

ESS

Electronic Services System – Standards Subcommittee Meeting

AGENDA

October 23, 2025

Web Conference
9:00 A.M. to 10:30 A.M.

Welcome and Introductions

July 17, 2025, Meeting Summary – Approval

Policies and Procedures

- ICRA Working Group – P&P and 28E – Update

- Data and Information Standards Update
 - Chapter 2 Draft Revision
 - Data Elements

- Platted Land Indexing Update
 - City/Town/(County Names)

Committee Nominations – Expiring Terms

- Districts 1, 2 and 6

Adjournment

Next Regular Meeting 2026 Calendar:

1st Quarter, 2026 - TBD

**ESS Standards Meeting
Web Conference
July 17, 2025**

Attendance

ESS Standards Subcommittee

Carolyn Siebrecht, Linn County Recorder
Cathy Voith, Calhoun County Recorder
Samantha Boothby, Cherokee County Recorder

Naomi Ellis, Marion County Recorder
Jayne Schultz, Winneshiek County Recorder
Katie Carlton, Union County Recorder

Other Participants

Jamie Stargell, Adams County Recorder
ReNae Arnold, Dallas County Recorder
Ann Ditsworth, Dickinson County Recorder
Nancy Booten, Lee County Recorder
Stacie Herridge, Story County Recorder

Dawn Froese, Linn County Recorder Staff
Cortney Hayler, Linn County Recorder Staff
Teresa Sackett, Linn County Recorder Staff
Anthony Bengs on, Certified Title of Buchanan
Danielle Michalski, Abstract Associates of Iowa

ESS ILR Staff

Phil Dunshee, Iowa Land Records
Lisa Long, Iowa Land Records
Samantha McMahon, Iowa Land Records

Corrie Strasser, Iowa Land Records
Kristen Delany-Cole, Iowa Land Records

Welcome

A meeting of the ESS Standards Subcommittee was held via web conference.

April Meeting Summary

The Subcommittee reviewed the April 17, 2025 meeting summary. Katie Carlton made a motion to approve the meeting summary. Jayne Schultz seconded, and the motion was approved.

New Standards Subcommittee Chair Selected

The Subcommittee reviewed the role of the Standards Subcommittee Chair and introduced members interested in the role. As a result of the discussion, there was a consensus to establish a Chair and a Vice Chair. The ESS Policies and Procedures do not specify the roles or requirements of a Chair or Vice Chair.

Katie Carlton moved to designate Carolyn Siebrecht (Linn County) as the Chair and Cathy Voith (Calhoun) as the Vice Chair of the ESS Standards Subcommittee. Naomi Ellis seconded. The motion was approved.

Communications Update

The Iowa Land Records Annual Report for the period of July 2024 through June 2025 was shared with the Subcommittee. The report was sent to county recorders electronically and to the boards of supervisors through ISAC email communications. Recordors were encouraged to share the report with their respective county supervisors.

Contracts & Agreements

The Project Manager provided background and an update on the "On Demand" (OD) payment system. Since 2023, Linn County has used the ESS online payment system for boat and ATV renewals. Linn County has requested that another online service be enabled to accept electronic

payments; Easy Air, an application for environmental permits.

The integration, in this case, is different, because it uses an application developed by a third-party vendor. The Subcommittee reviewed the current 28E agreement between ESS and Linn County, as well as information about the Easy Air Program. The Subcommittee discussed questions about integrating with a private vendor, and the capacity of the ESS development team to complete the integration at this time given other priorities. No action was requested.

Potential Application Development

An overview of two potential development projects was presented. One project would create a property notification system to enable users to monitor recording activity associated with names. The other project would create a new “Back the Blue” shielding reform to protect law enforcement and court officers who may be endangered in some way. ESS solicited cost estimates from designated software development vendors, We Write Code and Lean Techniques.

If either project moves forward, any work authorizations would be presented to the ESS Coordinating Committee for approval prior to the initiation of any software development. Questions regarding the logistics of a notification system, such as alternatives to email and the potential for hiring a new developer were discussed. No action was requested. The topic will likely be discussed at a future meeting of the ESS Coordinating Committee.

Policies and Procedures

It was reported that an updated version of the ESS Policies and Procedures had been published. The new version includes the recent changes to the ESS Terms of Service concerning usernames and processes when accounts are closed due to inactivity. Action on those policies was finalized by the ESS Coordinating Committee at their meeting on May 15, 2025.

Working Group Update

A new workgroup was established by the Iowa County Recorders Association Executive Board to review the ESS 28E agreement and the ESS Policies and Procedures. While the ESS Standards Subcommittee continues to meet quarterly, this new workgroup provides recorders with another avenue to share their perspectives and ideas. Any suggestions provided by the workgroup would be presented to the ESS Standards Subcommittee and the ESS Coordinating Committee for review. The workgroup is comprised of two recorders from each association district and is being coordinated by Jamie Stargell, Adams County Recorder.

County Project Assessment Cost Sharing Program

The Project Manager reviewed the definitions, formula, and history of the Cost Sharing Program since its creation in 2014. The program is codified as Chapter 9 of the ESS Policies and Procedures. The Subcommittee discussed the purpose of the Cost Sharing Program, which is to share the cost of maintenance fees paid to local land record management system service providers for their integration services with ESS. The service providers are expected to:

- Facilitate the transfer of records from county systems to Iowa Land Records, and
- Facilitate the recording of electronic documents through the ESS E-Submission service

Since the inception of the county land record information system, local service providers have been compensated for their integration work. In the beginning the governing committees decided to compensate the service providers equally by county, and that methodology has been maintained over the years with some form of annual cost of living or inflationary adjustment. It was noted that the governing committees had considered alternative forms for compensating service providers and calculating the cost sharing amounts at various times. No substantive changes have been made except for the addition of a standard dollar amount to the cost sharing credit, or the use of federal COLA formulas to be used as the basis for service provider fee increases.

The Subcommittee reviewed potential changes in the Cost Sharing program if the base recording fee increase is approved in the 2026 legislative session. If sufficient additional funds are provided for ESS

operations, it is generally expected that ESS will assume all responsibility for maintenance costs for integration with Iowa Land Records. If that occurs, then the Cost Sharing Program will be discontinued.

Data and Information Standards Update

The Subcommittee reviewed and discussed a draft amendment to Chapter 2 of the ESS Policies and Procedures. This part of the Policies and Procedures defines the standards for the exchange of data and information between counties and the Iowa Land Records system. The context for the proposed change is the creation of the new application programming interfaces (APIs) for electronic recording and the transfer of data from county systems to Iowa Land Records. The policies need to be updated to correspond to these important changes.

Another context for the updated policy is the possibility that a local land record management system (service provider) might opt out of a service agreement with Iowa Land Records system, or the possibility that a county might opt out of the Electronic Services System 28E agreement. In either case, counties might still be required to participate in the statewide land record database or the statewide electronic recording service. The Subcommittee discussed how the service provider or county would conform to the standards established by the statewide system.

One proposed solution may be to publish the standards in a form that does not require the adoption of a contract by a service provider or in a form that is independent of a county's membership in the Electronic Services System 28E agreement. The proposed amendment would require ESS to publish a Scope and Specifications document which would apply to all counties and all local land record management service providers.

The draft amendments to Chapter 2 have been provided to the ICRA working group which is reviewing the 28E agreement and the ESS Policies and Procedures. The ESS Standards Subcommittee members were also asked to review the draft policy changes. The Project Manager affirmed that all service providers have been informed of the scope of work and specifications within the Iowa Land Records system. The information is contained in the current agreements with local service providers and is included in the online documentation for the E-Submission and County Upload application programming interfaces (APIs).

Cathy Voith moved to defer action on the proposed amendments to Chapter 2 of the ESS Policies and Procedures until the CR working group has had the opportunity to review and discuss them. Carolyn Siebrecht seconded, and the motion was approved.

Point of Sale Voids and Refunds

The Subcommittee was asked to review Section 1.5(11) of the Policies and Procedures concerning void and refund actions in the ESS point-of-sale (POS) payment system. Counties have been reminded that refunds should not be issued on the Point of Sale (POS) devices. This is because any refund would be paid by ESS and not the individual county. Instead, counties should VOID transactions when necessary by 5:45 p.m. each business day. If this does happen, a policy to issue a \$25 handling fee for each monthly invoice submitted to a county (for repayment) could be enforced.

To date, no county has been charged this fee, but recorders are encouraged to review payment details with their teams to avoid potential penalties. The Subcommittee was also informed of new signs being created for county offices to assist with communications about payment types accepted on card readers, including contactless payments.

ILR Applications E-Submission and Search

The Project Manager provided information to the Subcommittee about several topics relating to the ILR E-Submission and County Upload/Search software applications.

Alternative E-Submission Interface

Currently, ILR provides a web interface for county recorders to review documents submitted through the E-Submission service for recording. This provides a simple interface to view document images and a minimum amount of information (document type, one party name and if applicable transaction value, number of parcels, number of additional transactions and exemptions).

House File 1031 requires the creation of an alternative interface which might allow a recorder to review and act on a document from within their local land record management system. This will require substantive development work and resources, but it is possible to do. Some have asked for alternatives to the current E-Submission service, and this is one possibility. It was noted this provision of HF 1031 should be reviewed thoroughly.

Data Elements Requirements

ILR will be actively asking local land record management service providers to begin the switch to the new county upload API which facilitates the transfer of images and information from the county to ILR. This is a substantive update to technology, and is intended to serve counties, their local service providers and ILR for years to come. ILR will be using this opportunity to communicate with counties about the indexing data elements which should be mapped and transferred to ILR. A draft table of data element requirements for service providers was shared with the Subcommittee for review and discussion. The table is intended to more clearly communicate what data, if present in the local system, is expected to be transferred to the ILR system. It is hoped that this will contribute to more consistency among counties with respect to data accessibility and searchability. Information about this process will be updated at future meetings.

Notary Information

ILR recently received information that a local land record management system service provider may be activating indexing data elements relating to notaries. Indexing notary information could become a more common practice as a component of fraud detection systems. The ILR data schemas already provide the infrastructure for archiving notary information, because they have been a part of the PRIA standards upon which ILR is based. However, these data elements are inactive, because the information has generally not been present in county indexing systems. If counties begin to index this information, then it could be made accessible through ILR as well. The likely data elements to be indexed might be as follows.

- Notary commission number.
- Notary expiration date.
- The state in which the commission was granted.
- The name of the notary.

Another group of possible future data elements that could be more consistently indexed are consideration amounts. Data elements for mortgage loan amounts, property sale amounts and lien amounts are present in the schemas, but they are currently not activated.

No action on these topics was requested but could be discussed again in the future.

Legislative Update

The Subcommittee reviewed House File 1031 as it passed the House in 2025. The Project Manager informed the Subcommittee that the bill could undergo changes related to fees. If so, it would be possible to make other changes and improvements to the bill. A list of bill sections which could be refined, improved or perfected was provided to the Subcommittee for review. No action was requested.

Next Meeting

The meeting was adjourned. The next regular meeting of the ESS Standards Subcommittee is tentatively scheduled for October 23, 2025.

This Page Intentionally Blank

October 13, 2025

To: ESS Standards Subcommittee
ESS Coordinating Committee

From: Phil Dunshee, ILR Project Manager

Re: October 2025 ESS Standards Memo

The agenda for the upcoming Standards Subcommittee meeting includes background information about two separate but related issues.

- How does ESS and ILR establish and communicate requirements which are necessary to operate a statewide land records system?
- What standards should every county be expected to follow locally so that the content of the statewide database is more consistent and importantly, easily searchable?

Communicating Requirements

The statewide land records system cannot exist without information and cooperation from each county and their respective land record management system service providers. It was intentionally designed this way because recorders wanted to control the system and because they opposed the transfer of recording responsibilities to a state agency.

The communication and cooperation between ESS/ILR and the local LRMS providers, from a technical standpoint, occurs through the application programming interface (API) provided by ESS/ILR. This structure provides rules for exchanging data. An example is the new county upload API which is openly published at <https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/search/services/county/swagger-ui/index.html>. See the illustration on page 10. The APIs have evolved over time as technology has changed.

ESS and ILR have also communicated requirements in the form of policy, as reflected in the current version of Chapter 2 in the policies and procedures. A few excerpts illustrate this communication.

2.3(2) Counties, County Recorders and the indexing, document management and document imaging systems employed or used by them shall comply with the published XML Data and Messaging specifications when transferring or receiving information through the Electronic Services System and the county land record information system.

2.5(3) Notification of third-party service providers who provide indexing, document management and document imaging services to a county shall be implemented according to the terms of any service contract or agreement between the service provider and the Electronic Services System and county land record information system when applicable.

These policies have been in place since the original Policies and Procedures document was created in 2011.

Excerpts of the most recent version of a contract (2019) between ESS and a local service provider can be found beginning on page 11. Section 2 of the excerpt includes important definitions about the exchange of information. Notably there are separate definitions for a Complete Recorded Document and a Fully Indexed Recorded Document. The distinction is made to clarify that Complete Recorded Document information should be transferred to ILR quickly to allow time for the redaction process to be completed and to ensure that a document can be published on the website as soon as possible. On the other hand, it is understood that the task of performing all the indexing may take additional time. And this definition provides additional information about the data elements which are expected.

The contract provides additional information in the Scope of Work about business processes and functions which must be supported by integrating with the API. The most substantive communication with counties and the local LRMS system is found in the contract. The contract template and Exhibits are submitted to the ESS Coordinating Committee for review and approval whenever there is a substantive change. Simply publishing the API data structure is not sufficient for clear communication with counties and service providers.

When a local LRMS service provider withdraws from participation in the maintenance agreement, it seems appropriate to explore alternative processes to facilitate communication about expectations for data exchange and other business processes. Expecting an individual county or county recorder to know and understand all the technical and business expectations necessary to maintain communications between systems does not seem practical. This is the thinking behind the revised Chapter 2, which calls for the publication of a separate document outside of the service provider contracts to describe the scope and specifications. The policy would apply to all members of the 28E agreement AND it would also apply to a county which is not a member of the 28E agreement (referencing 331.604 (5) and 331.605B (7)) or to any LRMS service provider which is not a party to an ESS maintenance agreement.

This suggested process would be consistent with the recent action of a service provider to announce that they will no longer field requests directly from Iowa Land Records.

Data Element Standards

As noted above, standards for data elements have been a part of the discussion since the beginning of Iowa Land Records. The PRIA standard upon which ILR was based provided for parsed location descriptions including section, township, range, quarter section (quarter quarter section) and lot, block subdivision name and city/town. Indexing standards proposed as a part of the legislation in 2025 (SF 371) sought to clarify this further with an addition to Section 331.606

- d. A legal description and parsed location information shall be indexed if known. For platted land, the indexed information shall include the lot, block, subdivision name, *city or town*, and county. For unplatted land, the indexed information shall include the section, township, range, and quarter section. Indexing quarters of a quarter section is recommended but not required.

As a part of our preparations for the new county upload API, we have prepared additional documentation to illustrate the required and expected data elements from counties. See page 47 of the meeting packet. This is nearly complete. There are many more data elements in the PRIA/ESS schemas, but it is not expected that counties index everything.

Recently a question was raised about indexing city/town names. ESS/ILR has always expected counties to index and transfer city/town names with their location information (when platted). In response to a customer question, we have reviewed a small sample of recently recorded documents in each county to identify which counties index city/town and transfer it to ILR. This is not an exhaustive study, but it seems to show that most counties index this information. See page 50 for a summary report sorted by service provider.

ILR uses city/town names as a search element, and as demonstrated by a recent customer query, it is used. See page 53.

One further observation we would make is that the data element is not consistently indexed. Some counties index the full name. Others use an abbreviation. In some cases, we observed the use of punctuation in the name. We have also observed county names indexed when a plat is in an unincorporated area. This variance can make things difficult for a searcher if they don't know the conventions of a particular county. See page 54 for the full report.

We have suggested that, going forward, data elements should be more consistently indexed both in form and content. For platted land, the standard could be to index city/town names and to use the full name (not an abbreviation). Punctuation should not be used in this data element.

Action Requested: Members of the ESS and Standards committees are asked to consider this information in preparation for future discussions.

County Upload Rest API 1.0.0 OAS3

</search/services/county/v3/api-docs>

Additional documentation available [here](#)

Contact support@clris.com

Servers

Authorize

portal-rest-api-controller ^

- POST** `/api/archive` Archive document. ⌵
- GET** `/api/archiveStatus` Returns archive status for document(s). ⌵
- GET** `/api/auditDocumentInformation` Audit Document Information ⌵
- GET** `/api/downloadDoc/` Download document. ⌵
- GET** `/api/downloadRedactedDoc/` Download redacted document. ⌵
- GET** `/api/findCheckedNoRedaction` Returns a list of documents that have been checked for redaction but no redactions made. ⌵
- GET** `/api/readyForRedactionDownload` Returns a list of documents that were redacted and are ready for download. ⌵

Schemas ^

Excerpts from Standard ESS/LRMS Agreement 2019

Section 2. Definition of Terms

Agreement - this Maintenance and Support Agreement.

API - an application program interface, a set of routines, protocols, and tools for building software applications.

Complete Recorded Document - A recorded document which includes a document image in an authorized format accompanied by a minimum amount of associated data including at least one party name, a correctly mapped document type, the recording number used by a County (instrument number and/or the book and page numbers, and the date and time of recording).

Conversion - The process undertaken by a County to convert from one product version or type of Service Provider System to another Service Provider System provided by the same Service Provider, even when the product is delivered by a different division, branch or affiliate of the Service Provider's company.

County - any county which is a member of, or participates in, the Electronic Services System, and which participates in the electronic delivery of government services including but not limited to the Iowa Land Records system.

County Operating Hours - the hours of normal operation of the land records recording office of the applicable County during which documents are accepted or processed for recording.

Data - information which is transmitted to or received by a County, another government entity, the Electronic Services System, any private organization or citizen.

Defect - a flaw in the Deliverables that prevents the exchange of Data or the operation of a business function.

Deficiency - a failure, omission, interruption of service, or other problem of any nature whatsoever with respect to a Deliverable, including but not limited to any failure of a Deliverable to conform to or meet an applicable Specification.

Deliverables - the goods and services to be provided by Service Provider to ESS and each County as more specifically set forth in the exhibits attached hereto as Exhibits A, B and C where applicable.

Derivative Works – any modification of a Service Provider system which is required to integrate with an ESS API.

Developments - any HTML pages, database designs, training materials, application documentation, and any portion of application software specifically developed for ESS and each County.

Document Images – Images which are submitted for recording through the ILR E-Submission service in PDF format, which after recording are converted to the format specified by a County and Service Provider System for permanent archiving by the County, or images or recorded which are transferred to ESS and Iowa Land Records for public, registered user access through the Iowa Land Records web site.

Documentation - all technical information, commentary, design documents, code and test materials, training materials and guides, operator’s or user’s manuals, technical manuals, worksheets, and all other information, documentation and materials related to or used in conjunction with the Deliverables.

Electronic Services System (ESS) - the 28E governmental organization established by Iowa counties to facilitate the electronic delivery of government services.

Electronic Services System API (ESS API) - Any API created, owned and maintained by the Electronic Services System.

Electronic Services System Policies and Procedures – The official policies and procedures adopted by the ESS Coordinating Committee and the Executive Board of the Iowa County Recordors Association. As provided in Section 331.604 of the Code of Iowa, Subsection 3a, each county shall comply with the policies and procedures established by the governing boards.

E-Submission - the act or practice of electronically submitting and receiving documents for recording and archiving by a County.

Fully Indexed Recorded Document - A recorded document which includes a document image in an authorized format accompanied by all of the following data indexed in the Service Provider system: all party names (correctly parsed), a correctly mapped document type, location or legal descriptions (correctly parsed), the recording number used by a County (instrument number and/or the book and page numbers, and the date and time of recording, the recording reference number for any associated document archived in the Service Provider System, the Unique Code Value permanently assigned to the document, and the Parcel Identification Number, if present in Recorder’s index.

Iowa Land Records (ILR) - The applications and associated web sites and pages created, owned and maintained by the Electronic Services system to provide electronic access to recorded public documents, to facilitate E-Submission and electronic recording and to provide other electronic services.

Excerpts from Standard ESS/LRMS Agreement - 2019

Exhibit A: Scope of Work

Overview

The Electronic Services System (ESS) and systems governed and administered by ESS such as the Iowa Land Records web site and applications, is governed and managed under an intergovernmental 28E agreement established by Iowa counties. An ESS Coordinating Committee has the authority under Iowa law and the ESS 28E agreement to establish standards, policies, and requirements for the delivery of electronic services, and all member counties are required under the 28E agreement to comply with all policies established by ESS. The scope of these policies includes but is not limited to the following.

1. The format, attributes and organization of data and images of recorded documents in ESS and member systems
2. Business rules and requirements for the management and maintenance of data and images of recorded documents in ESS and member systems
3. Specifications and procedures for the transfer of data and images from local county systems to the Electronic Services system including Iowa Land Records
4. Specifications and procedures for the exchange of information and business processes associated with the electronic filing and recording of documents through ESS including the Iowa Land Record E-Submission service

Official policies relating to these subjects are published in the Electronic Services System Policies and Procedure. All ESS policies relating to the operations of a County, Iowa Land Records, a Service Provider or Service Provider System are incorporated herein by reference.

Business Functions and Operations

ESS has established and published the Electronic Services System API (ESS API) which provides for the form and method of exchanging information between ESS and any Service Provider System. The specifications for the ESS API are further described in Exhibit B.

Business and government functions performed through the ESS API by a Service Provider and Service Provider System in service to a County include the following.

- A. The transfer of correctly formatted and mapped data and images associated with recently recorded documents to ESS and Iowa Land Records database application and image repository. Counties are required to transfer a **Complete Recorded Document** to ESS and Iowa Land Records not later than three business days after the time of recording. Service Provider shall provide a mechanism for

automatically transferring records which fulfill the definition of a Complete Recorded Document to ESS and Iowa Land Records. Such transfers, subject to the approval of a county recorder, shall be set to occur no less frequently than each business day.

- B. The transfer of data associated with a Fully Indexed Recorded Document to the ESS and Iowa Land Records database application and image repository. Counties are required to transfer all recorded document information which is archived in an electronic format. The data associated with a Fully Indexed Recorded Document shall be correctly mapped to the published and parsed data elements (with correct attributes) and shall be transferred to ESS and Iowa Land Records no less frequently than each business day.
- C. The transfer of data updates for a Fully Indexed Recorded Document to the ESS and Iowa Land Records Portal application. Data updates include but are not limited to the correction of typographical errors in party names, location or legal descriptions or other information, the addition of new information such as an associated document reference or redaction annotations. New, updated, or corrected data associated with a Fully Indexed Recorded Document shall be transferred to ESS and Iowa Land Records not later than one business day after the data is archived in County and the Service Provider System.
- D. The transfer of corrected replacement images associated with a Completed Recorded Document or a Fully Indexed Recorded Document to the ESS and Iowa Land Records Portal application. The transfer or replacement of an image requires the advance approval of personnel designated by ESS and Iowa Land Records. A County is required to maintain a permanent, unaltered archive of a recorded document, and may replace an image only in defined and authorized conditions.
- E. The retrieval of document images, or the annotation information or metadata associated with images which have been redacted to remove personally identifiable information from the ESS and Iowa Land Records Portal application. The ESS API provides a method which may be called by a Service Provider and Service Provider System to retrieve redacted documents and redaction information for use by the County and Service Provider System.
- F. The retrieval of information about electronically submitted documents which have been approved by a county recorder for recording from the ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission Service, and the provision of an interface through the Service Provider System to assign a recording number used by a County (instrument number and/or the book and page numbers, and the date and time of recording).
- G. The return of the assigned recording number used by a County (instrument number and/or the book and page numbers), and the date and time of recording to ESS and the Iowa Land Records E-Submission Service through the ESS API. The information is used by ESS and Iowa Land Records to place a recording stamp on the document image.

- H. The retrieval of the stamped document image for archiving in the County and Service Provider System from the ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission service.
- I. The monitoring of response messages from the ESS and Iowa Land Records portal and the ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission Service
- J. The monitoring of response messages from the ESS and Iowa Land Records database application and image repository and the ESS and County Upload Service
- K. Corrective action with respect to any errors or issues which are identified in the response messages

The specifications for these operations are further described in the ESS API documentation and Exhibit B.

Service Provider ESS API Developments

Each Service Provider is responsible for developing and maintaining the necessary software and systems to facilitate the exchange of information between the County and Service Provider System and ESS and the Iowa Land Records system using the ESS API and the associated specifications and requirements published by ESS. Such software exists and is operational as the Term of this agreement begins based on work performed in prior years. These Service Provider ESS API Developments by the Service Provider must be maintained to ensure that the exchange of information and the business functions described herein are performed successfully and timely. Therefore, an important element of this Maintenance and Support Agreement requires the Service Provider to maintain Service Provider ESS API Developments. As modifications are made by the Service Provider to the Service Provider System for any reason, Derivative Works may be required by the Service Provider to ensure that the exchange of information through the ESS API does not fail and continues without error or interruption.

As a part of the Maintenance and Support responsibilities, the Service Provider shall establish methods for maintaining and monitoring log files for the Service Provider ESS API Developments which may be used to diagnose and resolve any issues. All messaging between Service Provider System and Service Provider ESS API Developments and ESS applications through the ESS API shall be logged. All log files shall be maintained for a period of not less than thirty (30) calendar days. In the event that a processing error or failure occurs, Service Provider shall review the logs to identify to the source of the error or failure and to determine a resolution to the issue. When collaboration with ESS is necessary to resolve an issue, Service Provider shall provide to ESS with a copy of the relevant event log via e-mail or FTP.

The Scope of Work includes activities which may involve troubleshooting and corrective steps with respect to Service Provider System when the exchange of information does not work as required or expected. Errors and failures may either be reported through

ESS API messages or by ESS or Iowa Land Records Personnel. The ESS and ILR team members will work collaboratively with Service Providers to identify and resolve any issues which affect the operations of ESS and Iowa Land Records. However, it is the Service Provider's responsibility to make any necessary changes, corrections or updates to Service Provider ESS API Developments and its integration with the ESS API.

ESS and Iowa Land Records Updates

ESS and Iowa Land Records is committed to remaining current with generally accepted industry standards for land records, real estate information, electronic recording and related systems including notary services. Standards will be continuously developed, adopted, and published by the Electronic Services System - based on standards adopted and published by the Property Records Industry Association (PRIA), the Mortgage Industry Standards Maintenance Organization (MISMO), other recognized standards setting organizations, and by ESS governing boards and committees.

ESS and Iowa Land Records is also committed to the implementation of appropriate industry security systems and protocols, and the security requirements of partner organizations including but not limited to the State of Iowa and federal agencies such as the Internal Revenue Service.

ESS and Iowa Land Records will also continuously seek to improve its applications and software including the ESS API.

From time to time issues may arise which are of mutual interest to ESS and the Service Provider. The resolution of such issues may require an update to the ESS API or JSON/XML. Subject to the mutual agreement of ESS and the Service Provider, a change or update may be developed and implemented.

As a part of the Maintenance and Support responsibilities, when ESS makes a change or update, it is required that the Service Provider will make any necessary and corresponding updates to the Service Provider System, any Derivative Works, and Service Provider ESS API Developments. Such changes are to be included in the Scope of Work under the Terms of this Agreement.

ESS Update Processes

ESS will provide Service Provider notice of any planned changes or updates to the ESS API, or to the JSON/XML. Such notice will be provided not less than 90 days prior to implementation. Service Providers will generally be provided with information about planned changes as a part of ESS and ILR quarterly updates and meetings.

ESS will work in collaboration with Service Provider concerning the scheduling of any release to facilitate the coordination of the installation with other work being

performed by the Service Provider. ESS will answer service provider questions and accept reasonable requests for changes in the time frame for testing and implementation. ESS will also consider a reasonable request from a Service Provider for modifications to an update, provided that the changes can be implemented by ESS and any other Service Providers.

Prior to the release of any update or change to the ESS API or JSON/XML, ESS will install the update or change in a staging environment for the purposes of testing. Each Service Provider will be provided with appropriate credentials to access the staging environment, and ESS strongly encourages Service Provider to test any update during the notice period, and to communicate any concerns or issues to ESS personnel.

The Service Provider should provide ESS administrators with notification in writing (email is acceptable) when any testing is complete and when they are ready to proceed with implementation. At the conclusion of any published notice or testing period, if Service Provider has not expressed any concerns or issues, ESS will assume that Service Provider has accepted the update and is prepared to move forward with the implementation of the change or update.

Changes or updates which require synchronous installation shall be installed in a Service Provider County within five business days.

Changes or updates which do NOT require synchronous installation shall be installed in a Service Provider County within thirty business days.

ESS reserves the right to deviate from Update Processes described herein, and to require a change or update in the event that such an update is needed to address an unplanned and serious system failure or error.

Significant ESS Updates

If a planned change or update meets either of the following conditions, Service Provider may request supplemental compensation for such work subject to the mutual agreement of the Parties.

- a. a change or update planned by ESS will require significant and substantive development work far beyond what might be considered an incremental update or correction to a Service Provider System, any Derivative Works, and Service Provider ESS API Developments, and
- b. a planned change or update is not related to an ESS Business Function or Operation, the fulfillment of a new or updated standard, or current security standards as described herein

County Recorder Support

In addition to ensuring the operation of Service Provider ESS API Developments and the integration of the Service Provider System with ESS through the ESS API, the Service Provider shall serve as the primary point of contact and support for issues relating to the operation of the Service Provider ESS API Developments and the successful implementation of the Business Functions and Operations described herein. The key functions which may require support and maintenance services to county recorders are summarized as follows.

- The transfer of current and historical Fully Indexed Recorded Documents to ESS including any updates or corrections
- The transfer of document information updates to ESS
- The retrieval of redaction document information
- The retrieval of documents through the ESS E Submission Service and associated functions including recording, indexing and archiving the documents received
- Correcting errors, and addressing issues related to Service Provider ESS API Developments with respect to communication and integration with the ESS API

Service Provider shall provide county recorders and ESS with a technical customer support contact which should include a support e-mail address and telephone number, and a customer support web site if available. Service provider shall also provide contact information for other roles including the following: general customer support, business and contract matters, bill project management or system conversion managers.

Service Provider shall notify ESS administrators of all system issues or errors which may affect and require ESS investigation or action by submitting a report via email to support@clris.com. If the issue or error requires immediate attention, Service provider shall also notify a customer support contact at a telephone number specified by ESS.

Service Provider and ESS each agree to use best efforts to maintain its systems and services in full effective operation for each County during 99.9% of the respective County Operating Hours, except for downtimes mutually agreed upon by ESS, the County and Service Provider, or downtimes arising from any disruption in Internet (ISP) services, or from causes beyond the control of the parties. Service Provider and ESS will each make every effort to schedule system downtime outside of County Operating Hours. However, in the event that either Party is required to schedule downtime during County Operating Hours, the Party scheduling the downtime will collaborate with the Counties and with the other Parties to notify administrators, users and system technicians for work planning purposes.

The Parties agree to use commercially reasonable efforts to immediately identify and work to resolve disruptions to the Business Functions and Operations and disruptions to information exchanges through the ESS API.

The Parties agree to use commercially reasonable efforts to respond immediately to technical support incidents initiated by the other Party or by a County. The Parties further agree to use commercially reasonable efforts to address any interruption to service.

Service Provider shall, in collaboration with ESS and county recorders, seek to ensure the success of the ESS system.

In the event that the Service Provider is unable to resolve any issue affecting Business Functions and Operations, Service Provider shall immediately contact ESS at the specified telephone number or email address. The Service Provider shall provide both a concise summary and a detailed description of the problem. All applicable log files and related ESS API request/response files shall be timely provided to ESS.

After receiving the pertinent information from the Service Provider, ESS personnel will review the information and assist as practicable. ESS shall contact Service Provider at a specified telephone number or email address. ESS shall provide to the best of their ability a concise summary and a detailed description of the problem. All applicable log files and related ESS API request/response files will be timely provided to the Service Provider.

E-Recording Fees

It is the responsibility of the Service Provider to ensure that the correct recording fees and related information for an ILR E-Submitted document can be correctly inserted into the Service Provider System including any cashiering functions, whenever applicable.

County Recorder Support Exclusions

This Agreement does not apply to maintenance or support for the operation of the Service Provider System, e.g., local land record management system. Maintenance and support for the basic operation of Service Provider System shall be the responsibility of the Service Provider under the direction of an individual County or county recorder.

This Agreement does not apply to any training provided to a County, county recorder or their employees with respect to the interface between the Service Provider System, Derivative Works, or Service Provider ESS API Developments and the ESS systems. Training shall be the responsibility of the responsibility of the Service Provider under the direction of an individual County or county recorder.

This Agreement does not apply to activities relating to the parsing of names or legal (location) descriptions, or other necessary changes to the indexing data or other data associated with recorded documents. Such activities shall be the responsibility of an individual County or county recorder.

This Agreement does not apply to activities relating to the electronic indexing or image conversion of historical records. Such activities shall be the responsibility of an individual County or county recorder.

Upon the request of a county recorder, the Service Provider shall generally advise and assist with efforts to ensure access to sufficient bandwidth to transmit and receive Data and Images through the ESS API. However, each County will be responsible for acquiring any necessary hardware, software or Internet services or technical assistance services required to support communications between the County, Service Provider System and ESS systems.

Reports

Service Provider shall provide each Service Provider County with a method or tool for creating a report concerning the transfer of data and images to the ESS and Iowa Land Records database application and image repository during the previous business day. The reports should include the following information, when possible.

- Summary information about the number of Complete Recorded Documents and Fully Indexed Recorded Documents successfully transferred to ESS and Iowa Land Records during the previous business day.
- A table showing the document reference number and/or Book and Page associated with each document (or index update) successfully transferred to ESS and Iowa Land Records during the previous business day
- A table showing the document reference number and/or Book and Page associated with each document for which the transfer to ESS and Iowa Land Records failed during the previous business day, along with any error message returned by ESS and Iowa Land Records to the Service Provider system.
- If no records were transferred by a Service Provider County during the previous business day, the report should include a message similar to the following: "Alert – No records were transferred to ESS and Iowa Land Records during the previous business day. Please contact [service provider contact information] for assistance."

Service Provider agrees to work in collaboration with ESS to define and develop the reports described above.

Service Provider shall provide a periodic report via email (support@clris.com) which summarizes any notable activities or issues which have required an unusual level of support services during the previous period, and a summary of any issues communicated to the ESS development team.

Service Provider shall annually provide a report regarding each Service Provider County. (Exhibit C) The report shall include the following information.

- The name of the County
- The IP address used by the Service Provider to exchange County information with ESS and Iowa Land Records
- The Product Name of the Service Provider System, and any version number if applicable
- If the Service Provider System is hosted, the general location of the hosted system, or the hosting service, if applicable
- The names, addresses, e-mail addresses and phone numbers of appropriate personnel (or support systems) for business issues billing, customer support and technical support.

Additional reports shall be provided to ESS upon request subject to the mutual agreement of the Parties.

Periodic Service Provider Meetings/Conference Calls

Service Provider shall to the best of their ability ensure that a representative will participate in ESS Service Provider conference calls. Conference calls will generally be scheduled quarterly or as needed.

When necessary, ESS may convene face-to-face meetings at mutually agreeable locations and times. ESS will reimburse participants for actual travel and lodging expenses. Compensation for professional time dedicated to the meeting may also be provided subject to mutual agreement. The terms of such reimbursement shall be specified by ESS at the time plans for any face-to-face meetings are announced.

ESS Quality Assurance Activities

From time to time ESS and Iowa Land Records will conduct a review of the data and images for an individual County to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the information transferred to ESS and Iowa Land Records. The Service Provider may be asked to assist with related activities as needed, such as the provision of simple reports which may be used for comparison. The extent and timing of such activities shall be subject to the mutual agreement of the Service Provider, the county recorder, and ESS and Iowa Land Records.

Service Provider System Conversions and Migrations

While Service Providers and Service Provider Systems must conform to the requirements of the ESS Policies and Procedures and the Terms and Conditions of this Agreement, it is the responsibility of the County to select the company or organization to serve as the land record management system vendor or Service Provider for the County. From time to time a County may choose to work with their Service Provider to implement a conversion from one product or version of a product to another, or a County may choose to implement a migration from one Service Provider System to another system offered by a different Service Provider.

In circumstances involving either a Conversion or a Migration, it is required that the Service Provider work in collaboration with ESS and other parties, including other Service Providers which provide land record management Service Provider Systems, to ensure that the Conversion or Migration is successful. Further, the Service Provider is required to communicate with ESS and to engage in any necessary development and testing to ensure that the Service Provider ESS API Developments conform to all ESS and Iowa Land Records Requirements and to validate that Service Provider System is correctly configured to successfully exchange information with ESS and Iowa Land Records. Activities required by the Service Provider to fulfill these requirements shall include the following.

1. When a County and a Service Provider reach an agreement to migrate from one Service Provider to another, or to convert from one product or product version to another product or product version the Service Provider will notify and supply to ESS the planned time frame for implementation of the conversion or migration in a timely fashion. The planned time frame should include development, testing, implementation, and any anticipated times when County recording functions or communication/transmittal with ESS processes may be disrupted.
2. With respect to testing, Service Provider shall inform ESS and Iowa Land Records when active testing is underway. Using credentials provided to the Service Provider by ESS, the Service Provider shall use the ESS and Iowa Land Records staging environment to test and validate the exchange of information. Assuming that proper advance notice is provided as described in Section 3 herein, ESS personnel will assist with testing and data verification.
3. The Service Provider shall test the Business Functions and Operations described in Exhibit A. More specifically, Service Provider shall do the following.
 - a. Verify with ESS that they are connected to the correct staging web pages with the correct credentials and verify that the credentials are being used to access the staging environment from an identified and static IP address.

- b. Verify that data and images can be transferred to the staging environment without error.
- c. Verify that the County Data, specifically the document types, are mapped correctly to the ESS and Iowa Land Records approved PRIA document types. It is recommended that the Service Provider provide ESS and Iowa Land Records personnel with a complete mapping table for review and approval prior to active testing. All document types must be validated in testing.
- d. Verify that parsed name and legal or location description information is mapped to the correct ESS and Iowa Land Records JSON/XML data elements with the correct attributes.
- e. Verify that all other County Data, including but not limited to associated references, consideration amounts, instrument dates, parcel identification numbers (if present), and image annotations and redaction annotations (relating to the presence or location of personally identifiable information (PII) in a document), are mapped to the correct ESS and Iowa Land Records JSON/XML data elements with the correct attributes.
- f. Verify that certain information is NOT transferred to ESS and Iowa Land Records including vital records and military status information.
- g. Verify the implementation of a Conversion or Migration will retain the existing ESS and Iowa Land Record ILR Unique Code Value for previously recorded documents. Modifying the Unique Code Value for any archived document is prohibited. Changes in the format of Code values for day-forward recorded documents shall be timely communicated to ESS and Iowa Land Records personnel. A Service Provider may, subject to the approval of ESS, request consideration for assigning new Unique Code value to existing documents, provided that the Service Provider can demonstrate the capacity to provide a one-to-one mapping for every document showing the current Unique Code value and the proposed new Unique Code value. In a form and time specified by ESS, the Service Provider is required to provide a mapping table so that it may be used to correctly modify the values in the ESS and Iowa Land Records System.
- h. Verify that transfer processes to ESS and Iowa Land Records may be set to occur programmatically (without Recorder intervention) daily when a document has a status of Complete Recorded Document. Processes for manually sending data and image updates to ILR shall also be tested and verified. Note, updated or replacement images may not be transferred except with the advanced approval of designated ESS personnel.
- i. Verify that the County and the Service Provider System is able to programmatically check for redacted document information from ESS and Iowa Land Records and verify the operation of methods for retrieving either redacted images or the redaction coordinates.

- j. Communicate any other unique issues or circumstances with designated ESS and Iowa Land Records personnel. For example, communicate whether the Service Provider System requires a TIF image format, a single page, or a multipage format.
 - k. Verify that the image formats have the correct compression type and conform with other format requirements, i.e., the following image compression formats are prohibited: LZW, Old Style JPEG, JPEG, JBIG, Packbits or other formats which do not conform to the specified Group 3 or Group 4 options.
 - l. Verify the methods for checking for ILR E-Submission documents with a status of "Ready For Download".
 - m. Verify the methods (and timing) of downloading data and images for e-filed documents.
 - n. Verify the methods for assigning recording reference numbers and recording dates and times to downloaded e-filed documents and returning the required information to ILR.
 - o. Verify the methods for retrieving stamped or unstamped document images from ILR E-Submission and verify, as is the method for archiving the document in a County.
 - p. Verify that a document downloaded and archived from the ILR E-Submission service will then be transferred to the ILR Portal when the document achieves status of Complete Recorded Document or Fully Indexed Recorded Document.
4. Upon the completion of testing and verification, ESS and Iowa Land Records will timely provide the Service Provider with a written notice of acceptance.

Exhibit B: Specifications and Performance Standards

ESS requires that all Service Providers integrate with ESS and the Iowa Land Records system through the ESS API (web services). The Service Provider System and any Derivative works must communicate with ESS through the ESS API. The ESS API provides a means for presenting raw functions to interact with data and processes at ESS and Iowa Land Records. Unlike the legacy client model (known as the LCM), the ESS API does not manage the scheduling and timing of web service calls; calling the web service methods in the correct order; logging; data validation; error handling and reporting; and the marshalling and unmarshalling of XML or JSON. These functions must be performed by the Service Provider ESS API Developments created by the Service Provider.

In summary, the Service Provider ESS API Developments created and maintained by the Service Provider must manage and coordinate the following functions.

- The scheduling and timing of web service methods
- The sequence of web service methods to ensure that processes are executed in the correct order
- Logging
- Data Validation
- Error handling and reporting
- Marshalling and Unmarshalling of XML or JSON

ESS will provide Service Providers with the necessary credentials and settings to access the ESS API and make any necessary web service calls.

ESS API Web Service Specifications

The ESS API documents are intended to be living documents that will be updated periodically by ESS and Iowa Land Records technical staff in order to relay current requirements to consumers of ILR Web Services. Notice of changes to these documents will be provided to Service Providers as changes are made, subject to the ESS Update Processes described in Appendix A. The ESS API for the ILR E-Submission service and ILR County Upload service can be found at the following locations:

CUAPI - <https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/search/services/county/swagger-ui/index.html>

CESAPI - <https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/esubmission/services/county/swagger-ui/index.html>

Notices of Discontinuance - LCM

Support for the LCM Client for E-Submission will be discontinued effective **September 30, 2023**. Service Providers who currently utilize the LCM for E-Submission activities shall prepare Service Provider ESS API Developments for E-Submission conforming to the requirements of the E-Submission Rest API (CESAPI).

Support for the LCM Client for County Upload Functions will be discontinued effective **September 30, 2024**. Service Providers who currently utilize the LCM for County Upload activities shall prepare Service Provider ESS API Developments for E-Submission conforming to the requirements of the County Upload Rest API (CUAPI).

Notices of Discontinuance – SOAP API

Support for the current ILR E-Submission Client API will be discontinued effective **June 30, 2024**. Service Providers who currently utilize the ILR E-Submission Client API should, as soon as possible, proceed with Service Provider ESS API Developments for E-Submission functions conforming to the requirements of the E-Submission Rest API (CE API).

ESS has nearly completed development of the new County Upload REST API and it will soon be available for testing. Support for the current ILR County Upload Client API will be discontinued effective **September 30, 2024**. Service Providers who currently utilize the ILR County Upload Client API should, as soon as possible, proceed with Service Provider ESS API Developments for County Upload functions conforming to the requirements of the County Upload Rest API (CUAPI).

ESS is available to assist Service Providers with testing and implementation. Service Providers are encouraged to schedule time proactively with advance notice to the ILR development team for technical assistance and testing.

JSON

In order to simplify the handling and exchange of data through the County Upload Rest API (CUAPI), ESS is adopting JSON (JavaScript Object Notation). It provides a lightweight data-interchange format that all service providers should be able to use. When and if a standard is adopted, service providers should expect that ESS will move toward the adoption of a published standard.

Service Provider ESS API Developments – Processes

Service Provider ESS API Developments for exchanging information with the ESS API should be configured to run whenever the Service Provider System is operating, and if the Service Provider System is restarted for any reason, Service Provider ESS API Developments should also be configured to restart. Business Functions and Operations described in Exhibit A and which are to be fulfilled by processes incorporated within Service Provider ESS API Developments include the following.

ESS and Iowa Land Records County Upload and E-Submission Processes

- The transfer of information relating to recorded documents in electronic format to the ESS and Iowa Land Records portal using the specified ESS API and JSON.

This process will track the UniqueCountyRequestID for each message and automatically schedule the corresponding status process until all submitted messages have received a final disposition status.

- The notification to the county recorder that an electronically submitted document is ready for review in the ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission service. This process returns a status message indicating whether groups exist in the 'Ready for Recorder' state.
- The downloading of 'Recorder Approved' submissions from the ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission service. This process also downloads re-stamped documents.
- The process of sending newly assigned indexing information to the ILR E-Submission server in order to affix a recording stamp to the first page.
- The downloading of 'Stamped' submissions from the ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission service. This process downloads the image of recorded and stamped documents.

Note: For messaging in the ILR E-Submission service, the sequence of a download shall be based on the sequence id in the submission

E-Submission Stamp Correction Process

In certain circumstances it is possible that an electronically recorded document may be stamped incorrectly. Recorders may correct this error with a new stamped image created by providing the corrected stamp data points through the ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission user interface. This error correction process is only available after a group has been previously and successfully recorded. A corrected document image is made available to the original submitter and it is made available to the County and the Service Provider System for download through the ESS API.

The Service Provider System may either programmatically monitor the ESS API for images with corrected recording stamps, or manually call the ESS API, and retrieve and archive the corrected image in the County and Service Provider System. The format of the available image will be the TIFF version as specified by the County and the Service Provider.

Scheduling Available Processes

The Service Provider is responsible for the timely processing of all messaging transactions. In order to facilitate the timely processing of related messaging, Service Provider ESS API Developments shall include methods for programmatically scheduling all messaging processes.

Web Service Call Limitations

Web services calls to the ESS API may be subject to limitations in order to prevent abuse from excessive or unnecessary demands on resources for the ESS API or for Service Provider ESS API Developments. Web service calls are counted per endpoint key and IP address. When using the default endpoint URL, the limit is one call per thirty (30) second interval. When the limit is exceeded, the API will return an error.

Data Validation

ESS and Iowa Land Records have established various policies and standards relating to the organization and formatting of data (see ESS Policies and Procedures). These policies govern a number of topics including but not limited to the indexing of grantor/grantee names, the parsing of name information, the parsing of legal or location description information, and the mapping of certain information maintained by a County through a Service Provider System to the format specified by ESS such as document types.

As a part of the Maintenance and Support responsibilities the Service Provider shall validate that the data exchanged with ESS and the Iowa Land Records system as well as the JSON container for the data conform to these policies. At a minimum, any data, including embedded data such as document images, shall conform to this requirement. The Service Provider is also encouraged to work with client Counties to ensure that the data maintained in the Service Provider System also conform with these policies.

Monitoring ESS API response messages

The Service Provider is responsible for monitoring all response messages returned from the ESS API. In addition to the normal messages associated with the execution and completion of the Business Functions and Operations described herein, the Service Provider shall actively monitor all error and failure messages. The receipt of an error or failure message shall trigger an alert to a Service Provider technical account or user so that remediation and mitigation steps can be timely implemented. Whenever necessary, the Service Provider shall make necessary changes and updates to Service Provider ESS API Developments in order prevent the reoccurrence of any error or failure. If issues are identified which indicate that the source of an error or failure is the ESS API, the Service Provider shall immediately submit a support request to support@clris.com or by calling 1-888.790.2246.

Generally, the Service Providers should use existing tools and processes to monitor information transfers and to diagnose the reason for failed uploads. Monitoring should be timely, and extended periods of failed information transfers should not occur. Status checks are being run shortly after the upload process occurs (within minutes). Similarly, after a fix is implemented, service providers should be able to confirm resolution through the API by invoking the “archiveStatus” function to verify it returns a Posted status.

The current ESS API provides an “archiveStatus” function that returns the status of an upload provided it reached the ILR web service interface – either Received, Posted, or Failed. If “Failed” is returned, additional messages are returned within the response.

For more information about web service functions, see “*County Upload and E-Submission Web Service Timing*” in the Other Specifications and Technical Requirements section.

Operation of Service Provider ESS API Developments

Service Provider ESS API Developments for exchanging information with the ESS API should be configured to run whenever the Service Provider System is operating, and if the Service Provider System is restarted for any reason, Service Provider ESS API Developments should also be configured to restart.

XML

Until Service Provider API Developments are migrated to CESAPI (County E-Submission) and CUAPI (County Upload), all Messaging between a County, Service Provider System and Service Provider ESS API Developments and the ESS Iowa Land Records applications must be valid XML documents according to published DTD or Schema specifications. During the transition period it is required that Service Provider ESS API Developments be capable of processing all valid XML files associated with Service Provider responsibilities in a County (processing and archiving data and/or images).

The current specification for XML messages and the contained PRIA_DOCUMENT content (including embedded files) can be accessed via the following DTD's:

PRIA Document
http://iowalandrecords.org/portal/dtd/ESS_PRIA_DOCUMENT.dtd
PRIA Request
http://iowalandrecords.org/portal/dtd/ESS_PRIA_Request.dtd
PRIA Response
http://iowalandrecords.org/portal/dtd/ESS_PRIA_Response.dtd

Programming Language

Service providers may use a programming language of their choice to handle the integration. However, the choice of technology should take into consideration the stability and durability of the language. For purposes of managing ongoing maintenance and support functions, solutions utilizing languages not in the mainstream should be avoided. Current implementations utilize .Net, Java, and Powerbuilder. Service providers should advise of any current programming tools in use. ESS is not responsible for

providing service providers sample integration code but may do so as a courtesy to the Service Provider.

Testing

As noted in Exhibit A, ESS provides a staging environment for the Service Provider for developing and testing their integration code. ILR encourages use of this functionality and will provide a reasonable amount of test data for the service provider to use. Service Providers shall communicate with ESS personnel about testing activities including the time of testing, the functions being tested, the sample county credentials being used for testing (if applicable), and the public IP address of the devices being used in the testing process. Service providers who are known to be actively testing will be notified of any staging environment down time.

The locations of the ESS and Iowa Land Records staging services are:

ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission WSDL:

<https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/esubmission/services/ESubmissionClientService?wsdl>

ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission service:

<https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/esubmission/services/ESubmissionClientService>

ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission site:

<https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/esubmission/>

ESS and Iowa Land Records Portal WSDL:

<https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/xmlservice/services/PortalClientService?wsdl>

ESS and Iowa Land Records Portal service:

<https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/xmlservice/services/PortalClientService>

ESS and Iowa Land Records Portal site:

<https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/portal>

Before moving to production, Service Providers will be given a list of processes to test and will be required to demonstrate that their client systems function as specified by the ESS API documents. If the validation process is not successful, development work will continue until the requirements are met. If this validation process is successful, arrangements will be made between ILR staff and the Service Provider to promote the integration code to production.

Other Specifications and Technical Requirements

There are a number of other specifications and technical requirements, in addition to the specifications and requirements relating to the exchange of information between a County, a Service Provider System, Service Provider ESS API Developments and ESS applications through the ESS API. These other specifications and requirements are described below.

_Code Values

A Unique Code Value is a reference value assigned to a document by a County, county recorder or Service Provider which uniquely identifies each document within a County and which associates indexed document information with an archived image of the document or instrument. Every document archived by a County in a Service Provider system, whether locally or in a hosted environment, must have a permanently assigned unique code value. The purpose of this code value is to assure that every document can be uniquely identified and distinguished from all other documents in a county regardless of year.

For counties that elect to use services from different indexing and imaging providers, the Service Providers shall jointly be responsible for accurate and consistent assignment of <PRIA_DOCUMENT Code=""...> Values. The "Code" value is used to link index and image information for the ESS Search application. Without matching "Code" values for a given County's unique document, the image information will not be displayed.

ESS Policies and Procedures require that unique code value for each document be permanently assigned and remain unchanged even there is a change in Service Provider. See Section 3.7(9) of the ESS Policies and Procedures. "In the event that a County changes the indexing or imaging service, as applicable, the County and the new service provider shall retain any previously assigned Unique Code Value for each document and any Unique Code Value for associated documents."

While not a requirement, ESS encourages Counties and Service Providers to use the following unique code value convention for documents which are recorded in the future: a character string with the following elements: county number, year of recording, and the document reference number assigned to each document in the County and Service Provider System.

County Upload and E-Submission Web Service Timing

In order to ensure the availability of ESS system resources for county recorders, Service Providers and registered users, the following timing requirements apply to the frequency of calls Portal and E-Submission web service communications.

E-Submission Web Service (CESAPI)

Typical business hours for county recorders fall within the range of 6:00 AM CST to 6:00 PM CST. Web service calls to the ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission service should, in most circumstances, occur within this time frame. E-Submission documents should not be processed outside of those hours.

Calls to the ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission service shall conform to the following frequency guidelines:

findReadyForRecorder - Maximum frequency of calls: once every two minutes.

findReadyForDownload - Maximum frequency of calls: once every two minutes.

downloadDoc - Maximum frequency of calls: as needed based on the results of findReadyForDownload.

submitStampInfo - Maximum frequency of calls: as needed based on the number of E-submission documents that have been downloaded via downloadDoc

County Upload Web Service (CUAPI)

Frequency requirements for web service calls to the ESS and Iowa Land Records Search application (County Upload) are applicable 24/7/365. Calls to the ESS and Iowa Land Records Portal shall conform to the following frequency guidelines:

archive - Maximum frequency of calls: often as deemed necessary by the county to archive documents; Minimum frequency of calls: once per business day to archive documents. Newly archived documents are transferred for redaction services each night. It is recommended that all recently recorded documents be archived to the ESS and Iowa Land Records portal no later than 11:00 PM each weeknight to ensure timely redaction processing.

archiveStatus - Maximum frequency of calls: as needed based on the number of archives processed, and prior status checks

sendAudit - Maximum frequency of calls: as needed based on the county policy to transmit document audits.

auditStatus - Maximum frequency of calls: as needed based on the number of audit records processed, and prior status checks.

findRedactionReady - Maximum frequency of calls: once per hour.

downloadDoc - Maximum frequency of calls: as needed based on the results of findRedactionReady.

auditDocument - Maximum frequency of calls: at the Service Providers discretion. However, ESS and Iowa Land Records reserves the right to require Service Provider to alter the request schedule if it is determined that frequency is impacting system performance or if repeated excessive auditing occurs. For example, there is no need to audit the entire county inventory of documents every day or even every week.

Imaging

ESS has established the Adobe PDF format as the standard for document imaging for the display of images at iowalandrecords.org. However, images received from and delivered to local county systems shall be in TIFF format compatible with local imaging systems.

ESS and Iowa Land Records Search Application

The images submitted for inclusion in the Iowa Land Records (ESS) database are to be provided in valid TIFF format by the Service Provider. The Service Provider shall also ensure that the TIFF images provided to the Iowa Land Records (ESS) system are properly oriented for reading and shall assist county records with efforts to properly orient document images when they are initially scanned and archived in local document image systems. TIFF images may be provided as single or multi-page format consistent with the manner in which documents are archived for local systems. The TIFF images submitted must be the original un-redacted version.

All embedded files transferred to the ESS and Iowa Land Records Portal must be B64 or UU encoded, and otherwise conform to the specifications published in the ESS API. Images shall not be transferred as Packed bits, LZW, JPEG formats. If Service Provider efforts to convert images to supported formats are unsuccessful, ESS will attempt to assist if possible.

TIFF Image Format

It is the responsibility of the Service Provider to notify ESS and Iowa Land Records of the specific TIFF format (single or multi-page) applicable to each of the Service Providers Counties, including any variances in TIFF format by date range. Images to Counties and Service Provider Systems will be in TIFF format compatible with local imaging systems.

In the event that a county transitions to a different local Service Provider for land record management services, it is the responsibility of the new Service Provider to notify ESS and Iowa Land Records of any activities affecting the TIFF format for documents which were recorded and archived prior to the conversion to a new system and new Service Provider. See the section titled "Service Provider System Conversions and Migrations."

E-Submission Images

The embedded file(s) in all submissions downloaded from the ILR E-Submission service will be in TIFF format. The format will conform to the format requested by the county.

Recording Information for E-Submission Documents

When a document submitted through the ESS and Iowa Land Records E-Submission service is recorded, the Service Provider shall update the following data points, when applicable, in the JSON document and return them to the ESS and Iowa Land Records ILR E-Submission service through the ESS API.

Book and Page
Instrument Number
Number
Page Range
Recording Date and Time
Unique Document ID

TLS

Service Provider shall ensure that the integration and communications with ESS and Iowa Land Records systems will conform to TLS 1.1 or above. TLS 1.0 is no longer permitted. This requirement includes automated messaging between systems.

Recording Date and Time

All recording date information transferred to ESS and Iowa Land Records shall include the following: yyyy-MM-dd:HH:mm:ss:SSS. This is assuming that the Service Provider Counties have entered the above information in their files. It is the County's responsibility to correctly enter the complete information for transmittal. The Service Provider System shall provide the ability to do so. This requirement applies to all documents recorded on or after July 1, 2013. No updates are required for documents recorded or transferred to ILR prior to July 1, 2013.

Contract Terms and Conditions

Amendment Number 1

This first amendment to the Maintenance and Support Agreement (Agreement) made and effective as of July 1, 2023, by and between the Electronic Services System (ESS) and (Solutions, Inc., HLG, a company organized under the laws of the State of Iowa (Service Provider or Solutions HLG). The parties agree to amend the Agreement, as provided in Section 3 to modify requirements for integration and communications with ILR systems.

1. ESS API Web Service Specifications. Exhibit B is amended by modifying the ESS API Web Service Specifications section to adjust certain deadlines relating to the County E-Submission Application Programming Interface (CESAPI) and the County Upload Application Programming Interface (CUAPI).

ESS API Web Service Specifications

The ESS API documents are intended to be living documents that will be updated periodically by ESS and Iowa Land Records technical staff in order to relay current requirements to consumers of ILR Web Services. Notice of changes to these documents will be provided to Service Providers as changes are made, subject to the ESS Update Processes described in Appendix A. The ESS API for the ILR E-Submission service and ILR County Upload service can be found at the following locations:

CUAPI - <https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/search/services/county/swagger-ui/index.html>

CESAPI - <https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/esubmission/services/county/swagger-ui/index.html>

Notices of Discontinuance - LCM

Support for the LCM Client for E-Submission will be discontinued effective ~~September 30, 2023~~ June 30, 2024. Service Providers who currently utilize the LCM for E-Submission activities shall prepare Service Provider ESS API Developments for E-Submission conforming to the requirements of the E-Submission Rest API (CESAPI).

Support for the LCM Client for County Upload Functions will be discontinued effective ~~September 30, 2024~~ March 31, 2025. Service Providers who currently utilize the LCM for County Upload activities shall prepare Service Provider ESS API Developments for E-Submission county upload functions conforming to the requirements of the County Upload Rest API (CUAPI).

Notices of Discontinuance – SOAP API

Support for the current ILR E-Submission Client API will be discontinued effective June 30, 2024. Service Providers who currently utilize the ILR E-Submission Client API should, as soon as possible, proceed with Service Provider ESS API Developments for E-Submission functions conforming to the requirements of the E-Submission Rest API (CESAPI).

ESS has nearly completed development of the developed a new County Upload REST API and it will soon be available for testing. Support for the current ILR County Upload Client API will be discontinued effective ~~September 30, 2024~~ March 31, 2025. Service Providers who currently utilize the ILR County Upload Client API should, as soon as possible, proceed with Service

Provider ESS API Developments for County Upload functions conforming to the requirements of the County Upload Rest API (CUAPI).

ESS is available to assist Service Providers with testing and implementation. Service Providers are encouraged to schedule time proactively with advance notice to the IL R development team for technical assistance and testing.

Service Provider agrees to complete integrations with the CESAPI and CUAPI, and to conform to these deadlines and requirements.

JSON

In order to simplify the handling and exchange of data through the County Upload Rest API (CUAPI), ESS is adopting JSON (JavaScript Object Notation). It provides a lightweight data-interchange format that all service providers should be able to use. When and if a standard is adopted, service providers should expect that ESS will move toward the adoption of a published standard.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, in consideration of the mutual covenants set forth above and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt, adequacy and legal sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties have entered into the above Amendment to the Agreement and have caused their duly authorized representatives to execute this Amendment to the Agreement.

Electronic Services System

Service Provider

By: Phil Dunshee

By: Robert Dugan

Name: Phil Dunshee

Name: Robert Dugan

Title: Project Manager

Title: HLG VP Operations
Solutions Inc.
2311 West 18th Street
Spencer, IA 51301

Date: July 1, 2024

Date: 7-8-2024

Contract Terms and Conditions

Amendment Number 2

This second amendment to the Maintenance and Support Agreement (Agreement) made and effective as of July 1, 2023, by and between the Electronic Services System (ESS) and Solutions, Inc., HLG (Service Provider or Solutions HLG). The parties agree to amend the Agreement, as provided in Section 3 to modify the compensation amount, the Term, and the requirements for integration and communications with ILR systems.

1. Compensation. Section 4. Compensation is amended by striking the section and inserting in lieu thereof the following.

Section 4. Compensation.

In consideration of Service Provider providing ESS and Service Provider Counties with the Deliverables, Developments, Service Provider ESS API Developments and Documentation as specified in Exhibits A, B and C, subject to all terms and conditions, Service Provider shall be entitled to receive fees as stated herein. It is expressly understood and agreed that in no event will the standard fees or compensation to be paid hereunder exceed the sum of \$1,614.35 per Service Provider County for a one half-year Term as specified in Section 5.

The Service Provider Counties for the one half-year Term shall be jointly identified by ESS and the Service Provider for the period. Identification of Service Provider Counties shall be completed as soon as practicable, not later than the first business day of June, 2025.

If the Term of the Agreement is extended for the additional calendar year as provided in Section 5, the annual compensation per Service Provider County in calendar year 2026 will be the amount of \$3,228.70 plus a percentage amount as determined by the cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) published in October, 2025 by the Social Security Administration, not to exceed 3.5 percent. See: <https://www.ssa.gov/oact/cola/colasummary.html>

Except as otherwise amended by the Electronic Services System (ESS) through approved change vehicles, ESS shall not be required to pay any additional fees, expenses, costs, charges, or other amounts in connection with the Deliverables, Developments, Service Provider ESS API Developments, and Documentation to be provided hereunder other than as expressly stated herein.

2. Term. Section 5. Term is amended by striking the section and inserting in lieu thereof the following.

Section 5. Term

The extension of this agreement is one-half year; July 1, 2025, through December 31, 2025.

The term of this agreement shall be extended further for the period of January 1, 2026, through December 31, 2026.

The term of this Agreement may be extended for subsequent calendar year periods subject to the mutual written agreement of the parties

Notwithstanding anything in this Agreement to the contrary, ESS shall have the right to terminate this Agreement without penalty and without any advance notice if there is a change in Iowa law or if the Electronic Services System 28E agreement is modified in a manner which, in the sole opinion of ESS, results in funds which are insufficient to allow ESS to meet its obligations under this Agreement or to operate as required and to fulfill its obligations under this Agreement.

3. ESS API Web Service Specifications. Exhibit B is amended by modifying the ESS API Web Service Specifications section to adjust certain deadlines relating to the County E-Submission Application Programming Interface (CESAPI) and the County Upload Application Programming Interface (CUAPI).

ESS API Web Service Specifications

The ESS API documents are intended to be living documents that will be updated periodically by ESS and Iowa Land Records technical staff in order to relay current requirements to consumers of ILR Web Services. Notice of changes to these documents will be provided to Service Providers as changes are made, subject to the ESS Update Processes described in Appendix A. The ESS API for the ILR E-Submission service and ILR County Upload service can be found at the following locations:

CUAPI - <https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/search/services/county/swagger-ui/index.html>

CESAPI - <https://staging.iowalandrecords.org/e-submission/services/county/swagger-ui/index.html>

Notices of Discontinuance - LCM

Support for the LCM Client for E-Submission ~~is~~ discontinued effective June 30, 2024.

Support for the LCM Client for County Upload Functions will be discontinued effective ~~March 31, 2025~~ December 31, 2025. Service Providers who currently utilize the LCM for County Upload activities shall prepare Service Provider ESS API Developments for county upload functions conforming to the requirements of the County Upload Rest API (CUAPI).

Notices of Discontinuance – SOAP API

Support for the current ILR E-Submission Client API ~~is~~ discontinued effective June 30, ~~2024~~ 2025.

ESS has developed a new County Upload REST API ~~and it is available for testing~~. Support for the current ILR County Upload Client API will be discontinued effective ~~March 31, 2025~~ March 31, 2026. Service Providers who currently utilize the ILR County Upload Client API should, as soon as possible, proceed with Service Provider ESS API Developments for County Upload functions conforming to the requirements of the County Upload Rest API (CUAPI).

ESS is available to assist Service Providers with testing and implementation. Service Providers are encouraged to schedule time proactively with advance notice to the ILR development team for technical assistance and testing.

Service Provider agrees to complete integrations with the CESAPI and CUAPI, and to conform to these deadlines and requirements.

JSON

In order to simplify the handling and exchange of data through the County Upload Rest API (CUAPI), ESS is adopting JSON (JavaScript Object Notation). It provides a lightweight data-

interchange format that all service providers should be able to use. When and if a standard is adopted, service providers should expect that ESS will move toward the adoption of a published standard.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, in consideration of the mutual covenants set forth above and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt, adequacy and legal sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties have entered into the above Amendment to the Agreement and have caused their duly authorized representatives to execute this Amendment to the Agreement.

Electronic Services System

Service Provider

By: 

Name: Phil Dunshee

Title: Project Manager

Date: July 1, 2025

By: 
Ruth Niermeyer (Mar 28, 2025 11:41 ET)

Name: Ruth Niermeyer

Title: Executive Vice President
Solutions/ Harris Local Government
2311 West 18th Street
S encer, IA 51301
r_niermeyer@harriscomputer.com

Date: 28/03/25

COPY

Chapter 2 Policy and Procedures Data and Information Standards

Chapter 2 of the Electronic Services System (ESS) Policies and Procedures is amended to update provisions relating to the exchange of data and information between counties and County Land Record Management Systems and the Electronic Services System.

1. Section 2.1, Definitions, is amended by striking the section and inserting in lieu thereof the following.

ESS – 2.1 Definitions.

(Iowa Code Section 331.604, 3(a))

As used in this Chapter:

“Application Programming Interface” or “API” means a set of rules or protocols that enables software applications to communicate with each other to exchange data, features and functionality.

“County Land Record Management System” or “Local Land Record Management System” or “LLRMS” means the physical or hosted system maintained or licensed by each county for recording documents, assigning reference numbers, specifying recording times, maintaining the database and index of records, and archiving physical and electronic documents for providing recording services pursuant to subchapter V, part 3, of chapter 331 and section 558.49.

“Electronic services system” means the organization formed under a chapter 28E agreement to provide electronic and other services to counties and other public agencies. See: 2005 Iowa Acts, ch. 179, §101, as amended by 2021 Iowa Acts, ch. 126, §2. The Electronic services system provides a statewide electronic system to accept, manage, and make records filed with a county recorder available online, and to facilitate electronic recording.

2. Section 2.2, Authority and Purpose, is amended to read as follows.

ESS – 2.2 Authority and Purpose.

(Iowa Code Section 331.604, 3(a))

2.2 (1) The Electronic Services System (ESS) is required to ~~facilitate implement~~ electronic recording in each county, and to maintain a statewide internet website to provide electronic access to records and information. In order to provide the required services and functions it is necessary to establish data and information standards and other technical requirements including an application programming interface (API). ~~These~~ The API, standards and technical requirements provide a common basis which serves to normalize and make consistent a wide variety of information from different counties and different third-party County Land Record Management Systems (indexing and imaging systems), and helps ensure that citizens and customers receive high quality and consistent services through the ESS applications and websites ~~county land record information systems.~~

3. Sections 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 are amended by striking the sections and inserting in lieu thereof the following new section.

NEW SECTION 2.3 ESS and LLRMS Scope and Specifications

2.3(1) The Electronic Services System shall publish and maintain a description of the mutual responsibilities of the Electronic Services System and the County Land Record Management Systems to be known as the ESS and LLRMS Scope and Specifications (Scope and Specifications). The Scope and Specifications shall include the descriptions for the following items.

- a. The business functions and workflow for ESS and the LLRMS with respect to the exchange of information between the respective systems.
- b. The county functions to be supported by ESS and the LLRMS
- c. The API, its structure, schema and required and expected data elements
- d. Reporting and communication activities
- e. LLRMS system conversion and migration activities
- f. Links to the ESS API specifications
- g. Notices of API version support and discontinuance, as applicable
- h. ESS and LLRMS Upload and E-Submission Processes
- i. ESS and LLRMS data validation and response message processes
- j. ESS and LLRMS testing protocols
- k. Unique document code values
- l. Timing parameters for web service calls
- m. ESS and LLRMS image formatting
- n. ESS and LLRMS security protocols
- o. Other business or technical topics as needed.

2.3(2) Counties who are members of the Electronic Service System 28E agreement and their respective LLRMS service providers are required to fulfill the business functions and technical specifications described in the ESS and LLRMS Scope and Specifications. The ESS and LLRMS Scope and Specifications shall be incorporated by reference in any maintenance or support agreement between ESS and an LLRMS service provider.

The ESS and LLRMS Scope and Specifications shall also apply to any county which is not a member of the Electronic Services System 28E agreement, or to any LLRMS service provider which is not a party to an ESS maintenance agreement. Compliance with the ESS and LLRMS Scope and Specifications is required for participation in the ESS E-Submission service, the ESS county upload and land record search service, or any other ESS application or service.

If an LLRMS service provider is not a party to an ESS maintenance agreement, then the county shall provide evidence to ESS indicating that the LLRMS service provider has made a written commitment to the county that they will comply with the LLRMS Scope and Specifications published by the Electronic Services System.

2.3(3) The ESS and LLRMS Scope and Specifications published by the Electronic Services System will change and evolve over time. It is recognized that changes in standards may affect individual Counties, County Recorders and the Local Land Record Management Systems

employed or used by them. To the extent practicable, the Electronic Services System shall provide advance notice to Counties, County Recorders and Local Land Record Management Systems concerning pending or future modifications to published standards.

From: Peter Ollis <PeterO@fidlar.com>
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 8:55 AM
To: Lisa Long <llong@clris.com>
Subject: Request Handling for Iowa Land Records

Lisa,

My name is Peter Ollis and I am managing the Iowa County recording partners for Fidlar Technologies. I am following up on your request to Matt and Angela. Moving forward, any requests from Iowa Land Records should be directed through the appropriate County Recorder's office. We will no longer field requests directly from Iowa Land Records.

Thank you,

Peter

PETER OLLIS
Territory Manager
[563-345-1272](tel:563-345-1272) | Office
[563-214-4599](tel:563-214-4599) | Cell
PeterO@fidlar.com

From: Phil Dunshee
Sent: Friday, September 19, 2025 3:40 PM
To: Ditsworth, Ann <aditsworth@dickinsoncountyiowa.gov>; Lisa Kent <lkent@wapellocounty.org>
Cc: Black Hawk <ssmith@blackhawkcounty.iowa.gov>; Erin Canfield <recorder@boonecounty.iowa.gov>; Calhoun <cvoith@calhouncounty.iowa.gov>; Clinton <sjudd@clintoncounty-ia.gov>; Josie Fettkether <jfettkether@claytoncountya.gov>; Dallas <renae.arnold@dallascountyiowa.gov>; Jasper <recorder@jasperia.org>; Linn County Recorder <recorder@linncountyiowa.gov>; 'rvargas@scottcountiowa.com' <rvargas@scottcountiowa.com>; Pottawattamie <andrew.moats@pottcounty-ia.gov>
Subject: Request Handling for Iowa Land Records FIDLAR

Good afternoon,

As you know, since July 1, 2025, we have been operating without a support agreement in place with Fidlar. We have continued to communicate with the company as needed. When a support issue arises, the standard process has been for Lisa (or Corrie) to communicate directly with the Fidlar developers or support staff. I do not insert myself into these communications. That process has seemed to work satisfactorily until now.

Earlier this summer, ILR was informed by a county recorder that following a conversion to the Fidlar system, city names were no longer being transferred to ILR. Lisa initiated communication with the Fidlar team to determine the cause of the issue and to identify the appropriate corrective action. This month, Lisa has made three separate requests to Fidlar for XML samples of two documents to allow our developers to review and assess the situation. On or around September 10, the reporting recorder contacted their Fidlar sales representative, who responded that someone would follow up shortly, though he was unavailable that day. Lisa followed up directly with her Fidlar contact again on September 15 but received no response. On September 18, Lisa sent an additional request via email to the Fidlar sales representative, asking that they coordinate with the appropriate support personnel to provide the requested XML files.

Today, we wish to inform you that ILR has received a communication from Fidlar to notify us that moving forward, support requests from ILR should be directed through the appropriate County Recorder's office. Please see the message copied below. While the ILR team had continued to maintain communications between technical and support staff up to this point, this request is in keeping with the idea that support requests will need to be directed through the Fidlar client counties. ILR will comply with this request.

We therefore wish to report to you that there seems to be an issue preventing at least one Fidlar client county from transferring the "city/town" information to ILR. For now, we will ask our ILR developers to re-examine the issue, because we do expect each county to be able to transfer city/town information with respect to platted land. I will check status when I return from vacation, and if needed we may request some direct communication with the Fidlar technical staff to help diagnose the problem. We will report back to you when we have further information.

Best regards and have a great weekend.

pd

From: Erin Canfield <ecanfield@boonecounty.iowa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 12:03 PM

To: Phil Dunshee <phil@clris.com>; Ditsworth, Ann <aditsworth@dickinsoncountyiowa.gov>; Lisa Kent <lkent@wapellocounty.org>

Cc: Black Hawk <ssmith@blackhawkcounty.iowa.gov>; Calhoun <cvoith@calhouncounty.iowa.gov>; Clinton <sjudd@clintoncounty-ia.gov>; Josie Fettkether <jfettkether@claytoncountyia.gov>; Dallas <renae.arnold@dallascountyiowa.gov>; Jasper <recorder@jasperia.org>; Linn County Recorder <recorder@linncountyiowa.gov>; rvargas@scottcountiowa.com; Pottawattamie <andrew.moats@pottcounty-ia.gov>

Subject: RE: Request Handling for Iowa Land Records FIDLAR

I am against changing any policy while we have a specific working group who is tediously going through each chapter of the policies & procedures and discussing each point and the need for the exhaustive document we call policies & procedures. Creating another document "Scope of Work" which we have not seen even in draft form would just add to the stack of documents that most people do not read or care to understand. It is a backhanded way to enforce the Maintenance Agreement even though Fidar leaving the agreement has only had positive outcomes for ALL Counties. Fidar Counties do not pay "maintenance" in excess of their contracted fees paid directly to Fidar and the pot of money that ILR puts into "maintenance" is divided up by a smaller amount of counties. This is a WIN for everyone.

As stated in the memo "Expecting an individual county or county recorder to know and understand all the technical and business expectations necessary to maintain communications between systems does not seem practical" This may be the one statement in this memo that I agree with. In fact, that is not what Fidar said, it's what ILR assumed the e-mail meant. It means rather than ILR reaching out to Fidar, they just need to call/e-mail the County Recorder and tell them there is an issue. The Recorder will then contact Fidar and then all parties can work together to correct whatever the issue is. The Recorder doesn't need to understand "the technical expectations", just that there is something wrong. I think this is BETTER because it means neither Fidar nor ILR can go around the Recorder. This means that while we may not "understand the technical expectations" we will know that there is an issue. Transparency and inclusion would go a long way to build trust between ILR and County offices.

Fidar not having a Maintenance Agreement has nothing to do with the indexing of city/town. Those fields did not just disappear when Fidar chose not to continue with the Maintenance Agreement. I fail to see how to see how one person wanting to know their market share means we should all change our process and Fidar should change their software to include city/town. Seems like a lot of work that isn't really necessary and not just for Fidar, but for any county that doesn't have the ability to conform. Most abstractors offer the ability to build a Market Share Report. It's rare at best for people to own properties in more than one county and doubtful that the need for this is so great that multiple service providers and more than a dozen counties to change their processes.

SF371 is DEAD. End of story. It's dead for many reasons, one of which is the continued expansion of the standards without solid justification. Adding more strenuous language to Code literally makes it easier for the State to say we as Recorders are not needed. Continuing to point to dead legislation for reasoning is ridiculous and juvenile.

Thanks!

Erin Canfield
Boone County Recorder
201 State St
Boone, IA 50036
Ph. 515-433-0514
Fax 515-433-4972

From: Phil Dunshee <phil@clris.com>
Sent: Monday, October 13, 2025 4:25 PM
To: Ditsworth, Ann <aditsworth@dickinsoncountyiowa.gov>; Lisa Kent <lkent@wapellocounty.org>
Cc: Black Hawk <ssmith@blackhawkcounty.iowa.gov>; Erin Canfield <ecanfield@boonecounty.iowa.gov>; Calhoun <cvoith@calhouncounty.iowa.gov>; Clinton <sjudd@clintoncounty-ia.gov>; Josie Fettkether <jfettkether@claytoncountyia.gov>; Dallas <renae.arnold@dallascountyiowa.gov>; Jasper <recorder@jasperia.org>; Linn County Recorder <recorder@linncountyiowa.gov>; rvargas@scottcountiowa.com; Pottawattamie <andrew.moats@pottcounty-ia.gov>
Subject: RE: Request Handling for Iowa Land Records FIDLAR

All,

Follow up on this topic after my return. Attached is the packet for the upcoming Standards Subcommittee meeting. It includes some updated information on indexing city/town. Let me know if you have any questions. To be clear – this is NOT an action item at the meeting. Also, we are not aware of any technical problem with the ESS API.

pd

Table of Expected and Required
ESS/ILR Data Elements

Common Name	Description	ILR Data Element Name	Schema	Required (R) / Expected (E)	Specification	Notes
Full or Company Name	Unparsed name of person or organization	unparsedName	Grantor	R	(max length 128)	
Person or Organization Indicator	Indicator of human or organization name	nonPersonEntityIndicator	Grantor	R	(pattern Y/N)	
Sequence Number	Multiple Name Indicator	sequenceIdentifier	Grantor	E	String	
Full or Company Name	Unparsed name of person or organization	unparsedName	Grantee	R	(max length 128)	
Person or Organization Indicator	Indicator of human or organization name	nonPersonEntityIndicator	Grantee	R	(pattern Y/N)	
Sequence Number	Multiple Name Indicator	sequenceIdentifier	Grantee	E	String	
First Name	Parsed First Name (human)	firstName	Grantor	E	(max length 32)	
Middle Name	Parsed Middle Name (human)	middleName	Grantor	E	(max length 32)	
Last Name	Parsed Last Name (human)	lastName	Grantor	E	(max length 32)	
Sequence Number	Multiple Name Indicator	sequenceIdentifier	Grantor	E	String	
First Name	Parsed First Name (human)	firstName	Grantee	E	(max length 32)	
Middle Name	Parsed Middle Name (human)	middleName	Grantee	E	(max length 32)	
Last Name	Parsed Last Name (human)	lastName	Grantee	E	(max length 32)	
Sequence Number	Multiple Name Indicator	sequenceIdentifier	Grantee	E	String	
Recording Time	Date and Time of Recording	recordingDate	PRIA Document	E	String (pattern: yyyyMMdd:HH:mm:ss:SSS)	
					String pattern: AbstractOfJudgment Assignment AssignmentOfDeedOfTrust Deed DeedOfTrust FederalTaxLien ModificationAgreementOrConsolidationAgreement Mortgage PartialSatisfactionOfLien PowerOfAttorney QuitClaimDeed Reconveyance ReleaseOfFederalTaxLien ReleaseOfStateTaxLien SatisfactionOfLien SatisfactionOfMortgage StateTaxLien SubordinateLienAgreement SubstitutionOfTrustee WarrantyDeed AssignmentOfMortgage Other	
Document Type	Type such as Deed or Mortgage	type	PRIA Document	R	Enum: pattern: AffidavitTransfer ContractOrContractRelated UCC AffidavitNonTransfer Other GroundwtrHazardStmt DeclarationOfValue 28E SurveysAndPlats CornerCertificates Condominiums Easements Condemnations MonumentPreservationCertificate Heritage Covenant	
Other Type	Additional Types for "Other" Type	typeOtherDescription	PRIA Document	E (Conditional)	Enum:	
Date of Instrument	Date Document Is Signed by the Parties	instrumentDate	PRIA Document	E	(string) pattern: yyyyMMdd; the pattern of yyyyMMdd:HH:mm:ss:SSS also accepted	
Document Reference	Sequential Recording Number Assigned by the County	number	PRIA Document	E	String (Example: 123456) (max length 32)	
Book	A recording "book" number assigned by the county	bookNumber	PRIA Document	E	String (Example: 2025) (max length 16)	must be paired with Page
Page	A recording "page" number assigned by the county	pageNumber	PRIA Document	E	String (Example: 1190) (max length 16)	must be paired with Book
Unique Code Value	Unique reference number assigned by county service provider	code	PRIA Document	R	(max length 32)	
Long Legal Description	Appropriate for long legal description data	textDescription	Property:Legal Description	E	String (max length 1048576)	
Legal Description Type	Indicator for Metes and Bounds	type	Property:Legal Description	E	pattern – MetesAndBounds or Other	
Additional Parcel Number	Additional identifier assigned	additionalParcelIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Platted Land	E	String (max length 32)	
Block	Block number for platted land	propertyBlockIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Platted Land	E	String (max length 16)	

Table of Expected and Required
ESS/ILR Data Elements

Common Name	Description	ILR Data Element Name	Schema	Required (R) / Expected (E)	Specification	Notes
City, Town, or County	Government location of platted land	propertyCityTownIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Platted Land	E	String (max length 64)	County is sometimes entered
Lot	Lot Number for Platted Land	propertyLotIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Platted Land	E	String (max length 16)	
Subdivision Name	Subdivision name for platted land	propertySubdivisionIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Platted Land	E	String (max length 256)	should not be abbreviated
Unit	Unit name for platted land	unitNumberIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Platted Land	E	String (max length 16)	Used when applicable
Section	Section for platted land when applicable	propertySectionIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Platted Land	E	String (max length 32)	the section for platted land in unincorporated areas
Sequence Number	Multiple parcel indicator	sequenceIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Platted Land	E	String	
Range	Range for unplatted land	propertyRangeIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:UnPlatted Land	E	String (max length 16)	
Township	Township for unplatted land	propertyTownshipIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:UnPlatted Land	E	String (max length 16)	
Quarter Quarter Section	Quarter Quarter Section for unplatted land	quarterQuarterSectionIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:UnPlatted Land	E	String (pattern NE NW SE SW)	
Quarter Section	Quarter Section for unplatted land	quarterSectionIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:UnPlatted Land	E	String (max length 16)	Question - cardinal direction?
Section	Section for unplatted land	sectionIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:UnPlatted Land	E	String (max length 16)	
Sequence Number	Multiple parcel indicator	sequenceIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:UnPlatted Land	E	String	
Parcel Identification Number	PIN number assigned by county	numberIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Parcel Identification	E	String (max length 32) String (pattern: ParcelIdentificationNumber TaxMapIdentifier TaxParcelIdentifier TorrensCertificateIdentifier)	
PIN Type	The type of PIN	typeIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Parcel Identification	E	String	
Sequence Number	Multiple parcel indicator	sequenceIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Parcel Identification	E	String	
Property Description	Shortened unparsed Legal description	description	Property:Legal Description:Other Legal	E	String (max length 512)	
Sequence Number	Multiple parcel indicator	sequenceIdentifier	Property:Legal Description:Other Legal	E	String	
Recording County Name	name of county for recording	countyOfRecordationName	PRIA Document	R	String	
County Name	Name of county	county	PRIA Document:Property	R	String	
Number of Pages	Number of pages in embedded document	numberOfPages	PRIA Document:Embedded File	R	(integer (\$int32))	
Embedded Document	The actual embedded document	document	PRIA Document:Embedded File	E	String	
Encoding Type	An allowed encoding type	encodingType	PRIA Document:Embedded File	E	B64Encode	
Name of File	Document file name	name	PRIA Document:Embedded File	E	String (max length 256)	
Sequence Number	Multiple document indicator	sequenceIdentifier	PRIA Document:Embedded File	E	(integer (\$int32))	
Unique Code Value	Unique reference number assigned by county service provider	code	PRIADocument:associatedDocument	R	(max length 32)	
Recording County Name	name of county for recording	countyOfRecordationName	PRIADocument:associatedDocument	R	String String pattern: AbstractOfJudgment Assignment AssignmentOfDeedOfTrust Deed DeedOfTrust FederalTaxLien ModificationAgreementOrConsolidationAgreement Mortgage PartialSatisfactionOfLien PowerOfAttorney QuitClaimDeed Reconveyance ReleaseOfFederalTaxLien ReleaseOfStateTaxLien SatisfactionOfLien SatisfactionOfMortgage StateTaxLien SubordinateLienAgreement SubstitutionOfTrustee WarrantyDeed AssignmentOfMortgage Other	
Document Type	Type such as Deed or Mortgage	type	PRIADocument:associatedDocument	R	Enum:	
Book	A recording "book" number assigned by the county	bookNumber	PRIADocument:associatedDocument	E	String (Example: 2025) (max length 16)	
Date of Instrument	Date Document Is Signed by the Parties	instrumentDate	PRIADocument:associatedDocument	E	(string) pattern: yyyyMMdd; the pattern of yyyyMMdd:HH:mm:ss:SSS also accepted	
Document Reference	Sequential Recording Number Assigned by the County	number	PRIADocument:associatedDocument	E	String (Example: 123456) (max length 32)	

Table of Expected and Required
ESS/ILR Data Elements

Common Name	Description	ILR Data Element Name	Schema	Required (R) / Expected (E)	Specification	Notes
Page	A recording "page" number assigned by the county	pageNumber	PRIADocument:associatedDocument	E	String (Example: 1190) (max length 16)	
Recording Time	Date and Time of Recording	recordingDate	PRIADocument:associatedDocument	E	String (pattern: yyyyMMdd:HH:mm:ss:SSS) pattern: AffidavitTransfer ContractOrContractRelated UCC AffidavitNonTransfer Other GroundwtrHazardStmt DeclarationOfValue 28E SurveysAndPlats CornerCertificates Condominiums Easements Condemnations MonumentPreservationCertificate Heritage Covenant Enum:	
Other Type	Additional Types for "Other" Type	typeOtherDescription	PRIADocument:associatedDocument	E		
Sequence Number	Multiple associated ref. indicator	sequenceIdentifier	PRIADocument:associatedDocument	E	String	
Annotation Color		color	Annotation	E	String: Enum: (green or yellow)	
Annotation Icon X Coordinate	location of the icon on a page	x	Annotation:iconCoords	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Annotation Icon Y Coordinate	location of the icon on a page	y	Annotation:iconCoords	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Annotation Note HEIGHT	size of the annotation area	height	Annotation:noteCoords	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Annotation Note WIDTH	size of the annotation area	width	Annotation:noteCoords	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Annotation Note X Coordinate	coordinate of the message content	x	Annotation:noteCoords	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Annotation Note Y Coordinate	coordinate of the message content	y	Annotation:noteCoords	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Annotation Page	Page where the annotation is located	page	Annotation	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Annotation Text	Text of the annotation	text	Annotation	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Redaction Color	Color "Fill" of the redaction	color	Redaction	E	String (black)	
Redaction Page	Page location of the redaction	page	Redaction	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Redaction Height	size of the redaction area	height	Redaction:redactionCoords	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Redaction Width	size of the redaction area	width	Redaction:redactionCoords	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Redaction X	coordinate of the redaction area	x	Redaction:redactionCoords	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Redaction Y	coordinate of the redaction area	y	Redaction:redactionCoords	E	(integer(\$int32))	
Notary Commission Number	Notary's commission number	commissionNumberIdentifier	Notary	NA	String	Notary Schema Not Yet Active
Notary Expiration Date	Date when the commission expires State which commissioned the	commissionExpirationDate	Notary	NA	String (yyyMMdd)	Notary Schema Not Yet Active
Notary Commission State	notary	commissionState	Notary	NA	String	Notary Schema Not Yet Active
Notary Name	Name of the Notary Official	unparsedName	Notary	NA	String	Notary Schema Not Yet Active
Sequence Number	Multiple notaries City where property is located, if applicable	sequenceIdentifier	Notary	NA	String	Notary Schema Not Yet Active
Property city location	County where property is located	city	PRIA Document:Property	E	String (max length 64)	
Property county location	USPS zipp code	county	PRIA Document:Property	E	String (full county name, not numeric identifier)	
Zip Code	Common property address	postalCode	PRIA Document:Property	E	String (max length 10)	
Street Address	Suite, Apartment, Unit	streetAddress	PRIA Document:Property	E	String (max length 128)	
Additional Street Address	Multiple Property Addresses	streetAddress2	PRIA Document:Property	E	String (max length 128)	
Sequence Number		sequenceIdentifier	PRIA Document:Property	E	String	
Mortgage Loan Amount	Amount of the Mortgage	originalLoanAmount	Mortgage Consideration	NA	String String: Pattern	Possible Future - Not Currently Persisted
Property Sale/Lien Amount	Amount of Sale or Lien	amount	Consideration	NA	(SalePrice Judgment Lien AttorneysFee Other)	Possible Future - Not Currently Persisted
Type of Transaction	Sale or Lien are the primary types	type	Consideration	NA	String	Possible Future - Not Currently Persisted
Sequence Number	Multiple transactions	sequenceIdentifier	Consideration	NA	String	Possible Future - Not Currently Persisted

Service Provider	County	Sends City?
Avenu	Ringgold	Yes
Cott	Cass	Yes
Cott	Dubuque	*Yes
Cott	Johnson	*Yes
Cott	Polk	No
Cott	Union	*Yes
DevNet	Marshall	No
Eagle	Adair	Yes
Eagle	Benton	Yes
Eagle	Bremer	Yes
Eagle	Buena Vista	Yes
Eagle	Butler	Yes
Eagle	Carroll	Yes
Eagle	Cerro Gordo	Yes
Eagle	Chickasaw	Yes
Eagle	Clarke	Yes
Eagle	Crawford	Yes
Eagle	Davis	Yes
Eagle	Decatur	Yes
Eagle	Des Moines	Yes
Eagle	Dickinson	Yes
Eagle	Greene	Yes
Eagle	Grundy	Yes
Eagle	Guthrie	Yes
Eagle	Hancock	Yes
Eagle	Henry	Yes
Eagle	Ida	Yes
Eagle	Jefferson	Yes
Eagle	Jones	Yes
Eagle	Keokuk	Yes
Eagle	Louisa	Yes
Eagle	Lucas	Yes
Eagle	Monona	*Yes
Eagle	Muscatine	*Yes
Eagle	O'Brien	Yes
Eagle	Plymouth	Yes
Eagle	Poweshiek	*Yes
Eagle	Sac	Yes
Eagle	Shelby	Yes
Eagle	Sioux	Yes
Eagle	Story	*Yes
Eagle	Tama	*Yes
Eagle	Warren	Yes

Eagle	Washington	Yes
Eagle	Wayne	*Yes
Eagle	Webster	*Yes
Eagle	Winnebago	*Yes
Eagle	Woodbury	Yes
Eagle	Worth	Yes
Fidlar	Audubon	No
Fidlar	Black Hawk	No
Fidlar	Boone	No
Fidlar	Calhoun	No
Fidlar	Clayton	No
Fidlar	Clinton	No
Fidlar	Dallas	No
Fidlar	Jasper	No
Fidlar	Linn	No
Fidlar	Pottawattamie	No
Fidlar	Scott	No
Solutions	Adams	Yes
Solutions	Allamakee	Yes
Solutions	Appanoose	Yes
Solutions	Buchanan	Yes
Solutions	Cedar	Yes
Solutions	Cherokee	Yes
Solutions	Clay	Yes
Solutions	Delaware	Yes
Solutions	Floyd	Yes
Solutions	Franklin	*Yes
Solutions	Fremont	Yes
Solutions	Hamilton	Yes
Solutions	Hardin	Yes
Solutions	Harrison	Yes
Solutions	Henry	Yes
Solutions	Howard	Yes
Solutions	Humboldt	Yes
Solutions	Iowa	Yes
Solutions	Jackson	Yes
Solutions	Kossuth	Yes
Solutions	Lee	Yes
Solutions	Lyon	Yes
Solutions	Madison	Yes
Solutions	Mahaska	Yes
Solutions	Marion	Yes
Solutions	Mills	Yes
Solutions	Mitchell	Yes

Solutions	Monroe	Yes
Solutions	Montgomery	Yes
Solutions	Osceola	Yes
Solutions	Palo Alto	Yes
Solutions	Pocahontas	Yes
Solutions	Taylor	Yes
Solutions	Van Buren	Yes
Solutions	Wapello	Yes
Solutions	Winneshiek	Yes
Solutions	Wright	Yes

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION

From: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2025 8:30 AM
To: denise <recorder@jasperia.org>
Subject: Mortgage Filing Information

[NOTICE: This message originated outside of Jasper County -- DO NOT CLICK on links or open attachments unless you are sure the content is safe.]

Greetings-

The mortgage filing information prior to June 10, 2024 included the city/town of the property. See first snip below. This allowed for a search on Iowa Land Records to view all mortgages filed within the city limits of a city/town between specified dates. The city/town is no longer included starting on or about June 11, 2024. See second snip below.

I'm curious why this city/town is no longer included. Also, is there an alternative way to look up mortgage filings for a specific city/town within specified dates after June 10, 2024?

Thanks,
Jim

June 10, 2024

Parcel Id:
County Location Abbreviation:
Legal Description:

Platted Land				
Parcel Description	Lot/Unit	Block	Subdivision	City/Town
	2	2	BLAIR & ADAIRS ADDITION III	KELLOGG

June 11, 2024

Properties

Parcel Id:
County Location Abbreviation: (E 66 FT LOT G SD LOT 14)
Legal Description: (E 66 FT LOT G SD LOT 14)

Platted Land				
Parcel Description	Lot/Unit	Block	Subdivision	City/Town
	G		EAST ADDITION	

Service Provider	County	Recording Date	Doc Type	Reference	Book	Page	City in Index?	Notes	
Avenu	Ringgold	9/18/2025	Deed	1097	599	295	Yes	-MOUNT AYR (has an extra character in front of the city name)	
Avenu	Ringgold	9/18/2025	Deed	1095	599	293	Yes	-KELLERTON (has an extra character in front of the city name)	
Avenu	Ringgold	9/18/2025	Deed	1090	599	270	Yes	-DIAGONAL (has an extra character in front of the city name)	
Cott	Cass	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed		2025	1668	Yes	Anita	
Cott	Cass	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed		2025	1650	Yes	Atlantic	
Cott	Cass	9/18/2025	Warranty Deed		2025	1624	Yes	Anita	
Cott	Dubuque	8/22/2025	Warranty Deed	202500008966			No		
Cott	Dubuque	8/22/2025	Warranty Deed	202500008964			Yes	ASBURY	
Cott	Dubuque	8/22/2025	Warranty Deed	202500008963			Yes	DUBUQUE	
Cott	Johnson	9/24/2025	Deed		6696	59	No	Not includedd in legal Clubhouse Condominiums	
Cott	Johnson	9/24/2025	Deed		6695	419	Yes	Tiffin	
Cott	Johnson	9/24/2025	Deed		6695	35	Yes	Iowa City	
Cott	Polk	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	202500058690		20287	870	No	
Cott	Polk	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	202500058706		20287	973	No	
Cott	Polk	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	202500058703		20287	945	No	
Cott	Union	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	202500001679	1364	239	Yes	WEST CRESTON SEC A (<--Subdivision info is in the City field)	
Cott	Union	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	202500001674	1364	208	Yes	FIRST ADDITION CROMWELL (<--Subdivision info is in the City field)	
Cott	Union	9/29/2025	Warranty Deed	202500001654	1364	131	No		
DevNet	Marshall	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	No	Marshall has zero platted land indexed from 9/22/25 - 9/26/25 (there is unplatted land indexed); In a brief exploratory search, it appears that platted land was last submitted for recordings on 7/31/2019 and ceased as of 8/1/2019.	
DevNet	Marshall	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	No	Marshall has zero platted land indexed from 9/22/25 - 9/26/25 (there is unplatted land indexed); In a brief exploratory search, it appears that platted land was last submitted for recordings on 7/31/2019 and ceased as of 8/1/2019.	
DevNet	Marshall	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	No	Marshall has zero platted land indexed from 9/22/25 - 9/26/25 (there is unplatted land indexed); In a brief exploratory search, it appears that platted land was last submitted for recordings on 7/31/2019 and ceased as of 8/1/2019.	
Eagle	Adair	9/17/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1016			Yes	ORIENT	
Eagle	Adair	16-Sep	Deed	2025-1011			Yes	ORIENT	
Eagle	Adair	9/11/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-0996			Yes	GREENFIELD	
Eagle	Benton	9/22/2025	Deed	25-3615			Yes	City is SH	
Eagle	Benton	9/22/2025	Deed	25 3614			Yes	City is BP, Belle Plaine?	
Eagle	Benton	9/22/2025	Deed	25 3612			Yes	City is Vt. Vinton?	
Eagle	Bremer	9/15/2025	Warranty Deed	20252962			Yes	Tripoli	
Eagle	Bremer	9/2/2025	Warranty Deed	20252827			Yes	Denver	
Eagle	Bremer	9/18/2025	Warranty Deed	20253023			Yes	Waverly	
Eagle	Buena Vista	9/22/2025	Deed	252097			Yes	Storm Lake	
Eagle	Buena Vista	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	252081			Yes	Storm Lake	
Eagle	Buena Vista	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	252070			Yes	Albert City	
Eagle	Butler	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1995			Yes	City is NH, description says New Hartford	
Eagle	Butler	9/17/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1931			Yes	City is PB, description says Parkersburg	
Eagle	Butler	9/12/2025	Deed	2025-1900			Yes	City is AP, description is Aplington	
Eagle	Carroll	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-2568			Yes	Halbur	
Eagle	Carroll	9/18/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-2555			Yes	Manning	
Eagle	Carroll	9/16/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-2520			Yes	Carroll	
Eagle	Cerro Gordo	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-4995	2025	4995	Yes	City is MC, description says Mason City	
Eagle	Cerro Gordo	9/16/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-4781	2025	4781	Yes	City is MC, description says Mason City	
Eagle	Cerro Gordo	9/3/2025	Deed	2025-4542	2025	4542	Yes	City is CL, description is Clear Lake	

Eagle	Chickasaw	9/23/2025	Deed	2025-1622			Yes	City is FB, description is Fredricksburg
Eagle	Chickasaw	9/10/2025	Deed	2025-1491			Yes	City is NH, description says New Hampton
Eagle	Chickasaw	9/11/2025	Deed	2025-1507			Yes	City is IO, description is Ionia
Eagle	Clarke	9/24/2025	Deed	2025-1295			Yes	Osceola
Eagle	Clarke	9/22/2025	Deed	2025-1280			Yes	Woodburn
Eagle	Clarke	9/19/2025	deed	2025-1272			Yes	Osceola
Eagle	Crawford	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1862			Yes	Denison
Eagle	Crawford	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1840			Yes	Manilla
Eagle	Crawford	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1883			Yes	Denison
Eagle	Davis	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1406			Yes	City/Town value shows "West" (Part of subdivision name?)
Eagle	Davis	9/23/2025	Quit Claim Deed	2025-1396			Yes	City/Town value shows "Bloom" (part of Bloomfield?)
Eagle	Davis	9/15/2025	Quit Claim Deed	2025-1360			Yes	City/Town value shows "Bloom" (part of Bloomfield?)
Eagle	Decatur	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1304			Yes	Garden Grove
Eagle	Decatur	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1291			Yes	Leon
Eagle	Decatur	9/19/2025	Deed	2025-1286			Yes	Lamoni
Eagle	Des Moines	9/23/2025	Deed	2025-004219			Yes	City/Town value shows "Bur" (part of "Burlington")
Eagle	Des Moines	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-004198			Yes	City/Town value shows "Bur" (part of "Burlington")
Eagle	Des Moines	9/22/2025	Deed	2025-004194			Yes	City/Town value shows "Dan" (part of "Danville")
Eagle	Dickinson	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	25-04520			Yes	Wahpeton
Eagle	Dickinson	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	25-04519			Yes	Okoboji
Eagle	Dickinson	9/24/2025	Quit Claim Deed	25-04505			Yes	Terr
Eagle	Greene	9/23/2025	Deed	2025-1577			Yes	Grand Junction
Eagle	Greene	9/22/2025	Deed	2025-1575			Yes	Jefferson
Eagle	Greene	9/22/2025	Deed	2025-1571			Yes	Jeffe son
Eagle	Grundy	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1971			Yes	Dike
Eagle	Grundy	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1962			Yes	Reinbeck
Eagle	Grundy	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1934			Yes	Reinbeck
Eagle	Guthrie	9/23/2025	Quit Claim Deed	2025-2221			Yes	Lake Panorama
Eagle	Guthrie	9/23/2025	Quit Claim Deed	2025-2215			Yes	Lake Panorama
Eagle	Guthrie	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-2208			Yes	Panora
Eagle	Hancock	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	25-1632			Yes	City/Town value shows "GARNER 21" (for Garner)
Eagle	Hancock	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	25-1620			Yes	City/Town value shows "BRITT 22" (for Britt)
Eagle	Hancock	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	25 1602			Yes	City/Town value shows "BRITT 22" (for Britt)
Eagle	Henry	9/24/2025	Deed	2100	2025	2100	Yes	MT PLEASANT
Eagle	Ida	9/26/2025	Warranty De d	2025-1020			Yes	City/Town value shows "IG" (for Ida Grove)
Eagle	Ida	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1017			Yes	City/Town value shows "HO" (for Holstein)
Eagle	Ida	9/22/2025	Deed	2025 1015			Yes	City/Town value shows "BC" (for Battle Creek)
Eagle	Jefferson	9/26/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-2070			Yes	Fairfield
Eagle	Jefferson	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-2009			Yes	Libertville
Eagle	Jefferson	9/15/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1963			Yes	Fairfield
Eagle	Jones	9/26/2025	deed	2025-2408			Yes	City shows AM, description shows Anamosa
Eagle	Jones	9/24/2025	Warranty Dees	2025-2375			Yes	City shows An, description shows Amber
Eagle	Jones	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-2349			Yes	City shows WC, description shows Wyoming
Eagle	Keokuk	9/24/2025	Warranty Dees	2025-1638			Yes	What Cheer
Eagle	Keokuk	9/18/2025	Deed	2025-1595			Yes	Ollie
Eagle	Keokuk	9/29/2025	Deed	2025-1262			Yes	Richland
Eagle	Louisa	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1352			Yes	Letts
Eagle	Louisa	9/17/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1310			Yes	Wapello
Eagle	Louisa	9/15/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1298			Yes	Grandview

Eagle	Lucas	9/9/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1261			Yes	Chariton
Eagle	Lucas	9/18/2025	Deed	2025-1305			Yes	Chariton
Eagle	Lucas	9/8/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1257			Yes	Chariton
Eagle	Monona	9/26/2025	Deed	2025-1288			No	
Eagle	Monona	9/25/2025	Deed	2025-1283			Yes	CASTANA
Eagle	Monona	9/22/2025	Deed	2025-1275			Yes	SOLDIER
Eagle	Muscatine	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-04515			Yes	City/Town value shows "WLIB" (for West Liberty)
Eagle	Muscatine	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-04509			Yes	City/Town value shows "MUSC" (for Muscatine)
Eagle	Muscatine	9/25/2025	Deed	2025-04508			No	City/Town value shows "RURAL" (but the doc shows Muscatine)
Eagle	O'Brien	9/24/2025	Deed	2025-2092			Yes	PAULLINA
Eagle	O'Brien	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-2091			Yes	SHELDON
Eagle	O'Brien	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-2083			Yes	PAULLINA
Eagle	Plymouth	9/26/2025	Deed	3210	2025	3210	Yes	WESTFIELD
Eagle	Plymouth	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	3204	2025	3204	Yes	LEMARS
Eagle	Plymouth	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	3201	2025	3201	Yes	LEMARS
Eagle	Poweshiek	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-02796			Yes	GRINNELL
Eagle	Poweshiek	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-02793			No	
Eagle	Poweshiek	9/30/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-02788			Yes	BROOKLYN
Eagle	Sac	9/30/2025	Deed	251740			Yes	SAC CITY
Eagle	Sac	9/30/2025	Deed	251736			Yes	ODEBOLT
Eagle	Sac	9/30/2025	Deed	251732			Yes	LYTTON
Eagle	Shelby	9/30/2025	Deed	2025-1730			Yes	City/Town value shows "PT" (for Portsmouth)
Eagle	Shelby	9/30/2025	Deed	2025-1728			Yes	City/Town value shows "EH" (for Elk Horn)
Eagle	Shelby	9/30/2025	Deed	2025-1725			Yes	City/Town value shows "HL" (for Harlan)
Eagle	Sioux	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-05000	2025	5000	Yes	BOYDEN
Eagle	Sioux	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-04997	2025	4997	Yes	ORANGE CITY
Eagle	Sioux	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-04993	2025	4993	Yes	GRANVILLE
Eagle	Story	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-08061			No	Non-city data in index: NOT APPLICABLE
Eagle	Story	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-08059			Yes	AMES
Eagle	Story	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-08051			No	
Eagle	Tama	10/1/2025	Deed	2025-2520			Yes	TAMA
Eagle	Tama	10/1/2025	Deed	2025-2518			No	
Eagle	Tama	9/30/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-2498			No	
Eagle	Warren	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-08372			Yes	City/Town value shows "INDI" (for Indianola).
Eagle	Warren	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-08369			Yes	City/Town value shows "NORW" (for Norwalk).
Eagle	Warren	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-08366			Yes	City/Town value shows "WSTDM" (for West Des Moines).
Eagle	Washington	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-3296			Yes	City/Town value shows "BR" (for Brighton).
Eagle	Washington	10/1/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-3290			Yes	City/Town value shows "RI" (for Riverside).
Eagle	Washington	9/30/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-3285			Yes	City/Town value shows "HA" (for Haskins).
Eagle	Wayne	10/1/2025	Deed	2025-1177			No	There is other platted info, but the City field is null.
Eagle	Wayne	10/1/2025	Deed	2025-1176			Yes	City/Town value shows "COR" (for Corydon).
Eagle	Wayne	10/1/2025	Deed	2025-1175			Yes	City/Town value shows "COR" (for Corydon).
Eagle	Webster	9/30/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-04112			Yes	FORT DODGE
Eagle	Webster	9/30/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-04102			No	No platted land values, but Subdivision and City have a value of "0" showing.
Eagle	Webster	9/30/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-04084			No	No platted land values, but Subdivision and City have a value of "0" showing.
Eagle	Winnebago	9/29/2025	Deed	2025-1326			Yes	BUFFALO CENTER
Eagle	Winnebago	9/30/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1332			Yes	FOREST CITY
Eagle	Winnebago	10/1/2025	Quit Claim Deed	2025-1335			No	
Eagle	Woodbury	10/2/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-10273			Yes	SMITHLAND

Eagle	Woodbury	10/2/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-10270		Yes	Non-City Data in Index: City/Town has a value of "1".
Eagle	Woodbury	10/2/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-10269		Yes	Non-City Data in Index: City/Town has a value of "1".
Eagle	Worth	9/30/2025	Warranty Deed	20250990		Yes	NORTHWOOD
Eagle	Worth	9/30/2025	Warranty Deed	20250989		Yes	NORTHWOOD
Eagle	Worth	9/29/2025	Warranty Deed	20250983		Yes	MANLY
Fidlar	Audubon	9/24/2025	Deed	25-0919		No	Subdivision is CITY OF AUDUBON
Fidlar	Audubon	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	25-0911		No	Subdivision is Glenhaven Addition
Fidlar	Audubon	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	25-0908		No	Subdivision is Town of Brayton
Fidlar	Black Hawk	9/25/2025	Deed	2025-14081		No	
Fidlar	Black Hawk	9/25/2025	Deed	2025-14075		No	
Fidlar	Black Hawk	9/2/2025	Deed	2025-12736		No	
Fidlar	Boone	9/2/2025	Deed	20253155		No	
Fidlar	Boone	9/12/2025	deed	20253287		No	
Fidlar	Boone	9/12/2025	deed	20253285		No	
Fidlar	Calhoun	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1535		No	Subdivision is YOUELLS 1ST - Manson
Fidlar	Calhoun	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1529		No	Subdivision is 5TH ADDN MANSON
Fidlar	Calhoun	9/2/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-1419		No	Subdivision is ORIGINAL TOWN RICHARDS
Fidlar	Clayton	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2025R02706		No	Subdivision is Elkader
Fidlar	Clayton	9/23/2025	deed	2025R02710		No	Subdivision is VH#1 VH is Volga Heights. 1 is first addition
Fidlar	Clayton	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	2025R02696		No	Subdivision is Clayton
Fidlar	Clinton	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-05766		No	
Fidlar	Clinton	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-05678		No	
Fidlar	Clinton	9/18/2025	deed	2025-05581		No	
Fidlar	Dallas	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-16160		No	
Fidlar	Dallas	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-16158		No	
Fidlar	Dallas	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-16152		No	
Fidlar	Dallas	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-16151		No	
Fidlar	Dallas	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-16148		No	
Fidlar	Dallas	9/22/2025	Deed	2025-16104		No	
Fidlar	Dallas	22-Sep	Warranty Deed	2025-16089		No	
Fidlar	Dallas	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-16379		No	
Fidlar	Dallas	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-16394		No	
Fidlar	Dallas	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-16263		No	
Fidlar	Jasper	23-Sep	Deed	2025-04798		No	
Fidlar	Jasper	9/26/2025	Deed	2025-04868		No	
Fidlar	Jasper	9/29/2025	Deed	2025-04901		No	
Fidlar	Jasper	9/29/2025	Deed	2025-04858		No	
Fidlar	Linn	9/23/2025	Deed	2025-026236		No	
Fidlar	Linn	9/23/2025	Deed	2025-026229		No	
Fidlar	Linn	9/23/2025	Deed	2025-026224		No	
Fidlar	Linn	9/23/2025	Deed	2025-026221		No	
Fidlar	Linn	9/23/2025	Deed	2025-026219		No	
Fidlar	Linn	9/23/2025	Deed	2025-026217		No	
Fidlar	Linn	9/29/2025	Deed	2025-026853		No	
Fidlar	Linn	9/29/2025	Deed	2025-26807		No	
Fidlar	Linn	9/16/2025	Deed	2025-25425		No	
Fidlar	Pottawattamie	10/2/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-11095		No	
Fidlar	Pottawattamie	10/2/2025	Warranty Deed	2025-11093		No	
Fidlar	Pottawattamie	10/1/2025	Quit Claim Deed	2025-10998		No	

Fidlar	Scott	10/1/2025	Deed	2025-019248			No	
Fidlar	Scott	10/1/2025	Deed	2025-019246			No	
Fidlar	Scott	10/1/2025	Deed	2025-019245			No	
Solutions	Adams	9/22/2025	Deed		2025	574	Yes	CORNING
Solutions	Adams	9/15/2025	Warranty Deed		2025	552	Yes	CORNING
Solutions	Adams	9/15/2025	Deed		2025	546	Yes	CORNING
Solutions	Allamakee	9/15/2025	Warranty Deed	1813	2025	1813	Yes	Postville
Solutions	Allamakee	9/2/2025	Warranty Deed	1712	2025	1712	Yes	Postville
Solutions	Allamakee	9/3/2025	Warranty Deed	1723	2025	1723	Yes	New Albin
Solutions	Appanoose	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	1933	2025	1933	Yes	CENTERVILLE
Solutions	Appanoose	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	1925	2025	1925	Yes	MORAVIA
Solutions	Appanoose	9/16/2025	Warranty Deed	1904	2025	1904	Yes	CENTERVILLE
Solutions	Buchanan	9/16/2025	deed	2025R02886			Yes	Town is WIN, description says Winthrop
Solutions	Buchanan	9/22/2025	Deed	2025R02930			Yes	Town is AUR, description says Aurora
Solutions	Buchanan	9/24/2025	Deed	2025R02983			Yes	Town is INDEP, description says Independence
Solutions	Cedar	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2636	1790	200	Yes	Tipton
Solutions	Cedar	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2634	1790	185	Yes	Tipton
Solutions	Cedar	9/17/2025	Warranty Deed	2523	1789	110	Yes	Bennett
Solutions	Cherokee	9/17/2025	Deed	1744	2025	1744	Yes	Marcus
Solutions	Cherokee	9/11/2025	Deed	1695	2025	1695	Yes	Cherokee
Solutions	Cherokee	9/15/2025	Deed	1717	2025	171	Yes	Cleghorn
Solutions	Clay	9/23/2025	deed	2249	2025	2249	Yes	Spencer
Solutions	Clay	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	2227	2025	2227	Yes	Spencer
Solutions	Clay	8/11/2025	deed	1895	225	1895	Yes	Everly
Solutions	Delaware	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2572	2025	2572	Yes	Greeley
Solutions	Delaware	9/25/2025	Quit Claim Deed	2564	2025	2564	Yes	Hopkinton
Solutions	Delaware	9/22/2025	Deed	2536	2025	2536	Yes	Manchester
Solutions	Floyd	9/24/2025	Quit Claim Deed	1883	2025	1883	Yes	Nora Springs
Solutions	Floyd	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	1860	2025	1860	Yes	Charles City
Solutions	Floyd	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	1848	2025	1848	Yes	Charles City
Solutions	Franklin	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	20251636			Yes	Hampton
Solutions	Franklin	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	20251634			No	Has Subdivision info, no City.
Solutions	Franklin	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	20251625			No	Has Subdivision info, no City.
Solutions	Fremont	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	20251255	2025	1255	Yes	Tabor
Solutions	Fremont	9/23/2025	Warranty De d	20251254	2025	1254	Yes	Hamburg
Solutions	Fremont	9/22/2025	Deed	20251248	2025	1248	Yes	Riverton
Solutions	Hamilton	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	1919	2025	1919	Yes	City/Town value shows "KA" (for Kamrar)
Solutions	Hamilton	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	1917	2025	1917	Yes	City/Town value shows "WC/" (for Webster City)
Solutions	Hamilton	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	1915	2025	1915	Yes	City/Town value shows "WC/" (for Webster City)
Solutions	Hardin	9/25/2025	Quit Claim Deed	20252376	2025	2376	Yes	Eldora
Solutions	Hardin	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	20252375	2025	2375	Yes	Iowa Falls
Solutions	Hardin	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	20252371	2025	2371	Yes	Iowa Falls
Solutions	Harrison	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	2244	2025	2244	Yes	DUNLAP
Solutions	Harrison	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	2238	2025	2238	Yes	WOODBINE
Solutions	Harrison	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	2237	2025	2237	Yes	MISSOURI VALLEY
Solutions	Henry	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	2097	2025	2097	Yes	MT PLEASANT
Solutions	Henry	9/22/2025	Deed	2076	2025	2076	Yes	WINFIELD
Solutions	Howard	9/25/2025	Quit Claim Deed	1394	2025	1394	Yes	ELMA
Solutions	Howard	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	1384	2025	1384	Yes	ELMA

Solutions	Howard	9/22/2025	Quit Claim Deed	1375	2025	1375	Yes	PROTIVIN
Solutions	Humboldt	9/25/2025	Deed	250697	25	697	Yes	BODE
Solutions	Humboldt	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	250695	25	695	Yes	HUMBOLDT
Solutions	Humboldt	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	250693	25	693	Yes	HUMBOLDT
Solutions	Iowa	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	2269	2025	9375	Yes	WILLIAMSBURG
Solutions	Iowa	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	2265	2025	9364	Yes	MARENGO
Solutions	Iowa	9/15/2025	Warranty Deed	2173	2025	9028	Yes	MARENGO
Solutions	Jackson	9/18/2025	Warranty Deed	25-2789			Yes	Maquoketa
Solutions	Jackson	9/11/2025	Warranty Deed	25-2714			Yes	Jackson County
Solutions	Jackson	9/10/2025	Deed	25-2709			Yes	Baldwin
Solutions	Kossuth	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	2585	2025	2585	Yes	ALGONA
Solutions	Kossuth	9/18/2025	Warranty Deed	2550	2025	2550	Yes	Swea City
Solutions	Kossuth	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	2562	2025	2562	Yes	Bancroft
Solutions	Lee	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	3995	2025	3995	Yes	Fort Madison
Solutions	Lee	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	3963	2025	3963	Yes	Keokuk
Solutions	Lee	9/18/2025	Warranty Deed	3945	2025	3945	Yes	West Point
Solutions	Lyon	9/26/2025	Warranty Deed	2147	2025	2147	Yes	Larchwood
Solutions	Lyon	9/26/2025	Quit Claim Deed	2146	2025	2146	Yes	ROCK RAPIDS
Solutions	Lyon	9/26/2025	Deed	2144	2025	2144	Yes	GEORGE
Solutions	Madison	9/26/2025	Warranty Deed	2592	2025	2592	Yes	WINTERSET
Solutions	Madison	9/26/2025	Warranty Deed	2589	2025	2589	Yes	EAR HAM
Solutions	Madison	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2569	2025	2569	Yes	WINTERSET
Solutions	Mahaska	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2471	2025	2471	Yes	Oskaloosa
Solutions	Mahaska	9/24/2025	Quit Claim Deed	2466	2025	2466	Yes	Oskaloosa
Solutions	Mahaska	9/24/2025	Warranty Deed	2460	2025	2460	Yes	Oskaloosa
Solutions	Marion	9/26/2025	Warranty Deed	25-4208	25	4208	Yes	PELLA
Solutions	Marion	9/26/2025	Quit Claim Deed	25-4204	25	2404	Yes	PELLA
Solutions	Marion	9/24/2025	Quit Claim Deed	25-4181	25	4181	Yes	KNOXVILLE
Solutions	Mills	9/26/2025	Warranty Deed	2394	2025	2394	Yes	Strahan
Solutions	Mills	9/26/2025	Warranty Deed	2392	2025	2392	Yes	Malvern
Solutions	Mills	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	2380	2025	2380	Yes	Glenwood
Solutions	Mitchell	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	1374	2025	1374	Yes	ST. ANSGAR
Solutions	Mitchell	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	1364	2025	1364	Yes	OSAGE
Solutions	Mitchell	9/16/2025	Warranty Deed	1332	2025	1332	Yes	OSAGE
Solutions	Monroe	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	1149	2025	1149	Yes	City/Town value shows "ALB" (for Albia)
Solutions	Monroe	9/22/2025	Warranty Deed	1129	2025	1129	Yes	City/Town value shows "ALB" (for Albia)
Solutions	Monroe	9/24/2025	Quit Claim Deed	1138	2025	1138	Yes	City/Town value shows "68" (I found other indexes with this as the city)
Solutions	Montgomery	9/25/2025	Quit Claim Deed	1389	2025	1389	Yes	RED OAK
Solutions	Montgomery	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	1340	2025	1340	Yes	RED OAK
Solutions	Montgomery	9/18/2025	Warranty Deed	1328	2025	1328	Yes	ELLIOTT
Solutions	Osceola	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	20250929	2025	929	Yes	Sibley
Solutions	Osceola	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	20250921	2025	921	Yes	Sibley
Solutions	Osceola	9/10/2025	Warranty Deed	20250893	2025	893	Yes	Sibley
Solutions	Palo Alto	9/26/2025	Warranty Deed	1456	2025	1456	Yes	Mallard
Solutions	Palo Alto	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	1451	2025	1451	Yes	Data, but not a true city name: County Platted
Solutions	Palo Alto	9/25/2025	Warranty Deed	1447	2025	1447	Yes	Emmetsburg
Solutions	Pocahontas	9/26/2025	Deed	1264	2025	1264	Yes	ROLFE
Solutions	Pocahontas	9/25/2025	Deed	1261	2025	1261	Yes	LAURENS
Solutions	Pocahontas	9/25/2025	Deed	1254	2025	1254	Yes	PLOVER

Solutions	Taylor	9/30/2025	Deed	686	2025	686	Yes	BEDFORD
Solutions	Taylor	9/23/2025	Warranty Deed	659	2025	659	Yes	BEDFORD
Solutions	Taylor	9/18/2025	Warranty Deed	641	2025	641	Yes	LENOX
Solutions	Van Buren	9/29/2025	Warranty Deed	1196			Yes	TOWN OF BONAPARTE
Solutions	Van Buren	9/24/2025	Deed	1180			Yes	Milton
Solutions	Van Buren	9/23/2025	Quit Claim Deed	1175			Yes	Birmingham
Solutions	Wapello	9/29/2025	Warranty Deed	3851	2025	3851	Yes	OTTUMWA
Solutions	Wapello	9/29/2025	Warranty Deed	3849	2025	3849	Yes	OTTUMWA
Solutions	Wapello	9/26/2025	Warranty Deed	3823	2025	3823	Yes	EDDYVILLE
Solutions	Winneshiek	9/30/2025	Warranty Deed	2423	2025	2423	Yes	DECORAH
Solutions	Winneshiek	9/29/2025	Warranty Deed	2408	2025	2408	Yes	Calmar
Solutions	Winneshiek	9/26/2025	Warranty Deed	2391	2025	2391	Yes	Decorah
Solutions	Wright	9/29/2025	Warranty Deed	25-1720	2025	1720	Yes	Clarion
Solutions	Wright	9/24/2025	Deed	25-1693	2025	1693	Yes	Belmond
Solutions	Wright	9/19/2025	Warranty Deed	25-1676	2025	1676	Yes	Clarion

DRAFT
FOR DISCUSSION

September 15, 2025

To: PRIA Board of Directors

From: Phil Dunshee, Iowa Land Records Project Manager

Re: PRIA Advocacy

It was good to see most of you at the conference in Tacoma. It was a great event as usual. I also appreciated the opportunity to sit in at the governing board meeting.

One item of interest was the discussion about Legislative Advocacy Task Force. This is a topic that was last addressed by the PRIA Board in the context of the Operating Rules in 2022. I recall the many meetings of the working group which reviewed the Operating Rules at that time. The topic of advocacy is addressed in one of the operating rules policies, and it related to previous discussions of the working group which worked on the PRIA Bylaws.

The PRIA Advocacy Policy, attached for your reference, was the result of much discussion and in some measure it represents some compromises between those who supported engagement by PRIA in legislative advocacy and those who did not. The result was a policy which emphasized the PRIA role as a subject matter expert which can help educate policy makers. The policy includes “guard rails” by stating that advocacy efforts should not favor either government or business members, and by clarifying that if there were known conflicts in the views of PRIA members, then PRIA should not take a position. The policy also states that PRIA would engage at the state level only upon a request from a Member. These are principles that should continue to be upheld.

What does this have to do with the PRIA bylaws? The answer is it relates to the point in the Task Force report about “Member Input” and the need to “Create a Governance Process.” I’ve worked with many non-profit groups over the course of my career, and many of them have chosen to participate in legislative processes. In most cases, in my experience, those groups have processes which allow the members to vote on the issues. Some call their processes “business meetings”. Some use the term “delegate assemblies”. Generally, those groups don’t reserve policy decision making only to the Board of Directors as PRIA does.

The absence of opportunity to provide direct input into advocacy decision making by the organization’s members - all of them – is a reason why PRIA should exercise caution in taking positions for or against legislation at either the federal or state level. The public and private members of PRIA all belong to organizations which can ably advocate for their respective positions.

Allow me to end with a positive word of thanks.

1. Thank you for continuing to publish the meeting packets along with the Board minutes at <https://pria.us/members/meetings-minutes/>. References to this are found in the Operating Rules. These actions provide every PRIA member with the opportunity to be informed, even when a topic may not be highlighted in a PRIA newsletter or meeting.
2. Thank you for supporting efforts to engage in substantive discussions about blockchain, artificial intelligence and other technological developments which may affect the public land registry. It was a privilege for me to work on the blockchain workgroup and assist with the creation of an informative paper on the subject.

Best regards. pd

PRIA Policies

The following policy excerpts are taken from the published operating rules

3. Meetings of the Board of Directors (page 5)

- Meetings of the Board of Directors: “When practical, Board meeting notices will be published via the website two weeks in advance, Board meeting agenda one week in advance, and Board materials three days in advance of each meeting.”
- Meetings of the Board of Directors: “Materials and information will be published in an appropriate electronic format in the Members-only section of the PRIA website (www.pria.us); generally, published meeting notices and materials will be maintained on the website for a minimum period of two years plus the current year and then archived by PRIA Staff.

Transparency Policy: – Last approved: 12/16/2020 (page 22)

- Post a Board binder to the Members-only section of the PRIA website before each monthly Board meeting for review by all Members. The Board binder includes the agenda, previous meeting minutes, monthly financial reports, and other documents relative to the Board agenda.

[Emphasis Added]

PRIA Policies - Continued

Advocacy Policy – Last approved: 01/20/2021

Purpose: To establish a policy to guide the PRIA Officers and Board when considering advocacy efforts.

PRIA has advocated on topics of importance to the industry overall. This collaboration has been ongoing and benefits both PRIA and its partners. Several examples are:

1. PRIA developed materials to be used at the state level to educate legislators and the industry on the Uniform Real Property Electronic Recording Act (URPERA) and predictable recording fees.
2. PRIA has been actively involved with the Uniform Law Commission in considering model legislation on behalf of the industry, including Uniform Real Property Electronic Recording Act (URPERA), the Revised Uniform Law on Notarial Acts (RULONA), and the Uniform Home Foreclosure Procedures.
3. PRIA wrote model legislation for dealing with military discharge papers and the Social Security Number and Privacy Protection Act (SSNAPP) regarding personally identifiable information in recordable documents.
4. PRIA Members have met with federal legislators to educate them about the issues associated with a national database for land records.

Policy:

- PRIA may choose to take a position on industry-related issues by *educating and sharing knowledge or research* with legislators, regulators, the judiciary, and other entities. These advocacy efforts may come from a Member request, from an industry partner, or be initiated by PRIA in response to proposed actions affecting the property records industry.
- Government and business perspectives are often aligned, but also may differ. *PRIA's advocacy efforts should not disenfranchise either Government or Business Members.* Generally, *PRIA will only engage at the state level upon a request from a Member.*
- Requests should be routed to PRIA's Chief Staff Officer for processing. They will then be directed to the Officers for consideration and to the Board, *as the elected representatives of the entire membership.*
- Recognizing requests for support may be time-sensitive, the Officers or Board will determine the appropriate response. *If there are known conflicts in the views of PRIA Members, generally PRIA will not take a position.* PRIA may respond to requests for support by referencing resource documents, directing the requesting party to a group currently at work on the topic or to subject matter experts.
- The Officers and Board will *apprise the membership of advocacy actions* through established PRIA communication channels.

Emphasis Added

PRIA's Legislative Advocacy Task Force began meeting earlier this year and decided to recommend to the Board that PRIA undertake legislative advocacy. Based on that recommendation, the Task Force began developing guidelines for the proposed committee to present for the Board's review and consideration. The draft of the guidelines are below.

1. Define the Association's Mission and Scope

- Purpose Alignment:
 - o Continue to promote the value of land records
 - o Provide information for members
 - o Review and report on legislation to ensure that laws are in place that align with the work of land records industry professionals and do not adversely impact their work
 - o Continue to promote confidence in the security of land records
- Scope of Influence:
 - o Providing subject matter expertise as it relates to land records
 - o Providing consistent testimony for matters that PRIA supports or opposes
- Out of Scope:
 - o Writing legislation, direct lobbying or activities that may be considered lobbying

2. Create a Decision-Making Framework

Establish Criteria for Advocacy

The policy should define clear criteria for evaluating potential advocacy issues. Common criteria may include:

- Enactability: Reviewing legislation to determine likelihood of passage
- Relevance: Does the issue directly affect members' work and land record systems?
- Impact: What is the potential effect on the profession, the public, or land governance?
- Fiscal Impact: Does the legislation have an effect on members' budgets?
- Feasibility: Can the association realistically influence the issue?
- Urgency: Is there a timely need to act (e.g., pending legislation)?
- Member Support: Is there strong interest or consensus among the membership?

2. Create a Governance Process

- Member Input: Include mechanisms for gathering input (e.g., surveys, forums, PRIA meetings).
- Advocacy Committee: Form a dedicated committee to screen and recommend issues for advocacy. (Volunteers for legislative review committee – experience with legislation, ask people what background they bring to the table)
- Board Approval: Require final approval by the board or executive leadership.
 - o Question to the Board – how to take action on issues that have a short timeframe?
- Mechanisms for Disseminating Information: Directly to members, through the communications committee
- How to Document and Communicate Decisions: Need to determine avenues for this

- Develop and Maintain a Legislative Platform: Needs to be determined

Establish a Review and Feedback Loop

- Member Feedback: Solicit feedback on both the policy and advocacy efforts to ensure continued alignment with members' interests.
- Review: In conjunction with strategic planning session (or other cadence) to determine if process is working