

# Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

## June 2019 Board Meeting June 6, 2019

### Opening

A meeting of the INK Board was called to order at 10:14 a.m. on Thursday, June 6, 2019 at 700 SW Harrison, 2nd Floor Conference Room, Topeka, Kansas by Chair Aaron Kite, representing the Kansas Bar Association, with the following members present:

Mark Burghart, Secretary of Revenue

Lucas Goff, representing the Kansas Association of Counties (Board Secretary) (*departed at 11:50 a.m.*)

Jennifer Cook, representing the Kansas Secretary of State

Gregg Wamsley, representing the Kansas Library Association (Board Treasurer)

Glen Yancey, representing the Executive Branch Chief Information Technology Officer

Joined by phone at 10:55 a.m.

Doug Gaumer, representing the Kansas Bankers Association (Vice Chair)

Arrived at 10:56 a.m.

Deputy Secretary Patty Clark, representing the Secretary of Commerce

### Others Present

John Yeary, INK Board Counsel, Department of Administration; Duncan Friend, Information Network of Kansas; Nolan Jones, Ashley Gordon, James Adams - Kansas Information Consortium, LLC.

## Consent Agenda

The consent agenda for the meeting included the draft May 2019 INK Board minutes: the May 2019 INK Network Manager report; over-the-counter service (KanPay Counter) contracts for Butler County Rural Water District #6 and Gove County Register of Deeds; and contract amendments for Department of Labor and Board of Cosmetology to change to pass fees on to the user.

**Action Taken:** Yancey moved to accept the Consent Agenda as presented. Wamsley seconded. No further discussion. The motion was approved unanimously.

## Action Agenda

### Regular Business

#### 1) Introductions: Newly appointed board members

Kite noted that there would be newly appointed members of the Board in attendance and asked Friend to provide the introductions. Friend began by stating that Secretary of Commerce David Toland had been nominated by the Governor to the Board. However, Deputy Secretary Patty Clark plans to attend as his representative, but had a conflict and let him know she planned to arrive late. He then introduced Secretary of Revenue Mark Burghart and deferred to the other Board members to introduce themselves. Friend closed by noting the officers of the Board and mentioned that, while not in attendance presently, Doug Gaumer representing the Kansas Bankers Association was vice-chair.

**Action Taken:** None.

## 2) INK Executive Director Position

Kite began by stating that a search process and interviews had been conducted earlier this year for a candidate for the Executive Director position. As a result, they have extended the position to Duncan Friend who had been, essentially, serving as acting director. Kite had been directed by the Board in their May meeting to negotiate with Friend to arrive at employment terms. He has completed that, conducting discussions with Friend over several meetings by phone. It was straightforward as there was a budgeted amount for the position, and he has been a long-time employee here. The amount budgeted for Executive Director is the amount they arrived at and based on a review of what was moved in the last meeting, he felt the need to bring that back to the Board for approval. The theory was that he would negotiate it and the Board would approve it. He had a simple one-page letter that he had run by Counsel and by Friend offering him the position at the amount of \$106,430 with standard benefits he'd been receiving up to this point. Recognizing the possibility that there could be additional discussion, or even the possibility a member may want to go into executive session to discuss that, Kite stated that would be up to the Board's discretion at this point. If not, he would move for approval and authorization of the previously approved amount in the budget for executive director compensation. He mentioned that there was one quirk – there would be a cost-of-living-increase going into effect shortly. So, to avoid the COLA and go with the budgeted amount, Friend would just be entered in as a start date right after was applied to everyone. So, it would begin effective June 16<sup>th</sup>.

**Action Taken:** Kite moved that the Board approve the offer of employment to Duncan Friend for the position of INK Executive Director at the salary amount budgeted and authorize Kite to extend an employment letter to him for acceptance with a start date of June 16, 2019. Wamsley seconded. Kite asked if there was further discussion and there was not. Motion approved unanimously.

## 3) Network Manager Report

Jones re-emphasized that one of the technologies they have been exploring is Amazon Alexa, the voice assistant application suite. They released the first one for Board of Nursing – it went well, and they have one some awards and they have been learning a lot from it. Last Friday, they released one for the Kansas Real Estate Commission. It provides general information about the Commission and what they do and also enables license validation and allows Realtors to check status of their education requirements. The latest one they are working on is the Practice Driver Exam for the Department of Revenue. It is designed for the Amazon Echo Show, a device with a screen. There is one more demo planned, then a release of that solution.

He then spoke about the KBI Scrap Metal application project that he believed they would be involved with. He mentioned a meeting with new director of the project at KBI. He will talk more during the grant agenda item on that. They have also been working on planning related to the Kansas Business One-stop. Another near-horizon project is for the Kansas Department of Insurance Office of Securities Commissioner. They need a brand-new website and are talking about fee adjustments that could be used to help fund that, but that will probably be pushed out further in the year (about 8 months). The idea of absorbing the convenience fee is changing, they have been working with some agencies and it is getting down to where almost none of them absorb it anymore. He closed by talking about the work they had done with WebFile the previous year that served 27,000 people. He thanked the state libraries for their involvement as they'd distributed about 400 posters advertising it, along with around 9000 handouts. He closed by talking about the relaunch of the new Kansas.gov website.

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

Friend interjected at the end to remind the Board and tell the new members – since fees had been talked about in Nolan’s presentation and earlier on the Consent Agenda – that any fee increases go through the Board. There shouldn’t be any changes that they don’t know about, or get a chance to pull off the Consent Agenda to learn more about. He also emphasized that the INK Business Plan is really the Board’s way of setting what KIC will do for the year with the resources that the Board is granting them a franchise to.

**Action Taken:** None.

#### 4) Requests for Waiver of INK Subscriber Fee by Government organizations

Kite began by noting that this item is part of a continuing discussion on the issue. Friend provided the background on what it meant to be an INK subscriber (there are about 5,000) and the requests for waivers. He emphasized that they did not have a policy in that area, only a practice that they were going back to understand – also, the Board couldn’t waive fees agencies charge beyond that, it would be up to the agencies. Jones continued, talking about what his research had produced. The INK Board has not approved a waiver of the subscriber fee in at least three years. There are some that have been there 25 years. It took a lot of work to figure out who was there. Overall, there are about 100 government entities that are getting records but for whom the subscriber fee has been waived. Examples include Board of Healing Arts, Goddard Public Schools, it varies. He did contact other NIC states to see what policies were in place (as the Board had requested). There is only a handful that tackled this, everything else was on a case-by-case basis. Idaho is the only place he could find that had a written policy and it only applied to Driver History records – but it waived both the subscriber and driver history fee for government organizations. Alabama and North Carolina have an unwritten policy, but let it be known that they waive the subscriber fee for government.

Yancey asked, if INK followed that practice and assume they looked at current subscribers, what was the impact? He continued, “How many government entities are paying subscriber fees today and what would be the revenue impact of now waiving the fee for them?” Jones responded that the challenge was that this had been around for 20+ years and there was never a field created to indicate an organization was government, so they would need to go through all 5,000 and base it on their name. That’s how they were able to come up with the 100 that were excluded. Yancey asked if they had a sense of the number. He deferred to Gordon. Gordon stated that there are some things she could look at that would provide a ballpark. Jones continued that another issue was the number of accounts for a single agency – for example, Revenue had at least four from different divisions. He then laid out what he saw as the choices: Status Quo; Notify the 100 that starting next year they would have to pay; Try to identify everyone who is paying and let them know the fee can be waived from now on. Anything can be made to work.

Yancey said he hated to dole out benefits solely based on who had the nerve to ask. Jones continued that no one new has been added in several years – at least three years. And, the hundred that are there have probably been there for two decades. Not that this is justification, but from a logistical standpoint, that’s where things are at. Burghart asked if the waivers were granted in perpetuity. Jones responded that, from what he understood, they were just done by the Board previously on a case-by-case basis.

Friend asked if the customer database was free-standing enough to collect that information, or if they had a waiver. Jones responded that they manage that system – it’s not third-party software – so yes. Friend noted that at the end of the meeting they would be talking about strategic planning, so this uncovers a question about customers and the information we collect about that. The current issue has to be resolved, but it might be worth taking a closer look at what information INK is collecting. Yancey agreed, it would be nice to have

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

a better understanding of the customer profile that develops some categories, as that was part of their question – is there an exemption today for Law Enforcement? Jones responded that he thinks they are typically getting the data and it is not through INK. The bulk of these are Revenue, insurance, and school districts. In response to a question from Yancey, Jones indicated that these were all active accounts – at least one record request was processed in the last year. However, there are a ton of inactive accounts out there, thousands, that are still kept as they may become active at some point.

Friend asked Jones to confirm that, for renewal, it was a “no touch” automated process, so that would have to be automated if they were going to be prompted the following year to pay. Jones agreed.

Kite confirmed the role of the subscription and stated that he felt a lot of this comes back to the Board’s philosophy on transparency. There’s a core question – should they be charging for access to documents, and how much? He asked what the documents were that they in large part accessing. Jones indicated driver records, then deferred to Gordon. She responded that in addition to that, subscribers can access titling and registration information, background checks, court record searches – those are the main ones. Kite then confirmed that even though someone is a subscriber, they needed to provide some justification for access to the records. Jones confirmed that, for sure, in the case of driver history records. Friend added that it should be understood that the agency has their own fees, in addition to the subscription charge, for accessing the records. Yancey drew a comparison of the subscriber fee to something like Amazon Prime. Jones responded that they billed monthly and thus it allowed that capability and managed the payment. Yancey said, as opposed to having a credit card per transaction and Jones agreed. Kite asked if Jones had the number of non-governmental subscribers. He indicated that he did not, it was the reverse of the earlier problem about identifying the category of subscribers. They can try to swag a number – his guess is something like 4,000. The vast majority would be private sector.

Kite asked for Jones recommendation as a service provider – was it to continue to do it the way they had been? Jones said that their recommendation is to don’t make a policy and don’t go back to the 100 and make them start paying and don’t exempt out those that are currently paying. They are flexible on this. His experience is that often the organizations want the records free, rather than having a concern about the subscriber fee. Kite said he tended to be like Yancey – he doesn’t like making exceptions on a case-by-case basis. But if Friend is going to be the one administering it, he needs some guidelines. Yancey continued that the other thing here was that there is work involved in administering the subscriptions on the back end. Subscribers get the benefit of somebody else’s work and as a free subscriber, someone else is paying for that work. Gordon added that the subscription fee is for creating the account, changes to the account, billing, maintenance like password reset. Informally, the government tends to have the most users on their account. Friend made a quick calculation that 5,000 x \$125, less some exempt users, means something like \$625,000 in revenue per year. Yancey stated that without going back into previous decisions of the Board, he’s not inclined to make an exception for government. As government they pay fees to lots of organization, including government organizations, where they don’t ask for an opt-out. So, going forward, he doesn’t want to start offering the service free without a compelling reason.

Kite asked Friend for a recommendation. What is INK’s response to an agency that requests a waiver but no longer receives them? Friend noted that as it was originally posed, it was a legal obligation, that is, was there some problem if they were denied and it was granted to somebody else. If there’s not a legal case, he took the position of the Board to be that due to the socialization of the cost, they wouldn’t grant waivers. To be equitable with that, you would go back and approach people who they had been granted to and ask them to pay upon renewal, but that is significant legwork and also could produce problems. He sees the same

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

thing, a lot of waivers going forward. Kite said he feels like the answer is “previously we granted waivers and now we don’t.” Friend said he understood that had been the practice, so he was OK with moving forward implementing that.

[Gaumer joined the meeting by phone]

Friend asked if a motion was needed. He could continue with that practice. Kite noted that Friend didn’t have any authorization to grant a waiver, so if it got that far, he could come back to the Board. For clarification, Gordon asked if they’re prefer the request be passed to Friend. Friend said he felt it was fine so he got a feel for what was happening, then once he understood the practice, he could hand it back off and offer something concrete on how to approach for what to say to people requesting waivers.

**Action Taken:** None.

[Deputy Secretary Clark arrived at the meeting]

Kite stopped briefly and introduced himself, as did the other members and those in attendance, as well as on the phone.

### 5) Grant Submissions

Friend provided a brief recap for the new members and those who had missed the last meeting. The Board had recently approved a revised version of the Board grant policy and procedures. In addition, the finance committee has suggested an amount to be set aside for a grant pool so that they can decided on how to invest the rest. He then explained the grant program generally and the associated deadlines and the evaluation process. It became effective on June 1. Normally, he would come to the Board today to let the members know what he had received in the way of proposals for the spring (May) period, they will convene a grant committee made up of the CITO’s for all three branches (to make sure it fits with the state’s technical direction) and a board member, who will meet, evaluate the proposal(s) and then offer a recommendation back the July meeting. Then, the board can either accept the recommendation or not and makes a decision.

During the May period this year, they did not receive any grant applications, which is a larger issue they can talk about later. However, the morning of the Board meeting (June 6), he was contacted by KBI and they sent a grant request related to a scrap metal application. He has not reviewed it but knows about it general as does Jones and they can both speak to it. So, what the Board has before it is no applications during the grant period and an application received that morning from the KBI related to scrap metal. He is not sure whether they don’t want to entertain it out of hand – he just received it so he did not bring copies.

He felt like previously the real question, referring to a previous meeting that led to the revision of the grant application, was whether organizations were coming to the Board and just asking for funding and not starting with the legislature or trying other places. So, there had been an interest in that, but also an interest that it aligned with the mission and what the Board was trying to accomplish with INK. One of the concerns expressed when Jones and he had discussed it in the last meeting – which was confirmed when they went out to meet with the KBI – is that it is not dedicated to expanding public information. Its primary argument is that there will be better reporting, in aggregate, by the Attorney General each year, given that they will be collecting information in a database. It is exempt from the Kansas Open Records Act. They are asking for around \$60,000. Yancey asked if KBI had requested funding from the Legislature. Friend indicated he wasn’t sure that had been explicitly asked for and deferred to Jones – he had not yet looked at their

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

application. He thought they had said there were two places they could do it. The Legislature, from the fiscal note, looked to have been presented with the fact it cost money, but declined to fund it.

Jones continued that this had really been a joint Attorney General / KBI project, but the operation is currently under the KBI. There is funding for ongoing support and maintenance for it. One of the issues in estimating it is that they are not sure how many scrap yards there are. The core group would be around 75, and they still pay a registration fee that would be available for maintenance and enhancement of the system. Some of the prices for what this might cost were high, so they had scaled it back. Jones indicated that he had been in discussions with them because they needed a much more cost-effective system. They had not been clamoring to do it, it was just trying to figure out a solution at the lowest cost possible. He explained generally how the system would work and the work ahead for KBI in requirements gather and design. They still had work with law enforcement and the scrapyards. Jones stated that one of the things they had been talking with them about was a messaging board for the scrapyards for law enforcement to alert them about scrapyard thefts to be on the lookout, so this would be a form of data sharing, although it is not part of the statutory change.

As context – there has been sort of a rolling revisiting of this as the Board adds new members - Friend resumed discussion of the origin of the recent revisions in the grant procedures. Yancey had brought back a question from the grant committee to the Board that came about as part of an evaluation of an application about what the focus on the Board was. What had been brought to the committee previously was also a meritorious thing to do – to automating filing of complaints to the Human Rights Commission. So, the question was that while it was a good thing to do, is it in INK’s mission and does it support the portal? As a consequence, they added the question about whether the requestor had been to the Legislature for funding. That is one dimension. The other part is, historically, the Board had really not taken the grant money that comes out of INK’s split of the revenue, and used that to pay the Board’s contractor to develop them. In other words, 85% of the money that is coming in is already going to them to do the work that is outlined in the Business Plan. So, instead of providing a grant, there is an option to tell Jones that the Board would like him to take a look at the Business Plan and reprioritize some things so he can do it. It isn’t that the Board wouldn’t pay the extra money, it would just come out of the larger share that KIC is getting. The bigger question is in the business of INK to do. He added one last thing, that INK makes, probably a quarter million dollars on background checks with KBI – he looked to Jones to verify that – and they should also know that having INK do it was mentioned in testimony to the Legislature. So, there is a business relationship and INK also does Amber Alert. The point is that situation includes KBI expectations, that there is an existing revenue-producing relationship, there are the interests of the Legislature in getting this done in a short period – and then the Board’s interest in not doing things that don’t seem to align with its mission.

Kite asked if he feels like the applicants for the grant funds have an understanding of what INK’s statutory purpose is, what the Board can do with that money. Friend responded that he had not been in the earlier meetings, so he hasn’t talked with the head of the KBI. But he did attend a meeting recently with them and his discussion with their project manager involved presenting her with the “matrix” used to evaluate the grants and pointing out the emphasis on public information. In the grant policy and procedures, the Executive Director is positioned as an advocate for the grant requestors, since he doesn’t vote, so advised them to look at any way they possibly can to improve public information. Kite responded that he wanted to acknowledge that the theft of scrap metal is an issue. So, there would seem to be a public information type issue that could potentially be addressed in theory by some funds from the INK Board. He just doesn’t know if they are leading with that. Friend responded that they were trying to lead with that – he briefly to

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

the copy he had of the grant application that has just been submitted, quoting from the question about expanding public information “Increase citizen/business access”:

“The information to be collected through the database is exempt from KORA, however, the Attorney General will be required annually to update the legislature on the process, trends in scrap metal, and give some account to the frequency of scrap metal thefts within Kansas. This database will give the Attorney General the necessary information needed for the report. The alert system will also allow for scrap metal dealers to be privy to scrap metal theft alerts so they can assist local law enforcement in the possible recovery of those items.”

Ultimately, he deferred to Yancey, but the alert system sounded like a listserv, so it wasn't a major data sharing piece – it sounded more like they would set them up an email list where they could broadcast out. So, the two pieces are better reporting for the Legislature, in aggregate. However, much like the Human Rights Commission said, they could present more information about what's going on with Human Rights claims. And, then the idea of communicating about what's going on with scrap metal thefts via a listserv, which is something they could certainly do without a grant, although he is not certain what that would cost.

Yancey asked where they were going to get the money if INK didn't provide it. Friend was uncertain. Yancey continued, asking if it might come from their agency budget. Jones wanted to add, he didn't want to speak for KBI, but he believed they would be more than willing to attend an upcoming Board meeting to answer questions. He also said that during the Legislative session, no plan B was identified for funding that he's aware of if a grant wasn't authorized – but it also wasn't specified that this was the only way they would get funding.

Yancey asked if the Legislature had an expectation that they would apply for an INK grant and that there would be probable funding? Jones responded that he attended all the hearings and the real focus was on what the content of the database would be, the workload on the scrapyards – they really didn't get into the details of the funding mechanism. Friend stated that he felt like there might have been some testimony somewhere. Yancey pointed out that since Nolan was there, so it wasn't just for general interest's sake. So, obviously there was some outreach or notion that maybe they could get INK to pay for it. Jones said that yes, that was definitely discussed and on the record. Friend then brought up that two meetings ago, he had distributed the list of the grants the Board had made to-date, which went from the high-ground of what the Board should do in terms of the statute, to the laundry list of a variety of projects that received grants – each have a different distance from first base in terms of it following that exactly. There are different ways to fund this. They do have a fee that they receive from scrap metal dealers, so that could be used “in arrears” to fund it. The Board could have KIC do it through the Business Plan. Friend did not have a communication with them to say that getting the grant wasn't likely, as he wasn't in a position to speak to say that it wasn't. They do know about the statute and the criteria.

Kite confirmed that Friend had just received the application that morning. Friend said yes, but confirmed that the approach of the board recently had been that grant requests could be received at any time. They are open to coming to meet. Kite noted he assumed that Friend's role was to assist them with the grant. He said that he would do the best he could, but what he's described is where things are. The Board will have this situation where people are going to come to the Board indicating their system will put out some information – the Board of Pharmacy came for a grant, and that was related to opioid addiction, and that's a major public service thing, but that was considered operational. He confirmed that he would put them on the agenda for the next meeting – no motion would be needed.

**Action Taken:** None.

### 6) 1st Quarter 2019 Financial Report

Wamsley and Friend were happy to answer questions. Friend noted that from a financial health standpoint, INK has lost a few applications in the past year, so they are not seeing revenue there. Generally, they have some grants outstanding and he thinks they are performing OK, cash flow is reasonable to better than it has been. Other than there are some threats out there, like Judicial (court records) going away, but he thought the state is pretty straightforward. Addressing those who may not have seen the financials before, he noted that there is some detailed information presented about budget. The model is that all the activity flows through INK, so that activity is reflected on the INK financials. So, the expenses are not just the expenses of the Board itself, like lunch and travel, but include the overall activity of the portal. At Kite's request, he then went through the financial statements briefly at a high-level to explain them. Upon completion, he stated that he felt like he should come back and brief them on the higher-level picture. There were several questions, and Kite asked if perhaps they needed to develop a financial statement that more accurately reflects where the actual organization is, notwithstanding the monthly variation (in Accounts Receivable, for example) – and how easy would that be to do. Friend said it could be done, no doubt, but he would need to drill into it and go back and talk with the accountants. He continued that the way the portal is designed, all of this is “our” money, except that a large piece is collected on behalf of state agencies. Kite compared it to a trust account, it is being held for agencies, it is not really owned by INK – Friend agreed. Secretary Burghardt asked if the amount owed agencies were reflected as a liability on the other side, and Friend confirmed that it was. He then went on to describe the grants that were currently in process and discussed the challenges with the supplemental information regarding the detailed budget and variances, given that the budget was provided by KIC for the services. He had not had the time to address some of this when he was part-time and hoped to reengage it with KIC and the accountants.

Kite asked if the grant money then came from the Kaw Valley and UMB money market accounts. Friend responded that it was really Kaw Valley, in that he understood the Money Market to be just “seed money” for the commercial account. He had not touched it or really dealt with it since the previous Executive Director left.

**Action Taken:** Cook moved to accept the 1<sup>st</sup> Quarter 2019 Financial Report as presented. Seconded by Yancey. Unanimously approved.

### 7) Finance Committee Update

Friend began by noting that the updated listed both him and Wamsley. Friend provided a quick background. There were idle funds in Kaw Valley that were getting less interest than they might in another investment like a CD. So, the Finance Committee convened to come up with an approach to that, and that's all been read into the minutes. Then, when they came to the Board, they asked for an investment policy. So, they went back to develop that. Friend started late on this and didn't get it out until Tuesday of this week. Board Counsel has reviewed it. So, in fairness to the committee, however, they have not had an adequate chance to review it. So, he brought it to the meeting – they could go over it, but it hasn't been reviewed by them. Goff asked the Board to give the committee another month and bring something back at the next meeting.

**Action Taken:** None.



## New Business

### 1) Board member nomination process / Nomination for remaining open position

Friend explained that the Board has nine members by statute, eight of which are currently filled. The remaining open position is reserved for what is considered a “user association” – a user association of statewide character, although it is defined further in statute (Note: KSA 74-9301) and requires an association that would make use of INK, maintains a dues-paying membership, etc. This is in contrast to some of the user association members, like from Libraries, that are specifically named in the statute. Goff would be an example, representing the Kansas Association of Counties, of this type of member.

The process is that the Board forwards three names to the Governor and she picks (or could decline to do so) from those names. Currently, he does not have three names for that. He is happy to take suggestions and help bring that forward. He was not sure what the Board’s experience or preference is here – he has solicited members, the Board has approved, and the chair has forwarded them on by letter. Or, he believes he has seen the Board convene a nominating committee to identify candidates for new members – so he is happy to follow the boards preference. He noted that the Governor’s office did ask about the vacancy when they filled the two positions most recently.

Kite confirmed that Friend did not have a recommendation. Friend indicated that he didn’t – it was more “top heavy” to go through this as a Board...he could have Board members send him recommendations and they could charge the Chair with forwarding the pool to the Governor. Kite asked if a pool of user associations could be identified, that way they would have a list and could pick three with Friend’s advice.

Friend said he will come back and create a list (like Kansas Feed and Grain, and Board of Accountancy). Kite agreed and said the members could take a look at the list and help him make a decision.

**Action Taken:** Kite moved that Friend develop a list of associations for the Board to review and select from at the next meeting. Seconded by Goff.

**Discussion:** Clark said that when she considered the user groups Friend would come back with for recommendations, she felt it might be helpful to look at the various economic drivers in the State of Kansas for at least one of those nominees: The three-legged stool of Agriculture, Aviation, Oil & Gas, now the Technology sector is an economic driver. User groups from those industries might be a good way to augment the expertise around the table. Kite agreed and modified his motion to place an emphasis on those particular areas.

**Action Taken:** Kite confirmed that the motion would be for Friend to develop a pool of user groups that would fall within the criteria that the Board has identified (so that there is a limited number – 10, 15, 20 – whatever it is) and then the Board would consider those names. Then once they’ve narrowed it down to three user associations, Friend could extend the invitation to those associations to submit names for the Board’s consideration. Modified motion seconded by Goff. No further discussion. Approved unanimously. Friend will bring a list to the next meeting.

### 2) Next steps: Future agendas / Orientation and Planning

Friend said that one of the things the Board expressed interest in was strategic planning – the Board is outdated on their strategic plan now. So at one point he wanted to get some input from the Board, or come forward at the next meeting with some suggestions about what that next set of agendas might look like planning-wise. Fairly quickly, in September, they will move into the business planning cycle as the business

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

plan is required by the contract to be submitted by December 1 each year and there are a variety of initiatives ahead of the Board. It was a suggestion that the Board move towards planning pretty soon, even absent one new member, so he wanted to open it up to see if people had ideas about how to approach this. Yancey asked what the question was.

Friend stated the question was – moving into a planning cycle, how does the Board feel about that. Do they want to wait for one new member? The Board had expressed interest previously in strategic planning, but it had been four or five months since the new board had convened – are they ready to move into that. Yancey said he felt no one would be against it and asked what Friend thought the first step would be? Is it to put together an orientation like “This is what INK is, this is its history, so you know where we’ve been, so now what I want you to think about is where do you want it to go based on they have been following.” Friend said, agreed, along with a SWOT type of thing, so some suggestions on how they might engage in that process.

Friend then noted that they were getting ready to start a strategic planning process at Commerce and deferred to Clark. She said one idea she would offer for an orientation, besides what they normally be handed off to a new board member as they were coming on, was to encourage the Board to think about – especially for INK – What are the organization’s guiding principles...that are distilled from statute, distilled from experience? What guides the decision making of this Board? She stated that she thought this should be an integral part of orientation and of a strategic plan. Something that lives from one strategic plan to another. Not to say that things don’t change, but particularly for entities that have statutory responsibilities. Until those statutory responsibilities change, the Board does have some guiding principles. The Board was created for a certain mission and purpose. So, she encourages the Board to think about that as part of the orientation and strategic plan.

Yancey said that, especially as someone who had been awhile, he does think there’s value in understanding the context in which that has been viewed over the years. Because, as they all knew, as technology has changed and evolved so has the understanding of implementation of the core mission. And, that is important to understand, because he might be really focused on the technology aspect of the strategic vision, but they don’t want that to be the only driver of what INK is doing. That might be the vehicle for accomplishing the mission, but it shouldn’t decide what it is. Clark added in that it is not the how, it’s the why. Yancey agreed, but reemphasized that the “why” has evolved since the organization was created. In the beginning, it was “here’s this new thing, the Internet, we should take advantage of” – No one thinks that way anymore. Friend confirmed that this was the sort of discussion he was looking for. Board members have a lot of experience with strategic planning and there’s been sort of a pent-up desire, plus whatever they’ve seen so far direction-wise. He asked if anyone else had input and asked that if they, they should send it to him. He also wanted to note that they’d had the Executive Branch CITO attend a couple meetings ago, and OITS is also going through a strategic planning process right now, so he wanted to make sure – and he had mentioned that about Commerce – that INK is somehow connected, that they aren’t playing in a vacuum. INK can’t be part of everybody’s plan, but the OITS one seems very close to INK, as does Commerce, for the economic drivers point that Clark made.

Jones added that as a partner, they also don’t wait to see what is happening, but through the business plan they are required through the Business Plan to present where they think the trends are going in technology and business. They don’t make the determination, but post-orientation as part of business planning, they would present where they think wise investments would be, where technology is going, and opportunities to capitalize on.

## Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

---

**Action Taken:** None.

### 3) July 2019 meeting date

Friend brought up that the first Thursday of July was a holiday, July 4<sup>th</sup>, and indicated in anticipation of that when he was scheduling the meetings earlier in the year, he had reserved the following Thursday, July 11 for the meeting at the same place and time. However, now that it is here, he wanted to confirm what the Board wanted to do and everyone's availability for that.

**Action Taken:** Yancey made a motion that the next meeting be moved to Thursday, July 11. Seconded by Kite. Approved unanimously. (Goff was no longer in attendance)

### Adjournment

Motion to adjourn at 12:00 p.m. made by Yancey. Seconded by Kite. Approved unanimously.

**Minutes submitted by:** Duncan Friend