

# **Appendix E. LESSONS LEARNED – CREDENTIALS ADMINISTRATION**

This Page Intentionally Blank

---

## LESSONS LEARNED – CREDENTIALS ADMINISTRATION

This chapter contains “Lessons Learned” in the area of Credentials Administration. Several of the CVISN Model Deployment States responded to these questions in July 2000:

What did you do right that you’d recommend to other states?

What you didn’t do that you wish you had?

What issues do you wish you could have settled earlier?

What requirements turned out to be key drivers for design?

What design choices did you consider and reject/choose and why?

In general, what lessons learned about Credentials Administration would you like to share?

### E.1 Lessons Learned – California

- Agreed to the concept that CVISN required a multi-agency and industry effort.
- Approved over 100 carriers who volunteered to participate in this demonstration project either directly, through agents, or through leasing companies.
- Should have demanded significant break out sessions at workshops for open state interaction.
- Should have been concerned about lack of qualified vendors to support CVISN development.
- Should have been proactive in discussing multi-state development contracts to minimize cost.
- Design the interfaces to all legacy systems in their native mode rather than EDI.
- Combining the CI/CVIEW functionality into a single computer platform.
- Rejected a separate CI and CVIEW to minimize maintenance of test and operational systems.
- Chose to develop a PC CAT versus a Web CAT system to allow for distribution of inventory items (plates, stickers, decals, etc.) and handling of group payment options.
- Chose to produce final documents versus temporary documents as requested by the industry.
- Should have resolved the dependency for paper documents to satisfy the FHVUT reporting requirements.

### E.2 Lessons Learned – Colorado

(Updated April 1999)

- It always takes more time, money, staff and effort to do these projects than is economically feasible. At least if you're one of the pilot or prototype states.
- It is our hope that over time vendors will have gained the necessary experience and knowledge that will allow them to give reasonable estimates and to rely less on state staffing in order to insure project success.

- With few vendors willing to take the risk and provide these services to the states, there isn't the competitive marketplace that the states need to insure reasonable pricing.
- The majority of benefits associated with electronic credentialing side are for industry. The majority of the work effort and costs rests with the state.
- Get industry involved and keep them there. Besides our monthly meetings, which are well attended by both state and industry representatives, we have hired an industry representative to act as a "go between" to insure that the concerns and needs of both sides are being communicated.

### **E.3 Lessons Learned – Connecticut**

What did we do right? Involved the heads of the business units in each agency that are responsible for credentials administration. These units have historically worked together to successfully address common issues. It was not difficult to get them to address CVISN issues in the same manner.

We probably could have spent more time on design issues with this group. There is still work to be done that we expect to hire a systems integration firm to define and address. How to provide for electronic payment functionality is an issue. At the present time each agency has evolved its own process. It would be beneficial if the State adopted a standard approach and assigned a single point of responsibility for this function, but this may not happen in the CVISN time frame.

At this point we anticipate most of the design requirements for vehicle registration to be driven by DMV, for tax systems by DRS and for OS/OW by DOT. CVISN drives the requirements for data sharing among these systems, and we expect most sharing to occur through Connecticut's CI/CVIEW System. We reject the idea of connecting all the systems to each other. Instead they will each be linked to CI/CVIEW, a much simpler arrangement.

In general, we've tried to identify the stakeholders in this area and invite them to participate in the process and in the decision making. To date, this approach has served us well in the credentials administration area. .

### **E.4 Lessons Learned – Kentucky**

(Updated April 1999)

- Sufficient funding and personnel resources are necessary for supporting DUAL Systems
- Uniformity/compatibility among numerous states is necessary before the full benefits of CVISN can be realized
- Coordination efforts are directly proportional to the number of organizational units involved. The fewer the number of organizational units (departments) containing the credentialing, safety, and electronic screening processes, the easier it is to administer the CVISN activities

## E.5 Lessons Learned – Maryland

(Updated April 1999)

- Involve operations staff from day one: describe the business process first, then identify the functions of the system. Improve the process if you can, rather than just automating it, but don't stake the project on your ability to change the business process.
- Learn what the most-responsible agency's engineering staff needs, and what they like and hate. They, too, will have to live with the system after it's built.
- Use CVISN as a catalyst: stick your neck out to make "the right thing" happen for the state staff in areas broader than CVISN. You make friends and build momentum that way. (*Examples: promote use of TCP/IP network access and make it available to other projects; eliminate dumb terminals in favor of client/server systems- let others get onto the CVISN workstations; deploy capabilities where they belong, not just where they are now.*)
- Set small milestones very early; make them larger and farther apart only when confident in the capabilities and commitment of the vendors.
- CVISN makes waves. You'd better learn to surf: exploit the win-win opportunities that CVISN presents. *For example, in Maryland we were able to take advantage of a pent-up desire to convert many Mainframe-SNA network functions to Client/Server-TCP/IP. We gained a lot of support among top managers, line supervisors and hands-on staff, all of whom felt they had something to gain by making their part of CVISN work. If the wave is too wild to surf, or you're in the wrong position to catch the ride, you'd better learn to put your bow into the wave and make headway in the rough seas. For example, Y2K issues postponed action on IFTA registration, but we've kept up as well as we could while awaiting resource availability, and now we're in pretty good shape to proceed.*
- There is a gap between system developers and end-users that is hard to fill. Products may be finished and put on the shelf, and there is nobody whose job it is to take it off the shelf and get it into operation. *Example: we've had a couple months delay in getting subscriptions working routinely to ROCs (Roadside Operations Computers) because of logistics about data sets and mail accounts.*

## E.6 Lessons Learned – Michigan

In summary, Michigan has found that proper staffing and a strong commitment at the very beginning can avoid many pitfalls and lead to a much smoother project.

## E.7 Lessons Learned – Minnesota

No information was available from Minnesota at the time of publication of this document.

## E.8 Lessons Learned – Oregon

No information was available from Oregon at the time of publication of this document.

## E.9 Lessons Learned – Virginia

- Design driver: Requirement for a Credential Interface (CI).
- Design driver: Requirement for a CAT product that was little/no cost to carrier and integrated well into other state supported services.
- Design driver: By using a low level browser such as 3.0, one eliminates client-side scripting. Therefore, server side scripting must occur, which can affect performance.
- Design driver: By duplicating business rules between webCAT and legacy systems, we experienced an increase in additional development and maintenance. Control and security of the front-end system is the benefit for the jurisdiction.
- Rejected development of a PC-CAT. Market does not appear to be emerging. State cannot assume cost of ownership and maintenance.
- Selected webCAT option as most viable product.
- Integrated design to share components between webCAT & CI.

## E.10 Lessons Learned – Washington

- As an incremental step, developed simple interfaces between state legacy systems. Example: The story here is to do things as easily as possible. Since we have a site up and running now, and no clearinghouses to connect with, we developed our own data base by using our own licensing agency's data, Oregon's data, and data returned from our IRP/IFTA provider. We are using periodic updates and hope to let this portion through an RFP in the very near future.
- It takes longer than you think for mapping to legacy systems.
- CVISN architecture should be folded into or required as legacy core system functionality with your IRP/IFTA vendor. Example: Most states have a contract with their IRP/IFTA provider. We had just signed a contract with our vendor before CVISN came along. We weren't lucky enough to have them fall in the reverse order. Had it been so, we would have demanded that the CVISN architecture be folded in as core functionality with our state system.
- For leverage, partner with other states that use the same vendor. Example: It was easy for our vendor to stall us and keep making empty promises of a delivery date. However, our state is no different than other states using the same vendor. We should have partnered with other states in making our early demands to our vendor. If we had done so, we would already have a functioning CI.