copies of instructions provided to the reporting entities on filing the reports/forms.

Report Title:

Report Form #:

Report Contact Information:

Agency:

Office/Bureau/Division:

Name:

Phone:

Email:

Reporting Requirements (list all that apply and attach copies where possible):

Federal Statute:

State Statute:

Agency Rule:

Reporting Entities:

Number of entities filing: ☐

List of specific entities filing:

Frequency of filing: ☐ Monthly ☐ Quarterly ☐ Annual
☐ Other (describe)

Is money transferred as part of the report filing? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how are funds transferred? ☐ Check ☐ EFT ☐ Draft
☐ Other (describe)

How is the report submitted? ☐ Fax ☐ Web ☐ Email
☐ Paper ☐ Diskette ☐ CD
☐ Other (describe)

Is an original signature required on the report submission? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If the report is submitted on the web, list URL:

If the results are posted on the web, list URL:

Agency Processing:		
	Who audits this report and on what frequency?	
	What agency processes does this report support/interface with? Explain in detail.	
	What agency information systems interface with/are impacted by the data collected?	
	Estimated total agency hours required annually to prepare/process these reports (including corrections).	
	Percent of total agency hours required to process corrections to report data.	
	Is this information collected by other agencies?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Do not know If yes, list agencies.
	Is any information on this report confidential?	☐ Yes ☐ No

Recommendations:	
Can this report/form be eliminated? Why or why not?	
What changes to the process would benefit the agency?	
What changes to the process would benefit the submitting entities?	
Are you aware of other possible reporting requirements that will be issued to the local governing authorities? Explain in detail.	

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems State of Mississippi State Agency Survey - Instructions	
Report Title:	Title of form or report filed. Example: COURT ASSESSMENT/FINE SETTLEMENT FORM
Report Form #:	If numbered, provide the form/report number.
Report Contact Information:	
Agency:	Agency name. Example: Department of Finance and Administration.
Office/Bureau/Division:	Agency subdivision responsible for processing the report/form. Example: Office of Budget and Accounting.
Name:	Individual responsible for processing the report/form data. Example: Susie Smith.
Phone:	Agency contact phone number, including area code. Example: (999)-999-9999.
Email:	Agency contact email address. Example: susie.smith@xxx.state.ms.us
Reporting Requirements (list all that apply and attach copies where possible):	
Federal Statute:	If this reporting is required by federal statute(s), list the statute(s) and provide a copy or a link to the citation(s) on the web.
State Statute:	If this reporting is required by state statute(s), list the statute(s) and provide a copy or a link to the citation(s) on the web.
Agency Rule:	If this reporting is required or explained/expanded by agency rule(s), list the rule(s) and provide a copy or a link to the rule(s) on the web.

Reporting Entities:	
Number of entities filing:	Tell us how many inidividual (unique) entities file this report/form.
List of specific entities filing:	List all the entities required to file (may want to attach a separate sheet with this. These could include, but are not limited to, the following: City Court, County Court, Circuit Court, Justice Court, Chancery Court, Chancery Clerk, Municipal Court, Police Department, Sheriff Department, District Attorney, County Tax Assessor/Collector, City Tax Assessor/Collector, City Clerk, County Board of Supervisors, City School Boards, County School Boards. There may be others. If so, list them.
Frequency of filing:	Check all that apply. Most report/form filings are probably on a standard basis. Be sure to describe any exceptions.
Is money transferred as part of the report filing?	Yes or No
If yes, tell us how:	If money is a part of the reporting process, does the agency receive this by check (warrant), drafting the entity's account, and electronic funds transfer (EFT) or some other means.
How is the report submitted?	Is the report/form faxed to the agency, snet via e-mail, posted via a web based application, sent in regular U.S. Mail via paper, put on a diskette and mailed, put on a CD and mailed, or done some other way, Be specific.
Is an original signature required on the report submission?	If an original signature is required, say so. If an electronic facsimile or digital signature is allowed, state that. We also need to know if there are no signature requirements.
If the report is submitted on the web, list URL:	If the report/form is filed via a web application, please give us the URL for the application.
If the results are posted on the web, list URL:	If you (the agency) posts the results on these reports on the web, please give us the URL for the posting.

Agency Processing:	
Who audits this report and on what frequency?	If you (the agency) posts the results on these reports on the web, please give us the URL for the posting.
What agency processes does this report support/interface with? Explain in detail.	Is the data input into an information system or combined with other data sources for a report? Is the data used to transfer money/data to other sources? Please be specific.
What agency information systems interface with/are impacted by the data collected?	If the data is directly input to a system or is interfaced to a system, please identify the system. For example, at the Department of Finance and Administration, the Court Assessment and Fines data is input into a FoxPro application AND is input into the Statewide Automated Accounting System (SAAS) in two different forms because no interface between the two systems presently exists.
Estimated total agency hours required annually to prepare/process these reports (including corrections).	How much time annually does your agency staff spend processing the reports and data including the time required to process any corrections?
Percent of total agency hours required to process corrections to report data.	What percentage of the total processing time is spent processing corrections?
Is this information collected by other agencies?	Do you know whether the information collected by your agency is also collected by another state agency(s)? If so, who collects it and for what purposes?
Is any information on this report confidential?	Do you know whether the information collected by your agency is also collected by another state agency(s)? If so, who collects it and for what purposes?

Recommendations:	
Can this report/form be eliminated? Why or why not?	Is what is being collected of real value to your agency or are you still doing this because you always have and there is no real value provided by the process?
What changes to the process would benefit the agency?	How would you like to see the process changed to bring the most benefit to your agency?
What changes to the process would benefit the submitting entities?	Are there changes that could be made that would benefit the submitting entities? What are they?
Are you aware of other possible reporting requirements that will be issued to the local governing authorities? Explain in detail.	Are you aware of future reporting needs that are going to be mandated by your agency from any of the various local governing bodies? Please be as specific as possible. An examply might be standard enrollment/disenrollment of teachers in the local school districts in the State and Scholl Employees Life and Health Plan.

Exhibit D

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

MS Municipal League Survey

1. How many computers does your municipality own?
❑0 ❑1-2 ❑ 3-5 ❑ 6-10 ❑ 11-20 ❑21-50 ❑50-100 ❑100 +

2. Primarily what type of computers (operating system) are they?
❑Windows based PC
❑Non-Windows based PC
❑AS400 type

2. If you have a Windows based PC, what operating system is it
❑Win95 ❑Win98 ❑Win2000/NT ❑XP Professional ❑ XP Home
❑We don't have Windows computers

3. Do your computers primarily have internet connections (e-mail, World Wide Web, AOL, etc.)?
❑Yes ❑No

4. If yes, how do you get to the internet?
❑I dial-up through a modem/phone line
❑I am always "on" the internet because I have high-speed access (cable modem, DSL, ISDN, etc.)
❑I do not have internet access

5. Are your computers attached/"networked" to a server?
❑Yes ❑No

6. Does your city own one or more paper scanners?
❑0 ❑1 ❑2+

7. How many fax machines does your municipality own?
❑0 ❑1 ❑2+

8. When was your most recent computer purchased?
❑2003 ❑2002 ❑2001 ❑2000 ❑1999 ❑Before 1999

9. Do you have a person or department that takes care of your computers?
❑Person ❑Department ❑ More than one dept./person ❑We have a company take care of our computers

10. Who is the person or company referred to in number 9?

11. Who is your internet service provider?
❑Bellsouth ❑Cable One ❑LIST OTHER CHOICES ❑We don't have internet access

12. How often do you purchase new computers?
❑Every year ❑Every other year ❑ Less than every two years ❑Only when we have to

13. Do you send or receive any information to or from counties or state agencies electronically (reports, applications, requests, etc.)?

❑ By the internet ❑We mail disks or cds ❑ List any other ways:
❑We do not ever provide electronic information, we only fax and mail paper copies

14. What type of "electronic" do you send or receive from state agencies/counties/other government?
❑List governmental unit or agency and the types of information that you send:
❑We don't send/receive electronic data/information

15. What type of "paper data" do you send or receive from state agencies/counties/other government?
❑List governmental unit or agency and the types of information that you send:
❑We don't send/receive electronic data/information

16. Does your city use any sort of geographical information system (electronic mapping, digital mapping, any maps on computers)
❑Yes, we do the mapping in one or more departments in our municipality.
❑Yes, but we contract with a ❑firm ❑company ❑planning and development district to do our maps
❑No, we only have paper maps.

17. Who is in charge of your GIS? (please provide a name or indicate an outside company)

18. What department is in charge of GIS?
❑ Name of Department/contact/contact info
❑ We contract our GIS work to an outside source
❑ We don't have digital mapping capabilities yet

19. What mapping software do you use?
❑ESRI Product (ArcView, ArcInfo, etc.)
❑ERDAS Product
❑Autocad
❑Microsoft mapping product
❑Other—please list:
❑We don't have digital mapping yet

20. Do you (or the company you contract with) use ❑aerial photography ❑lidar ❑other?
❑Yes ❑No

21. Please list as many things as you can that you use GIS and remote sensing products for in your municipality (water lines, roads, fire, police, zoning, planning, etc.):

22. How much does your municipality spend each year on software, hardware, and data (not personnel costs) related to GIS and remote sensing?

23. How much total (in all departments) is budgeted for all GIS/remote sensing (including personnel costs):

24. What resolution is the data that you use most?
❑ 3 inch ❑6 inch ❑1 foot ❑2 foot ❑1 meter ❑more than 1 meter

25. What other resolutions do you use?
❑ 3 inch ❑6 inch ❑1 foot ❑2 foot ❑1 meter ❑more than 1 meter

EXHIBIT E
TASK FORCE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS
REPORT OF STATE GOVERNMENT DATA CIRCUITS TERMINATING IN COUNTY LOCATIONS

COUNTY	DHS	DOH	TAX	DOT	MESC	Co. Totals
Adams	2	3	1	1	1	8
Alcorn	1	2	1	2	2	8
Amite	2	2	1	2	0	7
Attala	1	2	1	2	2	8
Benton	2	2	1	1	0	6
Bolivar	7	4	1	1	1	14
Calhoun	1	2	1	1	0	5
Carroll	3	2	1	1	0	7
Chickasaw	3	5	1	1	1	11
Choctaw	1	2	1	1	1	6
Claiborne	2	2	1	1	1	7
Clarke	2	2	1	1	1	7
Clay	1	2	1	1	1	6
Coahoma	5	2	1	1	2	11
Copiah	2	2	1	1	1	7
Covington	3	2	1	1	1	8
DeSoto	1	4	1	3	1	10
Forrest	3	4	1	1	1	10
Franklin	1	2	1	1	0	5
George	2	2	1	2	0	7
Greene	3	3	1	1	0	8
Grenada	1	2	1	2	1	7
Hancock	2	3	1	1	1	8
Harrison	9	6	2	1	4	22
Hinds	9	11	2	3	4	29
Holmes	3	2	1	2	1	9
Humphreys	3	2	1	1	1	8
Issaquena	1	0	1	0	0	2
Itawamba	1	2	1	2	0	6
Jackson	1	3	1	2	1	8
Jasper	1	3	1	1	1	7
Jefferson	2	2	1	0	0	5
Jefferson Davis	1	2	1	1	0	5
Jones	2	2	1	1	2	8
Kemper	2	2	1	1	0	6
Lafayette	2	2	1	1	1	7
Lamar	2	2	1	1	0	6
Lauderdale	4	4	1	1	1	11
Lawrence	2	2	1	1	0	6
Leake	2	2	1	1	1	7
Lee	1	3	1	1	1	7

Leflore	2	4	1	1	1	9
Lincoln	1	2	1	1	1	6
Lowndes	2	3	1	1	1	8
Madison	4	2	1	1	1	9
Marion	3	2	1	2	0	8
Marshall	3	3	1	1	0	8
Monroe	3	4	1	1	1	10
Montgomery	2	2	1	1	0	6
Neshoba	2	2	1	1	1	7
Newton	1	3	1	1	1	7
Noxubee	2	2	1	0	0	5
Oktibbeha	1	3	1	1	1	7
Panola	3	4	1	1	1	10
Pearl River	2	3	1	2	1	9
Perry	1	2	1	1	0	5
Pike	2	5	1	1	1	10
Pontotoc	2	2	1	1	0	6
Prentiss	2	3	1	1	0	7
Quitman	1	2	1	1	1	6
Rankin	2	4	1	1	1	9
Scott	3	4	1	1	2	11
Sharkey	2	2	1	1	0	6
Simpson	2	2	1	1	1	7
Smith	1	3	1	1	1	7
Stone	1	1	1	1	0	4
Sunflower	5	4	1	2	1	13
Tallahatchie	3	4	1	1	0	9
Tate	2	3	1	2	2	10
Tippah	1	2	1	1	1	6
Tishomingo	3	2	1	2	1	9
Tunica	4	2	1	1	1	9
Union	2	3	1	1	0	7
Walthall	2	2	1	1	0	6
Warren	3	2	1	3	1	10
Washington	3	5	1	1	1	11
Wayne	1	2	1	1	0	5
Webster	1	1	1	1	0	4
Wilkinson	1	2	1	1	0	5
Winston	2	3	1	0	1	7
Yalobusha	2	2	1	2	0	7
Yazoo	3	2	1	2	1	9
Totals	187	220	84	99	64	
Grand Total	654					

EXHIBIT F

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

APPLICATION	YES Automated	NO Not Automated	NO RESPONSE
CHANCERY CLERK			
Land Records	50	32	0
Land Records Imaging	29	52	1
Chancery Court	33	48	1
Chancery Court Imaging	9	62	11
Chancery Clerk Accounting	54	27	1
CIRCUIT CLERK			
Circuit Court	44	33	5
Circuit Court Imaging	7	68	7
Marriages	49	29	4
Circuit Clerk Accounting	38	40	4
Justice Court	62	11	9
TAX ASSESSOR/COLLECTOR			
Tax Roll	77	2	5
Homestead Exemption	70	6	6
Unpaid Taxes	74	2	6
Car Tags	73	3	6
Land Sale	77	2	3
LAW ENFORCMENT			
Dispatch	43	27	12
Arrest Records	36	33	13
Offense Reports	30	37	15
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS			
Accounting	71	5	6
GIS	16	46	20

EXHIBIT F

APPLICATION SURVEY
Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

county	land	landimaging	chancerycourt	chcourtimaging	chanceryaccounting	circuitcourt	circuitcourtimaging	marriage	circuitaccounting	justicedocket	taxroll	homesteadd	unpaidtaxes	cartags	landsale	dispatch911	arrest	offense	bosaccounting	minutes	gis
Adams	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y		y	y	y	y	y
Alcorn	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y		n
Amite	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	y	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	n
Attala	y	n	n	n	y	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	n	n
Benton	y	n	n	n	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Bolivar	y	n	n	n	y	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
Calhoun	y	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	y	n	n
Carroll	y	y	n	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	n
Chickasaw	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	n	n	n
Choctaw	y	n	y	n	y	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	n
Claiborne	n	n	n	n	n	y	n	y	y		y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Clarke	n	n	y	n	y	n	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	y		n
Clay	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	n	y	n	n
Coahoma	y	y	n	n	y	y	n	y	y		y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	n
Copiah	y	n	n	n	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Covington	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n		y	y
Desoto	y	y	y	n	y	y	n	y	y		y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Forrest	y	n	y	n	y	n	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
Franklin	y	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	n	n
George	y	n	n	n	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	n	n
Greene	n	n	y	n	y	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Grenada	y	n	n	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	n	n	n
Hancock	y	n	n	n	n	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	y	y
Harrison	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Hinds	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	
Holmes	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
Humphreys	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Issaquena	y	y	y		y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n
Itawamba	y	n	y	n	y	y	n	n	n		y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Jackson	y	y	y		y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y			y		
Jasper	y	n	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y				y	n	y
Jefferson	n	n	n	n	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	n	y	y	y
Jefferson Dav	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	n	n
Jones	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	
Kemper	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y			y	n	n
Lafayette	y	y	y		y	y		y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y			y	y	n
Lamar	n	n		n	y	n		n	y	y	y			y	y				y		n
Lauderdale	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	p
Lawrence	n	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y
Leake	n	n	y		y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y		y	y	y
Lee	n		y	n	y	n		y	n	y	n	n	n	n	n				y	n	
Leflore	y	y	y		y	y		y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y

county	land	landimaging	chancerycourt	chcourtimaging	chanceryaccounting	circuitcourt	circuitcourtimaging	marriage	circuitaccounting	justicedocket	taxroll	homesteadd	unpaidtaxes	cartags	landsale	dispatch911	arrest	offense	bosaccounting	minutes	gis
Lincoln	y	y	y	y	y	y		y	y		y	y	y	y	y				y	y	
Lowndes	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	n	n
Madison	y	n	n		y	n		n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
Marion	y	y	y		y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Marshall	y	y	y		n	y	y	y	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Monroe	n	n	n		n	n	n	n	n	n					y	n	n	n	y		n
Montgomery	y	y	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	y											
Neshoba	n	n	n	n	y																
Newton	n	n	n	n	y			y		y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	
Noxubee	y	y	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	y	n
Oktibbeha	n		n			n		n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	
Panola	y		n		y	n		n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Pearl River	y	n	n	n	y	n	n	y	n		y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	n	
Perry	n	n	n	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Pike	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
Pontotoc	y	y	n	n	n		n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	n	n
Prentiss	y	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	y	n
Quitman	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y
Rankin	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
Scott	n	n	y	n	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	
Sharkey	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	n
Simpson	y	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	n	
Smith	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	n	y		y		y		y	n	
Stone	y	n	y	n	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	
Sunflower	y	n	y	n	n	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	
Tallahatchie	y	y	y	y	y																
Tate	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	h	n	n
Tippah	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n							n	n	n	y	n	
Tishomingo	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	n	n	n
Tunica	y	y	y	n	y	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	y	n
Union	y	n	y	n	n	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y				y	n	y
Walthall	n	y	y	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n
Warren	n	n	n	n	y	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y				y	n	
Washington	y	n	n	n	y					y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n	y	n	n
Wayne	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	
Webster	y	n	y	n	y	y	n	y	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n
Wilkinson	n	n	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y					n	n
Winston	y	n	y	n	y	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	n
Yalobusha	y	y	n	n	y	y	n	y	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	y	y	n
Yazoo	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	y	n	n	y	n	

EXHIBIT F

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

County Systems

COUNTY	Staff	Public	www	System	Software vendor	upgrade
Adams	38	7	n	AS400	Delta	n
Alcorn	29	3	n	AS400	Delta	2007
Amite	20	2	n	AS400	Delta	n
Attala	18	0	n	AS400	Data Systems	2004
Benton	13	0	y	AS400	Delta	2004
Bolivar	57	2	n	AS400	Delta, Golden Eagle, Heritage	n
Calhoun	22	4	n	AS400	Three Rivers, Delta, Data Systems	n
Carroll	14	1	n	?	GES, Data Systems,	n
Chickasaw	21	8	n	AS400	Delta, Magellan	2004
Choctaw	27	7	n	AS400	Heritage, Data Systems	n
Claiborne	29	1	n	AS400	Delta	n
Clarke	29	0	n	AS400	Data Systems, Delta	n
Clay	10	2	n	AS400	Heritage, Data Systems, PTS	n
Coahoma	42	2	n	AS400	Data Systems	2004
Copiah	32	4	n		Realvision, Delta	n
Covington	29	3	n	AS400	Delta	y
Desoto	14	7	n	AS400	Delta, Heritage, in-house, ESRI	2003
Forrest	8	5	y	AS400	Delta, Unix E-Data, Unisys	n
Franklin	23	5	n	AS400	Delta	n
George	19	2	n	AS400	Delta	n
Greene	11	0	n	AS400	Delta	n
Grenada	47	2	n	AS400	Data Systems, Golden Eagle, Tri-State Mapping	2004
Hancock	86	7	n	AS400	Data Systems, Delta, ArcView	2004
Harrison	200	10	y	AS400 (2),	Delta	n
Hinds	36	21	y			n
Holmes	14	0	n	AS400	Data Systems	y
Humphreys	4	0	n	PC	Townsend	n
Issaquena	7	0	n	AS400	Delta	n
Itawamba	17	2	n	AS400	Three Rivers PDD	n

EXHIBIT F

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

COUNTY	Staff	Public	www	System	Software vendor	upgrade
Jackson	132	25	n	Hewlett Packard	in-house, Delta, Blkwater Systems	n
Jasper	37	2	n	AS400	Delta	y
Jefferson	21	1	n	AS400, Unix,	Delta, Dejavu	n
Jefferson Davis	13	0	n	AS400	Delta	y
Jones	51	4	n	AS400	Delta	n
Kemper	24	0	n	AS400	Delta, Three Rivers PDD	n
Lafayette	30	21	n	AS400	Delta	n
Lamar	32	6	n	AS400	Delta	y
Lauderdale	49	10	n	AS400	Delta, in-house, Gauss Inc, PTS Solutions, THE	n
Lawrence	18	0	n	AS400	Delta	n
Leake	11	1	n	AS400	Delta, Data Systems	n
Lee	86	16	n	AS400	Three Rivers PDD, Gauss, Delta	n
Leflore	44	4	n	AS400, PC	Data Systems, Heritage Solutions,	y-GIS
Lincoln	60	4	y	AS400	Delta	y
Lowndes	100	22	y	AS400, Novell	Delta, PTS Solutions, Heritage Solutions	n
Madison	54	13	y	AS400		n
Marion	28	5	n	AS400	Delta	n
Marshall	29	1	n	AS400	Delta	y
Monroe	42	7	n	AS400	Delta, Three Rivers PDD, DBA Software	n
Montgomery	6	0	n	AS400	Data Systems	n
Neshoba	29	0	n	AS400	Data Systems, Delta	y
Newton	20	4	n	AS400	Delta, Syscon	n
Noxubee	16	0	n	AS400	Delta	n
Oktibbeha	67	12	n	AS400, Server	Heritage, Delta, Crimestar	n
Panola	61	0	n	AS400	Data Systems, Heritage Solutions	n
Pearl River	60	7	y	AS400	Delta, Eagle, ESRI	n
Perry	0	0	n	AS400	Delta, Heritage Solutions, Curtis Anderson	n
Pike	72	6	n	AS400	Delta	n
Pontotoc	35	6	n	AS400	Delta, Magellan, GES	n
Prentiss	18	1	n		Delta	y

EXHIBIT F

Task Force on Local Government Information Systems

COUNTY	Staff	Public	www	System	Software vendor	upgrade
Quitman	21	2	n	AS400,	Southern Computers, Data	n
Rankin	142	16	y	AS400	Delta, Custom	y
Scott	23	2	n	AS400	Syscon, Delta	n
Sharkey	0	0	n	AS400	Delta	n
Simpson	12	3	n	AS400	Delta	y
Smith	2	1	n		Delta	n
Stone	41	1	n	AS400	Delta, other	n
Sunflower	44	3	n	AS400	Data Systems, Heritage Computer, Delta, Motorola, Evercom	n
Tallahatchie	12	0	n	AS400	Data Systems	n
Tate	18	2	n	AS400	Data Systems, Heritage Solutions, 911	y
Tippah	19	1	n	AS400	Delta	n
Tishomingo	35	3	n	AS400	Delta	n
Tunica	20	0	n	AS400	Data Systems,	y
Union	38	3	n	AS400	Gauss, Delta, Apex, Lemes, Three Rivers PDD	y
Walthall	17	0	n	AS400	Delta	n
Warren	25	10	n	AS400	Delta	n
Washington	0	0	n			n
Wayne	25	2	y	AS400	Delta	y
Webster	9	0	n	AS400	Data Systems	n
Wilkinson	14	0	n	AS400, IBM3486	Delta	n
Winston	14	0	n	AS400	Data Systems	y
Yalobusha	20	0	n	AS400	Data Systems	y
Yazoo	26	1	n	AS400	Delta	y