



Association of Administrators
of the Interstate Compact on
the Placement of Children



TECNHICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Date: 2.28.2024 **Time:** 12:00-1:00 PM ET

Link to recording: https://aphsa.zoom.us/rec/share/G-RZG56eElmU11k3G0a8iwEKSJOGzyFhPaFLTAA9hXu4oE-u_9WH7fUw7eISEyFa.KJJcl78yuxhuh-KR?pwd=WQCgJnwT6MFmWcWL0xEAEcTP8R8CEjwf

ATTENDEES:

Attending Committee Members-Voting <i>*(Member not present)</i>	Attending Committee-Non-Voting Members <i>*(Member not present)</i>
*Leigh-Anne Bordas (ME)	Spencer Wilder (ACYF)
Shernelle Crawford, (MD) (TAC Chair)	Wendy Wilson (ACYF)
*Mitchell George (WI)	Ray Davidson (APHSA)
Brian Thatcher (NJ)	Carla Fults (APHSA)
*Pamala Gambrell (LA)	Lynnea Kaufman (APHSA-NEICE)
Heather Spencer (OH) (Immediate Past President AAICPC)	Marci McCoy-Roth (APHSA-NEICE)
Shannon Freeman (WA) current AAICPC President	Marcus Robinson (APHSA-NEICE)
	Bertha Levin (APHSA-NEICE)
	Duane Fontenot (APHSA-NEICE)
	Alex Kamberis (ACYF)

Agenda

February 28, 2024

- I. Welcome
- II. Presentation and Demonstration of APHSA THRIVE Solution
- III. NCH 1.0 – 2.0 Conversion Update
- IV. Current status of states on-boarding to NEICE Options
- V. Cloud Computing for NEICE Discussion/Recommendation
- VI. Cadence of Meetings and TAC Roadmap
- VII. Other Issues

Summary of Meeting

The meeting discussed a variety of topics including, the use of the APHSA's Learning Management System: Training Hub for Resources, Innovation and Virtual Exchange (THRIVE) solution for information sharing and collaboration, the progress of the NCH, 1.0 to 2.0 conversion updates, and the implementation of new data reporting systems. The team also discussed the use of cloud computing for the NEICE system, the challenges of ensuring state compliance with system specifications, and the increasing expenses of their system. Towards the end of the meeting, the team agreed on the need for a roadmap, a regular meeting schedule, and a focus on cost savings and technical aspects of systems.

I. Welcome



Shernelle started the meeting with introductions from the team. Alex said this would be his last meeting with the group as he is moving to a new role, but Wendy Wilson will take his place with them.

II. Presentation and Demonstration of APHSA THRIVE Solution (Recording Time: 10:07)

Shernelle moved to the demonstration of THRIVE learning management system. To provide a way to have collaboration outside of meetings. Lynnea shared her screen and gave a brief overview of the THRIVE system. Lynnea explained that THRIVE facilitates information sharing, discussion forums, and resource sharing. The THRIVE portal for committee documents and minutes is on the website. She shared the link to THRIVE in the chat. (https://thrive.matrixlms.com/group_dashboard/show/153128)

To gain access to the Technical Advisory Committee hub in THRIVE, a member must set up an account in THRIVE and tell Lynnea they have signed up, she will then add the member to the TAC committee area.

Lynnea also mentioned that THRIVE allows for the posting of news and announcements, and the system has a feature for document sharing. Marci noted that a new contact management system was implemented, and they are updating all member records. She asked members to let us know if they noticed anything wrong with their accounts. Lynnea agreed to check and add those who have already signed up for THRIVE.

III. NCH 1.0 – 2.0 Conversion Update (Recording Time: 18:02)

The team discussed the progress of the NCH, 1.0 to 2.0 conversion updates, with Duane providing an overview. Duane explained there is an end-of-life feature in the Microsoft system. There is a bridge NEICE utilizes in the clearinghouse system, and it is obsolete. The NEICE team has set a deadline of May 31, 2024, to get everyone converted over to 2.0. He mentioned that 9 states are currently using the 1.0 bridge. The hard deadline to complete the conversion is 8/8/2024, when the system will no longer work at that time. States are making progress – some better than others. Kentucky may be first, converting on 3/16 and Minnesota expected to convert on the same date. Lynnea showed her screen with projected dates for each state: Idaho is 3/25/2024; Maine is 4/1/2024; North Carolina is 4/15/2024; Missouri is 4/29/2024; Ohio is 5/9/2024 and West Virginia is to be announced. Duane also highlighted the importance of testing and encouraged the team to check in on individual state's progress. Duane explained the NEICE team is reaching out to states when we have not heard from them. Alex suggested the Division of State Systems could bring this up during their monthly calls with the states. He added they can provide support and to let them know if there is a state who is needing support. Duane added during the 1.0-2.0 calls we are trying to address issues as they come up. He explained Minnesota did have a go live date, and during testing they found some issues which delayed their date. The states are putting a lot of effort into the conversion. Spencer added a report out state-by-state and separating out by analyst would be helpful so each analyst could follow up. From a CCWIS standpoint, the analysts want to be sure all the components have modern security and architecture, and their upgrades include the most secure system possible.

IV. Status of states on-boarding to NEICE Options

Lynnea stated the update on states onboarding and the team also celebrated the addition of Montana as a MCMS (Modular Case Management System) state on 2/20/2024, bringing the total number of live states to 44. The NEICE team is working with 5 states with signed MOU's to onboard. We continue to



work with three states to sign the MOU. Lynnea also added that there are several states working to transition from one connection type to another.

V. Cloud Computing for System Storage: Cost, Security, and Variability (Recording Time: 25:40)

Duane explained the task for this committee is around the use of cloud computing, highlighting the current use in 15 states who are housed on Azure Government Cloud. The clearinghouse piece of our system that connects the MCMS and the Clearinghouse states is hosted on the cloud as well. Duane emphasized the question is Cloud the right place? Should we look at some other way of hosting and managing our system? From a technical standpoint, we have redundancy, we have security, and encryption to try to be as secure as possible. We meet the requirements of the FedRamp rules.

Recommendations needed from this committee: (Recoding time 26:46)

Duane clarified, we are looking for a recommendation from this committee – What is your opinion on the use of Cloud, going forward for the NEICE system? Duane asked for other thoughts.

- **Cost effectiveness concerns – Moving States off cloud-based storage: (Recording Time 27:07)** Heather noted the concern from the AAICPC regarding the cost-effectiveness. The members are concerned about greatly increasing NEICE fees due to the cost of the system. We need to look at whether this is the most cost-effective way to do it? Should we have everyone on NCH where their documents are not stored on the cloud. She noted that moving the states off the cloud-based CMS platform would reduce costs overall. This would mean states move to the MCMS or NEICE Clearinghouse Direct method.

Alex added the potential future cost increases that could occur with cloud-based systems vendors (such as Microsoft specifically).
- **NEICE Flexibility to meet state's needs: (Recording time 29:12)** Marci emphasized the need to consider the varying capabilities and resources of different states. Some states did not have the resources to build ICPC into their CCWIS or SACWIS. Other states were able to build that in. We need to consider where states are. There is a desire for some to have all states in the CMS cloud, while other states have built the functionality into the SACWIS or CCWIS may not feel that is not the right way to go. Heather proposed a compromise option of moving CMS states to MCMS, where the documents are stored in their servers. Duane confirmed that only the CMS states' data is currently stored on the cloud. Only data for reporting is stored on the cloud at this point.
- **CCWIS Recommendations for working in one system/MCMS Capabilities: (Recording time 31:25)** Marci added following CCWIS there was strong direction to support ICPC professionals to only need to work in one system. She added the MCMS could be attached to the state system through APIs. MCMS also has single sign on.
- **Challenge with uniformity (Recording time 32:27)** Marci added, the other challenge with the NCH direct, they build their systems differently, and there is not a uniform experience across all different users. NCH and CMS/MCMS experience NEICE differently.

Spencer added the CCWIS experience stresses the importance of efficiencies and data quality. You want the experience of the users to be as seamless as possible and be able to use the data in NEICE. Anything we can do to standardize that experience and make it more effective and



efficient for the user is needed. He pointed out that CCWIS is being approached in many different ways and we may need to be able to meet them where they are and be a little more flexible now until we can implement more standardization.

- **System Governance:** (Recording time 34:09) Alex asked about a governance solution to reduce the discrepancies between states. Some sort of expectation with a data dictionary. Marci explained the MOU/BAA outlines for each state what they will exchange in the system. We also use Onboarding Validation specifications before they onboard to ensure they can perform all the functions. The NEICE team does not have a way to confirm they have followed the specifications. When a state does not follow the specifications, it is challenging for other states. Additionally, support is needed to help states make updates when changes are made to the ICPC process. Marci added we are looking for this committee's recommendations for moving forward.
- **Interim Solution (Recording time 36:50)** Alex added that many states wanting to do NCH will not be onboard for years. Some are looking at 2028-2029. Some states need something in the interim. Spencer suggested taking a NEICE census and take a scan of all the states and have that drive the decision as to what is the best option. Think about where they are and when they plan to move.
- **Expense of CMS (Cloud Storage) Recording Time 38:32)** Heather added, one of the things we know costs a lot of money, because of security and storage in the cloud is CMS because that is the only connection that stores documents in the cloud. If we decide the cloud is too expensive for storing documents, if states want to use MCMS, it is the same experience as the CMS. They are just not storing their documents in the cloud. Want to keep in mind it is not just the two options of NCH direct or CMS (storing documents in the cloud).
- Brian agreed, saying he raised this in Florida. He said the discussion is always about CMS to NCH direct and there has not been discussion about CMS moving to MCMS and he wondered why. Marci stated it might be that there are other compact systems that have their system in the cloud-based environment. They do not have anything stored in their CCWIS. The AAICPC members are trying to understand from a cost perspective it might be cheaper in some ways to have everyone doing the same thing in the cloud. NEICE has not developed this way and it might be difficult to move to this model now. Agree one way to save costs is to encourage the CMS states to move to the MCMS until they are ready to do their CCWIS.

Shannon added the states are looking to this committee to make recommendations to make the decisions. This committee is the experts on IT and knowing cost-saving measures. Concern is the amount NEICE has been going up, compared to other systems they use.

- **Chart with NEICE Security Implications per system:** (Recording time 41:59) Duane presented a chart detailing the security implications of various options for each NEICE connection type. The team agreed to put this chart in THRIVE for further discussion.

V. **Cadence To Team Roadmap, Contract Review, and Cost-Effectiveness (Recording Time: 45:10)** Shernelle proposed creating a team roadmap with timeframes the committee is targeting. The team agreed on the importance of having a clear direction for their meetings. Duane suggested monthly meetings. The Committee agreed to send out a survey to select the best day/time.



Shernelle will work on creating a roadmap for the next meeting. It was mentioned that the annual AAICPC Conference is scheduled for May 29th -May 31st.

- **Tetrus Contract Language regarding increasing costs:** (Recording time 51:32) Shannon asked what the current contract with Tetrus says about increasing costs. Marci clarified that it's a yearly process to keep costs down. She also mentioned that Tetrus reduced their costs slightly between 2023 and 2024. Marci added each state has an MOU directly with APHSA as the secretariat for AAICPC and in that it says the current fee is this, as determined by the AAICPC.

Alex clarified he was referring to the contract for the hosting server (Amazon or Salesforce) or whatever Tetrus is using behind the scenes. Duane clarified it is Microsoft Azure Federal Cloud. Marci indicated those costs go up and Tetrus works with us to try and not make it too big of an impact on the fees.

- VI. **Other issues:** (Recording Time 52:59) Heather raised a question about the team's role in reviewing their contracts and services, to review whether we are paying for services we do not need. She stated the AAICPC is counting on this group to come back and say this is what we could be doing differently and how we can save. The group reviewed the charter and concluded that their role is focused on technical analysis of the system with an understanding of different costs, granting waivers if a state cannot comply with the requirement and making recommendations to the Guidance Committee. The team also discussed the role and focus of the committee, particularly concerning cost savings and technical aspects of systems.

Next Steps:

1. Lynnea will provide access to the technical advisory committee on THRIVE for the committee members. Lynnea agreed to check and add those who have already signed up for THRIVE.
2. The team will continue to work with states in adopting the Clearinghouse model to ensure a more seamless and consistent experience.
3. Shernelle will create a roadmap for the committee's progress and set firm meeting dates.
4. A survey will be sent out to the team to find an agreeable monthly meeting date and time.



State	Target Go Live / Conversion Date	Implementation Stage	Go Live / Conversion Progress
Minnesota	03/18/24	Validation Checklist	75%
Idaho	03/25/24	DEV	25%
Indiana	03/29/24	UAT	50%
Kentucky	04/01/24	UAT	50%
Maine	04/01/24	DEV	25%
North Carolina	04/15/24	UAT	50%
Missouri	04/29/24	DEV	25%
Ohio	05/09/24	DEV	25%
West Virginia	TBD (May)	Planning	10%



Security Implications by System			
	CMS	MCMS	NCH-Direct
Maintaining FedRamp Security Levels	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maintaining NIST Compliance	Yes	Yes	Yes
Centrally Store PII/PHI Data	Yes		
Audits/Scans Needed?	HIPAA SOC-II Cybersecurity Audit Vulnerability/Penetration Scans (Monthly)	- SOC-II - Vulnerability/Penetration Scans (Less Frequently)	- SOC-II - Vulnerability/Penetration Scans (Less Frequently)
System Security Responsibility	Shared (States, Tetras, APHSA/AAICPC)	Shared (States, Tetras, APHSA/AAICPC)	Shared (States, Tetras, APHSA/AAICPC)
Chief Security Officer	Yes	-	-
Breach Security Drill & Responsibilities	Annual - Full	NEICE team	NEICE team
Breach Security Responsibilities (including Communications)	Primary Role	Secondary Role	Secondary Role
Liability	Depending on exposure type, Advisor	Limited, Informational	Limited, Informational
BAAs required for some states	Yes	No	No
Cyberinsurance needed?	Yes		
Costs to AAICPC/APHSA	Current, as is	-Less time for administering security and legal requirements for CMS -Less costs for maintaining cloud database -Reduced costs for security audits -Reduced data storage costs	-Less time for administering security and legal requirements for CMS -Less costs for maintaining cloud database -Reduced costs for security audits -Reduced data storage costs



Technical Advisory Committee Recommendation to AAICPC for Sustainability of NEICE

Questions from AAICPC:

1. Are there technical ways to reduce costs? AAICPC/APHSA are working on how to sustain NEICE in the most cost-effective way?
2. Do we need to transition states from CMS to another connection method?
 - a. If they recommend allowing the CMS states to remain on that system, how can we make that cost effective?
3. How can the TAC support greater conformity in experience for our states?
4. Review security implications by system and assess if these are accurate or anything needs to be added.

