

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

April 2022 Regular INK Board Meeting April 7, 2022

Opening

A meeting of the INK Board was called to order via online videoconference in Zoom at 10:01 a.m. by INK Board Chair Tom Sloan with the following members present:

Lori Blake, representing the Kansas Association of School Boards
Mark Burghart, Secretary of Revenue
Kate Butler, representing the Kansas Bar Association
Jennifer Cook, representing the Secretary of State
Jim Haugh, representing the Secretary of Commerce
Kristy Wilson, representing the Kansas Association of Insurance Agents
Glen Yancey, representing the Executive Branch Chief Executive Technology Officer

Others Present

David Harper, Director, Property Valuation Division, Kansas Department of Revenue; Gio Giordano, Saf Rabah, and Christopher King, Tyler Technologies; Molly Saunders, Organizational Performance Practice Leader, Shockey Consulting, LLC; Susan Mauch, INK Board Counsel; Duncan Friend, Information Network of Kansas; Nolan Jones, James Adams, and Ashley Gordon, Kansas Information Consortium, LLC.

Consent Agenda

The Consent Agenda included for the meeting originally included the draft meeting minutes for the regular meetings of the Board on January 6, 2022, February 3, 2022, and March 3, 2022, along with the March 2022 Network Manager report and the following contracts: Yotta Automated Software Solutions, Inc. (YASSI) with the Kansas Department of Revenue and the Information Network of Kansas to enable the purchase of Motor Vehicle Records through INK using fee schedules previously approved by KDOR/INK; KanPay payment processing contracts for the City of Lewis, Greenwood County Noxious Weed, Hodgeman County Health Department, Logan County EMS, Morton County Health Department, Rice County Appraiser, and Riley County RWD #1, along with the Kansas Real Estate Appraisal Board (KREAB) for KanPay payment processing for license renewals, and Osage Public Library Foundation for AppEngine and payment processing.

Friend noted before the Consent Agenda was approved that the February 3, 2022 meeting minutes were not yet complete, and should be removed from the Consent Agenda.

Action Taken: Wilson moved to approve the Consent Agenda, without the February 3, 2022 meeting minutes, seconded by Blake. There was no discussion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Regular Agenda

Regular Business

1) **Presentation: Connected Assessment Data Network for the State of Kansas**

David Harper, Director of the Division of Property at the Kansas Department of Revenue introduced himself and explained that he had come to the meeting to talk about the potential benefits to KDOR of Tyler Technologies software called Assessment Connect. He began by explaining what the Property Valuation

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

Division did, and the computer-assisted mass appraisal (CAMA) system that was used to support property appraisal statewide. The system contains data on about 1.7 million parcels and he summarized the large volume and different types of data involved, including pictures, valuation history and sales data, etc.

The CAMA system has been provided by Tyler since 2003. He briefly explained their relationship to the Data Access and Support Center (DASC) at KU for delivering data and also the shortcomings of the current CAMA system in terms of a statewide view of data and data sharing. He noted that there is a lot of demand for these records by state agencies, like KDOT, Water Resources, Department of Education and it is not easy to obtain. He also discussed demand from the private sector – private appraisers are big users, and there is demand from property owners. And, finally, there is demand from the county appraisers themselves, including for regional data for special use properties. It may be that this solution it can be expanded to work with the Board of Tax Appeals, as well.

Harper then turned over the presentation to Gio Giordano, a representative from Tyler Technologies to discuss the Assessment Connect software and introduce the others on the videocall. Giordano stated that he was the regional sales lead with the Tyler Property and Recording Division. Saf Rabah is the Vice President of Data Solutions, and Christopher King is Director of Sales for their Data Solutions group.

Giordano gave an overview of a proposal – Friend noted the Board had not yet seen it – that he summarized the goal for as increasing the volume and utility of the data that is available to the public, while automating the production and delivery of public-facing data assets”. He discussed some of the things that they hoped to accomplish with the software in terms of that, and stated that the proposal includes all of the managed services related to the “data pipeline” to share and make the data available to all, all of the professional services that would be needed to build all the APIs, and then support over the life of the contract as well. The proposal was a “not-to-exceed” cost of \$2 million. Of that, the subscription fee would be in the range of \$550,000-\$600,000 annually. Once funding was received, they would then work with groups like the county appraisers and DASC to finalize the project details. He concluded his summary and asked if there were questions.

Sloan asked if there were questions for Giordano or Harper. Friend asked Harper to clarify if Orion, the CAMA system, that they were building on top of was a Tyler system. Harper said that it was. Sloan asked Giordano to repeat the cost, and he responded that they would look for a “not to exceed” cost of \$2 million, that included a subscription fee of \$550-600,000 a year. The contract would be for three years and would be renewable. Sloan asked if they would anticipate upgrades that would increase the cost at the end of three years. Giordano stated that he would anticipate other departments having interest and doing some similar programs that are related to their work and so they would leverage the platform to make other programs available to them. There would be increased costs but he wouldn’t expect it to be as large as this. So, the platform would be established and they would just build off that platform for them.

Sloan asked if they could give the Board some idea of what it would cost to add agencies and leverage the platform. He said he was not going to hold them to a specific dollar amount, but he would like the number to be in the ballpark. Giordano referred the question to Rabah and King from the Data Solutions team. Rabah summarized Sloan’s question “What’s an approximate cost when a new agency sees what Department of Revenue is doing and wants to emulate it for its own programs?” Rabah answered that it really depended on the scope of what the agency wanted to do. The costs are driven by the systems from which data is being collected – for example, in KDOR’s case, it was just one system. The estimated range would be something like \$100K at the low end and a few hundred thousand dollars at the high end, assuming that a new agency had 1 or 2 systems that they wanted to add and their reporting needs are very

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

similar to what they would do for KDOR, like packaged dashboards and analytics, and the ability to create dynamic ad hoc reports.

Sloan then asked if it were INK or Department of Revenue that would be paying for this program. The original program. Friend said he thought that was a question for Harper. Harper said that it was one of their goals today was to bring this to the Board and see if it fit in the mission, and, if there was interest, they would look to Friend and the Board on the best way to proceed. Sloan confirmed that was his understanding. Sloan then asked Giordano to confirm his assumption that they would be paying only on a yearly basis as opposed to the \$2 million up front. Harper added that it would be a goal eventually that this was something that might eventually be able to be rolled into their contract with Tyler. Sloan then asked if Harper and Giordano envisioned that this could be a revenue source to help pay for those programs.

Harper thought there was some subscriber potential there - private appraisers are large users. Some counties do have a subscriber service for them to use that data.

Friend said he needed to talk about some of the mechanics and the INK grant process and Tyler's relationship to KIC and how this might be brokered in. Friend told Sloan that he wanted to allow the Board members to continue deliberation first, but he wanted to make sure he had a chance to discuss some of the context here before they decided – whether it be contractual, procurement, or the planning. Sloan asked him to continue.

First, Friend said he'd had a chance to meet with the team as well as with the DASC. It did look like there was increased public information available. They obviously have some more work to do to lock down the scope and they think they know the costs. One question is whether they go through the grant process, which is traditionally what they would do. There is another about ongoing maintenance. Normally the Board wants some kind of a commitment that they won't be on the hook after three years. That number is roughly two thirds of INK's annual income from the partnership each year and would be a big commitment if it were ongoing. Also, normally the grants have been backed up by a contract, which should be able to be executed fairly quickly with the attorney. And, finally, there is the issue of Tyler – there are alternative ways to deliver this, he has talked with Jones and that includes through KIC. So, there is a question as to whether that is a service that INK pays KIC for, and then that's how it ends up being deployed to multiple agencies. The question is – it's not really for Tyler to know and maybe not for Department of Revenue to have a strong opinion on as long as it serves their needs. If they did get other agencies involved, Tyler may understand that from their point of view, but how would INK want to avail themselves of this if KDOR is OK with it. The steps would be to go off and negotiate it. They said \$2 million – if they just want to go with what they presented as the cost.

Sloan asked if Yancey had any comments and he said no. Sloan said Friend had anticipated one of his comments and that was how KIC fit in this. This was back to his question about adding additional agencies. Can that be done more cost-effectively through KIC than through Tyler or whatever?

Jones said he thought there was a variety of approaches that could be taken with this. But at the core, the system that is hopefully being procured will provide the enterprise foundation for additional agencies to be added. They don't need to buy that again. There's customization, training, data migration that Rabah talked about, the initial cost. From KIC's perspective, they can certainly provide their subject matter expertise, but ultimately that's what the Data and Insights group at Tyler does. The nice thing is the core system will already be there, there will be no need to re-procure that, then we can just start adding those on. Hopefully, that is a core element of what INK does, adding these additional agencies, so that we have a whole bunch of

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

them working through this same system in a few years.

Friend then said that it didn't go to whether or not the Board was supportive, but – this might be something they wanted to talk about in Executive Session later - Tyler could come in with any number of their products and ask the INK Board to pay out of their funds to license things from them, but INK doesn't do that for the software that KIC delivers, so while he is supportive, there's various ways to work this out and it depends on the Board's interests and also what works best for Department of Revenue. Friend is not sure for Revenue's procurement of it, if they can just kind of "glom on" to their current Orion contract. The Board doesn't normally give funds from the Board directly to KIC. While it wouldn't necessarily be the local staff doing it, he would think that that KIC would be the face through which they'd want to deliver it in the future, but that is presumptive, this thing stands on its own even if they never got anyone else on it.

Sloan asked the Board what their preference was on this topic: Did they want to approve going forward? Get more information? Not do it?

Yancey asked what documentation had been provided on this. Friend responded that he was presented with a proposal and he wasn't really sure of the status – it wasn't a grant proposal and lacked the detail that they normally required for that. It was a high-level explanation of the project..it did have some timelines and some costs. He wasn't really clear with the "ask" was then – he has been working with Jones who has been working with Harper to understand what they want – did they want INK to procure it directly, would it be a grant request, is there more detail coming? He didn't distribute it because he thought this was the next step that folks wanted to go through here – to inform the Board at a high level, see if the members were interested, before drilling out the detail.

Sloan asked if there were more questions. Secretary Burghart spoke, asking Harper to confirm that the purpose in bringing this forward was to confirm if the Board was interested and, if so, more detailed information that would be consistent with pursuing the grant procedure would then be employed. Friend said that this was how he understood it and Harper confirmed as well.

Sloan then said he would see if he could summarize things and move this on. He continued

“If the Board agrees, then, INK would work out the details, including KIC and Tyler and the Department of Revenue, with the expectation that this would be a three-year paid grant to get this software and get it implemented and maintained, that would benefit all 105 counties, plus the Department of Revenue, and the public, broadly defined, by making information available more easily for the user as well as for the department or agencies.”

He asked if he were summarizing it correctly and noted that heads were nodding. He then made a motion as follows:

Action Taken: The Board approves moving forward, conceptually approving the grant program. He would expect that at the May meeting, we would have a contract that we would then review and approve or not. Seconded by Butler. Discussion followed

Friend asked if he mean a grant proposal with a contract, “I mean, we need the other information.” Sloan confirmed “The grant proposal and the contract”. Sloan asked if it met the Board's approval. Butler said “As long as the more granular proposal is part of that” she would second. Because, she thought that they needed to have the details before they officially bless going forward with this. Yancey then said that he agreed with

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

that. He wanted to get the detailed proposal with timelines, initial costs, ongoing costs, responsibilities – if there's cost sharing that's being proposed, with enough time to consider it before the next board meeting.

Friend said that would be the target. They have work to do, there is a potential agreement with KDOR, KDOR has an agreement with Tyler, it would need to be priced out, they would need feedback from Jones' group about delivering this as a service through them as an alternative model. They are clearly eager to get them going, they will proceed as fast as they can with that goal. Sloan said that's why the motion was to have it for the next meeting. He recognizes it is important to the Department.

Action Taken: The motion was approved unanimously with Secretary Burghart abstaining.

2) March 2022 Network Manager Report / Q1 Business Plan Outcomes

Jones provided the Board an overview of the items in the 2022 Business Plan that were scheduled for activity and / or completion in Q1 of 2022. *<A copy of the presentation that includes the status discussed is attached to these minutes.>* There was no discussion.

Action Taken: None.

3) Strategic Planning: INK Stakeholder Interview Summary and Next Steps

Molly Saunders, Organizational Performance Practice Leader, Shockey Consulting, LLC presented a high-level summary of the results of the Stakeholder Interviews she had performed in February and March 2022. *<A copy of her presentation is attached>*. Saunders closed her presentation by suggesting that, prior to moving into the Board working on Mission, Vision, and Goals, that they stop and make sure everyone has the same understanding and same information. So, she is suggesting taking a step back to get everyone on the same page by having a board retreat where they took 2-3 hours and get together. In it, they would provide some very concise information about INK, then talk about what typical board roles are and how INK is the same or different, and really come to a common understanding of INK itself and the Board and how to move into the strategic planning process with a common foundation. In her experience, if people don't have a common foundation, it becomes very difficult to agree on common goals. She also suggested having the meeting in-person – the members have actually never been all in the same room together – and then asked for feedback on that proposal.

Sloan noted that the meeting agenda was running behind, so to expedite things, he polled the members informally to see how many were in favor of the proposal. He noted that a majority of the Board was expressing interest, so he asked that Friend or Saunders send out a poll to find a date and time for the meeting. Saunders asked if the members would like to do it at their next Board meeting. Sloan observed that their board meeting agendas tend to be full, so he said that he would rather that they try to do it outside of that, as from what she said, it would be 2-3 hours, which is a full board meeting. Saunders agreed, but also offered the suggestion of combining them. Friend said he would check it out and Sloan asked that they poll the members.

Sloan asked if Saunders had anything else to present. She responded that she did not and asked if there were any questions or comments. Friend thanked Saunders for all the work she had put in with the interviews. He noted that this retreat was interposed in the planned timeline as it was not a step that was originally included. The next meeting would have been the mission, vision, and goals, but he doesn't think that's really the intent here – Saunders confirmed – so it affects the timeline. The process is fluid anyway, so they may be able to make it up later, but he wanted the members to know this was stepping ahead of what would have normally been the next meeting in the series. He said he would work with Saunders on the material for that. Also, he added, that later in the afternoon he planned to send out the report she had prepared that provided more detail on what had been talked about in the presentation.

Action Taken: None.

Information Network of Kansas Board Meeting Minutes

4) Executive Session: Attorney Consultation on Personnel and Contractual Matters

Action Taken: Cook moved that the meeting of the Information Network of Kansas Board of Directors be recessed for a closed executive meeting for thirty minutes beginning at 11:30 a.m. for two purposes - pursuant to K.S.A. § 75-4319(b)(2) for consultation with an attorney for the public body which would be deemed privileged in the attorney-client relationship involving 1) for personnel matters of non-elected personnel involving the Executive Director, and 2) for consultation involving the Information Network of Kansas Network Manager Contract renewal, the Information Network of Kansas Board of Directors to resume the open meeting at the current Zoom conference at 12:00 p.m. and that this motion, if adopted, be recorded in the minutes of the Information Network of Kansas and be maintained as a part of the permanent records of the Board and that the board members in attendance, their proxy representatives, Friend, and Mauch attend. Seconded by Haugh. The motion was approved unanimously.

The board returned to open session at 12:00 p.m. and indicated their intent to return to Executive Session for five additional minutes with the following motion.

Action Taken: Butler moved that the meeting of the Information Network of Kansas Board of Directors be recessed for a closed executive meeting for five minutes beginning at 12:01 p.m. pursuant to K.S.A. § 75-4319(b)(2) for consultation with an attorney for the public body which would be deemed privileged in the attorney-client relationship involving consultation regarding the Information Network of Kansas Network Manager Contract renewal, the Information Network of Kansas Board of Directors to resume the open meeting at the current Zoom conference at 12:06 p.m. and that this motion, if adopted, be recorded in the minutes of the Information Network of Kansas and be maintained as a part of the permanent records of the Board and that the board members in attendance, their proxy representatives, Friend, and Mauch attend. Seconded by Wilson. The motion was approved unanimously.

The board returned to open session at 12:06 p.m. There was no further discussion.

Action Taken: None.

5) Q4 2020 INK Financial Statements

Sloan asked if there were any questions on the Q4 INK Financials. There were none.

Action Taken: Blake moved to accept the Q4 2020 INK Financial Statements. Seconded by Wilson. There was no further discussion. Approved unanimously.

New Business

1) Return to in-person regular board meetings / Approach to special meetings

Sloan suggested that Friend poll the members about this as part of asking them about the Board retreat. Friend agreed. Friend wanted to clarify if deferring the decision about meeting in person next time was more to allow members to express their personal preference offline. Butler suggested that she had a conflict with a standing meeting on Thursday mornings that she could move with advance notice. Friend confirmed he understood, it was just to coordinate timing and he would reach out to the members.

Adjournment: Haugh moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:08 p.m. Seconded by Secretary Burghart. The motion was approved unanimously.



INK STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE

STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

INK BOARD MEETING

APRIL 7, 2022

AGENDA

- Stakeholder Interviews
- Strategic Planning Process
- Next Steps

STAKEHOLDERS (20)

- Current INK Board Members and/or Delegates
- Former INK Board Members
- State Chief Information Technology Officers (Legislative & Executive Branch)
- Data Access and Support Center
- Kansas Dental Board
- Kansas Department of Insurance
- Kansas Historical Society
- Riley County Treasurer
- Cowley County Administrator
- Kansas Bureau of Investigation

KEY TOPIC AREAS

- INK Organization & Services
- INK Board
- Customers/Outreach

The background is a solid dark blue color. It features several abstract, light blue circular and semi-circular patterns. On the left side, there is a large, semi-circular scale with numerical markings from 140 to 260 in increments of 10. The numbers are oriented vertically. There are also several smaller circles and arcs, some with arrows indicating a clockwise or counter-clockwise direction. The overall aesthetic is technical and modern.

INK ORGANIZATION & SERVICES

INK ORGANIZATION & SERVICES

- INK Purpose
- INK Staffing
- Network Manager

INK ORGANIZATION & SERVICES

- INK Purpose
- INK Staffing
- Network Manager

INK ORGANIZATION & SERVICES

- INK Purpose
- INK Staffing
- Network Manager



INK BOARD

INK BOARD

- Knowledge of INK
- Onboarding
- Board Composition
- Board Roles
- Board Meetings

The background is a solid dark blue color. It features several abstract, light blue circular and semi-circular patterns. On the left side, there is a large, semi-circular scale with tick marks and numbers ranging from 140 to 260. Other elements include smaller circles, some with dashed outlines, and curved arrows pointing in various directions, suggesting a sense of motion or a process. The overall aesthetic is clean, modern, and technical.

CUSTOMERS/OUTREACH

INK CUSTOMERS/OUTREACH

- Target market
- Marketing
- Branding

The background is a dark blue gradient. It features several faint, light blue circular patterns. On the left side, there is a large circular scale with tick marks and numbers ranging from 140 to 260. Other circular elements include concentric circles, dashed lines, and arrows pointing in various directions, suggesting a process or cycle.

STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS/ NEXT STEPS

PROCESS & TIMELINE

01



February – April 2022

DISCOVERY

Stakeholder Interviews
(Internal & External)

Existing Plans Review

Expert Panelists

Research

02



April 2022

FRAMEWORK

Mission

Vision

Goals

Align Strategies & Measures

03



May - June 2022

PLAN

Strategic Planning
Document:

- Incorporates stakeholder input & research
- Defines the vision, mission, goals, strategies & actions

04



July 2022

ADOPT & IMPLEMENT

Gather Board feedback

Finalize plan

Present final plan to the Board

Deliver final work product

PROPOSED NEXT STEPS

- Board Retreat
- Strategic Visioning Workshops

The background is a solid dark blue color. It features several faint, light blue technical diagrams. In the top right, there is a large circular diagram with concentric circles and radial lines, resembling a gauge or a scale with numerical markings from 80 to 210. In the bottom left, there is a smaller circular diagram with a dashed outer ring and a solid inner ring, with an arrow pointing clockwise. Another similar diagram is partially visible in the top left. The word "QUESTIONS?" is centered in the lower half of the image in a white, bold, sans-serif font.

QUESTIONS?

2022 INK Business Plan Objectives Update – April 2022

INK Board Presentation
April 7, 2022

1

Key Elements of the Plan

- Strategic Planning Initiative
- Provide a Gateway to Public Information
- Expand the amount, kind, and utility of information available
- Expand the base of users of Kansas government information
- Improve Access Technologies
- Seek advice from the general public, subscribers, professional associations, academic groups, institutions and individuals with knowledge of and interest in areas of public information access, gateway services, add-on services & electronic filing
- Advise the State (Secretary of Administration, OITS, Agencies) on Citizen/Business Data Access
- Marketing Plan
- Customer Service Plan
- Technology Plan
- Staffing Plan
- Financial Plan

2

Updates

G1 Kansas.gov

Further expand Kansas.gov as a central hub for agency contact information and aggregated source for social media and other outreach efforts by agencies and elected officials. Specific initiatives for expanding the website will be identified as part of strategic planning efforts in spring 2022. Examples could include a searchable directory of online services, more information about educational resources in the state, and improved access to agency news and press releases.

Update – Paused while waiting for DOA for approval of the proposed new Kansas.gov. Once this has occurred, we will focus on the additional elements identified in G1.

G3 Live Chat / Chatbots / Home Assistants

Work with state and local partners to identify opportunities to further expand the use of Live Chat and Chatbots to assist individuals and businesses in interacting with government. This is a continuing project from 2021.

Update – Working with KDOR on a pilot project for live chat and chatbots for Tax and then DMV. Providing subject matter expertise for the implementation of a live chat system as first step. Concurrently, assisting with the planning for an agency-wide chatbot solution. Depending on what is learned during this program will help determine how to support agencies with understanding the value of chatbots and live chat. We do not anticipate offering this as a separate solution for individual agencies but rather will potentially provide subject matter expertise for this type of technology.

3

Updates Cont.

E2 Judicial

INK continues to pursue a non-disclosure agreement with the Office of Judicial Administration and their vendor providing their system to determine if there is data that can be used or combined to provide added value to the private sector. These efforts will include market research and contacting / convening INK subscribers from communities currently using this data - and prospective ones - to understand their needs and potential opportunities as well as evaluating products that could provide greater and more customized access and alerts to users of this data like attorneys. This is a continuing project from 2021.

Update – Working with Tyler to obtain a better understanding of the Odyssey system that is being implemented. We are being careful to avoid interfering with the current large-scale rollout of the new system yet still explore potential opportunities for alternative services that could be provided to offset the loss of revenue from the new system.

A3 TeleGov

As part of Agency Outreach efforts, continue to promote and expand the use of the TeleGov meeting scheduling product to facilitate interaction between Kansas government agencies and their customers / users of their services. Target the implementation of at least four (4) new instances of Telegov in calendar year 2022. Plan opportunities, identify and initiate two projects to provide and/or improve electronic access. This will be accomplished in concert with the review of opportunities for expanding data access in Objective E1.

Update – TeleGov solutions have been successfully implemented for KDOR DMV and KDOR Taxpayer Assistance Center (TAC). Both implementation are going very well. Further exploration of additional opportunities include Department of Labor and the Department of Corrections.

4

Updates Cont.

S1 Center for Digital Government

Contact the Center for Digital Government, a national advisory and research institute, to discuss best practices and trends in digital government at the state and local level. Invite presentation to the Board to present overview and discuss this information as it relates to INK.

Update – Nolan is working with NIC Corp on arranging an initial discussion with the CDG and Executive Director. Based on that initial engagement a more complete plan will be developed.

S3 Subscriber Survey

Conduct a survey of INK subscribers to identify additional needs or interests, along with level of satisfaction with existing services. Present results to INK Board summarizing any resulting ideas for new or expanded services that are offered and evaluating their feasibility.

Update – Survey is being drafted and will be sent out to subscribers in Q2. The results will be analyzed and presented to the INK Board.

5

Marketing Plan

- KIC has been approved a budget for 30th Anniversary by Tyler Technologies. Further planning is underway.
- KIC has hired a new employee who, among other responsibilities, will handle social media. She is currently undergoing training.

6

Q2 Objectives

G5 Social Media

Analyze INK's current use of Social Media channels (Our Twitter following is one of the largest in Kansas government) and develop a written strategy for their ongoing use and maintenance in support of INK and state initiatives that includes goals for promotion and use by key audiences for state information.

E3 Commercial Data

Develop plan, then investigate government data sales to commercial parties through data aggregation, integration, manipulation, packaging, or other methods. Identify five (5) new candidates in 2022. Includes analysis of current INK subscriber base. Ie data, market research and contacting / convening INK subscribers from communities currently using this data - and prospective ones - to understand their needs and potential opportunities.

7

Q2 Objectives Cont.

E4 Professional Associations

Identify and work with at least five (5) professional associations, including those currently represented on the INK Board, to solicit needs and ideas for expanding the amount, type, or utility (usefulness) of Kansas government information available to them at the state or local level.

EB2 Local Government

Subscribe to a Request for Proposal notification service and, by discussions with other NIC states and work with the Kansas Association of Counties and League of Kansas Municipalities, identify and market existing or new services to local government. Subscribe to a Request for Proposal notification service and, by discussions with other NIC states and work with the Kansas Association of Counties and League of Kansas Municipalities, identify and market existing or new services to local government. Identify state agencies with local partners in these areas and seek their insight with the idea of expanding the base of users to include users of local information and services.

8

Q2 Objectives Cont.

A1 GIS

Partner with state geographic systems governance group (GIS Policy Board), state Geospatial Information Officer and state agencies to help agencies increase use of GIS in their work and both publish and facilitate the delivery of resulting public information.

A2 Accessibility

Encourage, support, and partner with state technology accessibility organizations. Expand involvement with the Kansas Partnership for Accessible Technology, including solicitation of opportunities to contribute and use expertise from the state's accessible technology community.

9

Strategic Planning Initiative

This is one of the primary elements of the 2022 INK Business Plan. This will help add, shape, and refine many of the objectives in the INK Business Plan.

10