**SECURE Owner’s Meeting**

Wednesday, January 11, 2017

San Diego County ARCC Branch Office

141 E. Carmel Street, San Marcos, CA 92078

**MINUTES**

Present:   
Dean Logan (Los Angeles)  
Monique Blakely (Los Angeles)  
Dana Ohanesian (Orange)  
Hugh Nguyen (Orange  
Michelle Martinez-Barrera (Riverside)  
Peter Aldana (Riverside)  
Ernest J. Dronenburg, Jr. (San Diego)  
Rolf Bishop (San Diego)  
Val Wood (San Diego)  
Joanne Lim (San Diego)

Meeting called to order at 11:12am

1. Out-of-State Submitters Inspections  
     
   Orange County has developed a contract for third-party companies to conduct the out-of-state inspections. This will begin in February, so the Owners no longer need to send their own staff out to inspect. Dana will check on the term limits (believes it to be 1-2 years) and send the contract to the Owners.
2. SECURE Partners Pricing Committee  
     
   The Pricing Committee created a spreadsheet to show the partners the deficit between what is currently being paid and what needs to be paid. The bottom line is there is a greater need from the partners to pay more. The Committee will research and develop different tier structures to present to the partners. The Committee will meet with the partners this Thursday, Jan. 12. The spreadsheet also showed CERTNA’s fee structure to show the pricing difference from SECURE’s.   
     
   The partners will be asked to pay more in order to cover a “fair share”; not to cover the Owners costs or the entire $1.8 million costs. The Owners pay $292,500 as a base price. The question was raised whether the Owners are supplementing for the deficit this year – Dana answered that we must wait for the Board to decide that, and if so, the MOU would need to be amended.   
     
   The Pricing Committee consists of representatives from Sacramento, Santa Barbara, and Ventura. Dana, Susie, and Monique will also volunteer for this committee; Riverside will have someone included as well. Peter would like to see the Committee show a clear benefit of being an Owner versus a partner. Dean suggested that the group look at a different pricing structure for the Owners where all would pay an identical amount for “base pricing” as well as a pricing based on number of recordings. This would provide for a more equitable Owner’s pricing for counties based on their use of the system and the benefits for those items that are used equally.
3. SECURE COOP and Disaster Recovery Plan

Val reported that the San Diego Recorder’s Office has been working on their Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP), and resolutely has been inquiring to the plans of everyone they partner with, including SECURE. What is SECURE’s COOP? As of today, San Diego is eRecording 60% of all documents, so it would be very challenging to move to paper if something disastrous happened to SECURE.   
  
Rolf Bishop, San Diego’s Chief Deputy of Systems, provided insight as to what a Disaster Recovery Plan (subset of a COOP) would look like. Patrick Copland estimated a complete recovery to operational functions would take 6 weeks or more after a disastrous event to the data center and network. Dana questioned whether the 6 weeks stated by Patrick was accurate. It was posed that all Owners have access to the source code, which could be replicated; but Val questioned whether DoJ would have to inspect the hardware first. Rolf believes that DoJ did need to inspect and approve hardware in Version 2, but Version 3 may be different – he will consult with Patrick. Rolf confirmed another inquiry regarding whether a physical server could be replicated to a virtual server.   
  
A subcommittee will be created to figure out a SECURE COOP and Disaster Recovery recommendation.

1. Data Analytic/SECURE Performance Measures  
     
   Due to the networking problems and delays all the Owner counties experienced, analytics have been taken regarding SECURE performance. Dana presented a document in progress of different graphs. The graphs display what SECURE is running and at what time; how many batches/documents are waiting to be downloaded vs. time of last upload; hosts connected and network outages; pages per second, database queries per second. This report will be posted to the full SECURE website in real time.   
     
   The weekly and monthly reports recording summaries are currently on the Owners website and display only the Owner counties. Partner counties will be added to the report and uploaded to the full SECURE website. Stats can be kept on the website for one year, then can be archived.
2. Annual SECURE Costs & Cost Saving Options  
     
   Orange County was able to save money by reducing licensing fees. Server licensing costs $160,000 for Enterprise licensing for both servers. It was determined that the Enterprise licensing was only needed for the main server, and a lower-level licensing for the second server.

As the lead county, Orange has a team of four people focused on SECURE tasks – one person to work with submitters and DoJ, one person dedicated to monitoring the network, one person answering all support calls, and one person to sign up all G2G agencies. Hugh believes they could save $70,000-$80,000 a year by eliminating one of these roles and distributing the responsibilities amongst the remaining team of three.   
  
This prompted a discussion regarding the extra costs (in finances, time and effort) the lead county inputs, and whether it would be a possibility to either share more tasks with the other Owners or perhaps even discuss rotating the “lead county” every five years. Orange, while comfortable in the role of lead county, has lost money each of the last four years of being a SECURE Owner. While the county does get reimbursed periodically, there is no time being paid for the extra tasks like running reports and analytics, coordinating and leading meetings, and other time-consuming administrative tasks. The role of the lead county has evolved since the beginning. It was suggested that Orange would define all of their tasks to a list, and at the next meeting, all the Owners will go over that list and see what tasks could be delegated out. The other Owners would like to know in what areas they can help.   
  
Another issue that has delayed a lot of progress is the process of gaining approval from all four Boards of Supervisors for any one document. Because only Orange can sign on behalf of SECURE, and because Orange County’s BoS needs to review and approve anything they sign, it prolongs the process of finalizing MOU’s, amendments, and other documents. If each of the Owner counties can sign on behalf of SECURE, it would expedite this process greatly.

Overall, it was noted that the four Owners are on the right track, and the ownership among the four counties has been a good investment and they have built good relationships. All were in agreement.

1. Next SECURE Owners Meeting  
     
   Orange County to host the next meeting on Wednesday, April 5, 2017.

Meeting adjourned at 1:17pm