ICTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES
10/21/26 | 9:30am

Member	Term Ends	Member	Term Ends
Barry Anderson, Chair	7/1/28	VACANT (TBD)	
Karla Weiss	1/1/28	Sandy Sweeney	11/1/28
Ryan Eaton	7/1/29	Sue Duhn	7/1/29
Dewey Hildebrandt	12/31/26	Chopper Albert	7/1/27
Niccole Schippers	7/1/28	Andrea Woodard	

In attendance:
Barry Anderson, Karla Weiss**,** Ryan Eaton, Dewey Hidebrandt, Niccole Schippers, Sandy Sweeney, Sue Duhn, Chopper Albert, Andrew Dewey

ISAC Staff:
Dylan Young, Brandi Kanselaar, Brad Holton, Andrew De Hann, Ashley Clark, Beth Manley, Eric Guth, Lynsey Pierce

Absent:
Andrea Woodward

Meeting called to order at 9:31am.

Approval of Agenda
The committee reviewed the agenda.

MOTION: Approve agenda with no changes. Motion by Sweeny. Seconded by Weiss. Motion passed.

Approval of Minutes
The committee reviewed the prior meeting minutes.

MOTION: Approve meeting minutes from 11/5/25 Motion by Albert. Seconded by Duhn. Motion passed.

Committee Appointments
Hildebrant will be retiring on 12/31/26. His replacement is proposed to by Bob Brunkhorst from Bremer County, and he will start on 1/1/27.

Due to the ICTS bylaws, Albert cannot be a voting member on the ICTS Advisory due to being employed by a city and not a county. This is no fault of Albert. Albert has been a great asset, and the proposal is to move Albert to the TSB Committee as an ex officio member. His replacement on the ICTS Advisory will be Andrew Dewey with Pottawattamie County and will start on 11/1/26.

MOTION: Approve the new ICTS Advisory appointments and move Albert to the TSB Committee. Motion by Hildebrant. Seconded by Sweeney. Motion passed.

The ICTS bylaws used to state that a MHDS Region CEO had to fill a position on ICTS Advisory. The bylaws have since been updated to remove that requirement. The group was asked what affiliate should be filled by this appointment, or if it should be a general appointment that any affiliate member can fill. This advisory committee has two general appointments currently.

MOTION: Table this item on what affiliate should fill the vacant spot until more information is known about who uses the ICTS programs. Motion by Weiss. Seconded by Duhn. Motion passed.

CSN Program Update

Kanselaar presented the CSN Update. Marketing for CSN has continued. New flyers were made for both the financial and client sides of CSN. A webinar was held on 9/28/26 for county auditors introducing them to CSN. Although there was low attendance for the webinar, the webinar recording has been viewed over 30 times.

Public Health has an interest in CSN due to HHS' realignment of their program. Each district will have a lead entity, and CSN is already set up for that type of structure. Kanselaar has had meetings with Polk, Guthrie, and Boone counties showing them a demo and having discussions on the future. Public Health is looking at other systems as well, but they stated they'd like all Public Health agencies to use the same system in the end. These three counties are going to speak to their affiliate and see if Kanselaar can be included in a future meeting or hold a webinar/demo on CSN.

CSN Proposed Licensing Fee

A CSN Focus Group was created with CSN users from several entities such as General Assistance, Veteran's Assistance, Judicial Advocates, Justice Involved Services, Disability Access Points, and elected officials from the Board of Supervisors and Auditors.

The group met on 9/3/26 and came up with a proposed CSN licensing fee that is a ramp up approach. CSN needs $225,000 to $250,000 to keep running, and that would include one production release per year to keep the system updated. The group proposed to charge a licensing fee by number of users for each county/entity starting low, then increasing the cost every year until the minimum revenue needed is reached. Based on current user count, if the user count stays consistent, would take until FY31 to reach the minimum revenue.

The CSN focus group stated ICTS should reach out to the Iowa PCA, the ASO, and ask if they would contribute any money to CSN since they reimburse counties for Judicial Advocates. Kanselaar had a conversation with the ASO, and they stated HHS will not allow them to reimburse counties for any software system an advocate would use. Kanselaar stated she does not expect any money to come from the ASO for CSN.

An additional proposed rule the CSN Focus group recommended is that a county with only an advocate using CSN will be asked to pay $1,000 to help support the system that allows their assigned advocate to serve their most vulnerable clients. If a county refuses to pay the $1,000, it should not negatively impact the advocate's ability to track committals for all counties they are assigned to. Sweeney shared an example that she serves seven counties as an advocate, but she thinks only four counties will pay the licensing fee. Weiss stated she

had conversations with some of the smaller counties in southern Iowa, and even $1,000 is a lot for them to budget for.

Hildebrandt asked if a population type licensing fee would make more sense. Kanselaar explained that a per capita model was looked at, but it increased the license cost for the middle to larger counties. When the $2,500 per county license fee was presented, 20 counties opted out of CSN, so ICTS felt a per capita model would increase the chance more counties would opt out due to the cost.

Discussion continued if this proposed structure cannot bring in the revenue needed, there will have to be a discussion about pulling CSN offline and shelving it.

MOTION: Recommendation to the ICTS Board to accept the proposed licensing fee structure by the CSN Focus Group. Motion by Hildebrant. Seconded by Sweeney.
Further discussion: Hildebrant would like to encourage the ICTS Board to look more closely at not allowing counties/entities to use CSN for free and maybe offer a lower amount depending on the situation.
Motion passed.

Tech Team Update

De Hann reported this last year has been busy. During the last fiscal year, the ICIT/ICTS Tech Teams program successfully completed engagements with Osceola, Palo Alto, Clarke, Chickasaw, Greene, Henry, and Mahaska counties.

In addition to these assessments, ICTS provided support to many of these counties throughout the recruitment and hiring process for new IT professionals. These efforts have helped counties strengthen their internal technology resources and improve long-term operational support.

Looking ahead, one additional Tech Team engagement is currently in progress and is expected to be completed this fall. As staff availability increases, particularly with Joel Rohne returning to active project work, ICTS anticipates additional county engagements and continued growth of the Tech Teams program throughout the remainder of the fiscal year.

County Tech Advisor, Ninjio, and ERP Program Updates

Guth presented an overview on the following programs:

County Tech Advisor (CTA)

The County Tech Advisor service continues to provide counties with technology planning, budgeting assistance, project guidance, vendor coordination, cybersecurity support, and operational consulting to 3 counties. In addition to planned engagements, the program also involves responding to impromptu questions and emerging issues as they arise within counties. Counties regularly reach out for guidance on technology purchases, vendor proposals, cybersecurity concerns, infrastructure decisions, and other operational challenges. Providing timely, independent guidance helps counties make informed decisions before issues become larger projects or risks.

NINJIO

The NINJIO program is growing with 3 counties active and a 4th recently contracted. We are providing both licensing and an optional managed-service model for county security awareness training and phishing simulation campaigns. County onboarding and monthly operating procedures have been documented, including user setup, email allowlisting, training assignments, phishing simulations, completion tracking, and reporting. As additional counties are onboarded, continue to refine processes and scheduling patterns.

ERP Program

ReGov

Interest in the ReGov platform continues to grow at a rapid pace with 15 counties expected to have signed contracts with ReGov in the very near future. Plans are nearing completion for Phase 2 of the partnership, where ICTS would provide implementation assistance, training, first-tier support, and continuing education services. The Phase 2 agreement framework has been substantially developed. Current efforts are focused on finalizing staffing expectations, implementation support responsibilities, service standards, escalation procedures, and long-term financial sustainability. The target remains to complete the agreement, review, and present the proposed arrangement to the ICTS Board for consideration later this fall. First-round interviews for the ERP Support Representative position are underway. Hiring discussions are being coordinated alongside Phase 2 planning to ensure support staff can receive appropriate training before county implementations begin.

Wiess asked if it was primarily Solutions or Tyler counties switching to ReGov. Guth stated it was primarily Solutions counties, but ReGov has been in conversation with some Tyler counties.

Tyler

Discussions regarding a potential Tyler support partnership have continued; although, at a slower pace. Key focus areas remain financial sustainability, staffing requirements, and ensuring any support model reduces administrative burden on participating counties. Efforts to establish a Tier 1 support program with Tyler have not yet reached alignment on the underlying financial and legal structure. Discussions on that are currently paused; however, alternative options are being explored, including a liaison position that could help advance county support and advocacy efforts. Future direction will depend on whether a mutually beneficial structure can be established.

ICTS Financial Review

Holtan presented the ICTS financial overview and FY28 Budget.

ICTS ended FY26 with a $1 million deficit, mainly due to the fact that it was the first year CSN was offered for free. There is a prediction that ICTS will lose another $1 million for FY27, again to being CSN being offered for free and other ICTS projects being built up.

For FY28, the budget is based on the best information we have currently. Total revenue is predicted at $527,000, and expenses are predicted at $1.2 million, leaving a deficit. Holtan stated ICTS staff will continue to try and improve the outcome as this is a worst-case scenario. Some projects are front heavy for expenses but

will bring in revenue once they're up and running. CSN revenue is dependent on how many counties stay opted in, and if Public Health agrees to use it.

MOTION: Accept the FY28 Budget. Motion by Sweeney. Seconded by Weiss. Motion passed.

Open Discussion Items

No items were discussed.

Hildebrant motioned to adjourn as his last official act with the ICTS Advisory Committee. He will be missed and everyone wishes him well in his retirement!

Meeting adjourned at 10:33am.