CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SUPPORT SERVICES
P.O. Box 419064, Rancho Cordova, CA 95741-9064

February 1, 2001

LCSA LETTER: 01-02

TO: ALL IV-D DIRECTORS

SUBJECT: PRISM ADVISORY GROUP MEETING MINUTES

Please find attached the minutes from the January 4, 2001 Pre-Statewide Interim Systems Management (PRISM) Advisory Group (PAG) meeting. The PAG is a forum for consortia counties and the State (Department of Child Support Services, Department of Justice, and Franchise Tax Board) to exchange information related to program policies and procedures that may impact automation. Although not all counties attend the PAG meeting (as there are designated representatives), all counties will receive copies of the PAG meeting minutes. We anticipate PAG meetings will be held monthly.

In addition to the PAG meeting minutes, attached are the discussion items from the Department of Justice Update provided by Bruce Kaspari, and the PAG Charter, which was approved at the January 4th meeting.

If you have any questions, please contact Rick Torres at (916) 464-5497.

Sincerely,

ELAINE MOODY, CHIEF
Systems Support Branch
Technology Services Division

PRISM ADVISORY GROUP (PAG) DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
JANUARY 4, 2001

Attendees:

Paula Deen, Alameda County
DeeAnn Hebert, FTB
Anthony Blue, FTB
Cheryl Hotaling, DCSS
Evan Auberry, DCSS
Elaine Moody, DCSS
Rick Torres, DCSS
Donna Martin, DCSS
Barbara Catlow, ARS
Jim Mohler, KIDZ Consortia
Helen Faust, DCSS
Christine Anderson, CASES Consortia
Ed Del Real, DCSS
Michael Graham, DCSS
Laurye Gage, FTB
Mary Jones, FTB
Ron Modes, DCSS
Edwina Young, DCSS
Linda Sekany, DCSS
Stacey Glass-Smith, DCSS
Dennis Covell, Solano County
Bruce Kaspari, DOJ
Bill Malloy, Kern County
Gail Thomas, Riverside County
Milt Hyams, San Francisco County
Jim Beaumont, San Mateo County
Steve Baer, Shasta County
Paul Morris, DCSS

1. Agenda Review, Housekeeping & Introductions

The Agenda was reviewed, housekeeping information was provided and attendees introduced themselves.

2. Update & Group Discussion

- **Rhode Island Interface** – Elaine Moody provided an update on the Rhode Island Insurance Interface, which intercepts third party personal injury and workers compensation insurance payments from NCPs owing child support arrearages. California is investigating the feasibility of implementing a similar process. At the December 2000 PAG meeting, the discussion included how collections would be obtained - either through the levy process (similar to Connecticut's process) or the offset process (similar to our IDB process). Since then, the opinion from DCSS legal is that the offset process cannot be used without new legislation. Therefore, DCSS will be preparing the feasibility study, part of which will include input from the counties and consortia regarding ramifications and impact of using the levy process, as well as the alternative of seeking new legislation to allow for use of the offset process.

  Rhode Island and TMR-Maximus, the developers of the interface system, have offered to assist with development efforts by conducting a test submission of approximately 200,000 California cases. The test would be a preliminary rough match based only on Social Security Number. However, the State requires signed confidentiality statements from Rhode Island and TMR-Maximus before testing can begin.

Extensive discussion ensued concerning the levy versus the offset process. The offset process is not beyond the realm of consideration, but would require legislation, and DCSS is attempting to avoid submitting legislative changes impacting child support for the next two years. However, using the levy process may require legislation anyway in order to create a lien against the obligor. Concern was also expressed that a moratorium on new projects be considered, unless there is legislation to use the offset process given all the other work that is currently being done at the local level. Also, it appears that the offset process lends itself better to automation than the levy process.

The State reiterated that part of the process of preparing the feasibility study will include gathering county/consortia data on the impact of using the levy process on their local operations.

Any questions, contact Elaine Moody (Elaine.Moody@dcss.ca.gov) or Stacey Glass-Smith (Stacey.Glass-Smith@dcss.ca.gov) at (916) 464-5275 (voice) or (916) 464-5335 (FAX)

- **Foreign language Indicators** – Elaine Moody provided an update on the request to the consortia leads for information on foreign language indicators. DCSS needs to gather information that will be used to determine how to comply with the Dymally/Alatorre Act. The Dymally/Alatorre Act requires services to be provided in a foreign language if a certain percentage of the client base served speaks that language as their primary language.

  Four of the consortia have foreign language indicators. This information has been passed on to the DCSS Civil Rights coordinator.

  There was also discussion about using welfare language statistics for child support. There is probably a large overlap, but it should be verified. There was a suggestion that the State may want to consider using the MEDS system to obtain language indicator data.

- **CS 157 Update** – Helen Faust provided an update on the status of the revisions to the CS 157 Report. The CS 157 Report and instructions have been finalized. The transmittal letter is in the final sign-of process, and the revised form should be released the week of January 8, 2001. Once the letter has been released, DCSS will work with the consortia leads on facilitating a requirements definition session so that the six consortia can program the changes consistently.

- **Questions to Elise Wing** – Helen Faust provided an update on the status of a question discussed at the December 2000 PAG meeting: "What if the case changes status before the end of the reporting period? How is the case reported?". After contacting Elise Wing, Helen provided the following clarification:

  > All paying cases (including those with an IRS tax intercept as the first and only collection) are counted on line 18. Where it changes, is how and which cases are counted on line 29. For a "former assistance" case, if past due support is owed to the family, but they do not receive any money because the IRS intercept (the first collection in the case) is used to pay welfare arrears FIRST and there are insufficient funds left for past due support owed to the family, you CANNOT count the case.

However, if no past due support is owed to the family and an IRS intercept is made and used to pay welfare arrears, counties may count the case.

For never assistance and current assistance cases where the only collection made is an IRS intercept and the money collected went either to the family (never assistance cases) or the State (current assistance cases), counties may count these cases as paying towards arrears on Line 29.

When reporting collections for cases that changed status during the fiscal year, counties report the status of the case as it was as of the end of the fiscal year.

Counties are required to compute monthly collection data and should be reporting the status of the collection based on the case as it was when the collection was received.

- **CS 155 & 156 Updates** – Helen Faust reported that the estimated release dates for the revisions to the CS 155 and 156 Reports will be sometime in March 2001 to be effective for the reporting period beginning July 1, 2001. The first CS 155 Report will be due October 15, 2001 for the quarterly reporting period July 1 though September 30, 2001. The first CS 156 Report will be due in August 2002 for the annual reporting period July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2002.

- **IFCR Update** - Paul Morris provided an update on the status of submitting child support information via the Interim Federal Case Registry (IFCR). Consortia leads were previously provided copies of the mapping tool, data dictionary and reporting tool. Los Angeles has submitted test data to the IFCR. All locate functions performed by the FPLS can now be performed by the FCR. Five San Francisco cases were submitted to the FCR for locate processing. A response from the FCR is pending. Paul will be calling each consortium lead county by mid-month regarding an FCR implementation schedule for their consortia counties. The completed schedule will be distributed to the Feds and all counties by the end of January 2001.

- **Audit Case Listing Update** – Mike Graham provided an update on the status of the Audit Case Listing preparation efforts. To date, 52 counties have submitted their files. Special thanks to Alameda and Fresno Counties for submitting their files early. This provided an excellent opportunity to troubleshoot potential problems with preparing the list. Additional thanks to Christine Anderson from the CASES Consortium for submitting the Audit Case Listing for her member counties on a single CD. We are working with the remaining counties to have them submit their files (these counties constitute less than one percent of the statewide caseload).

- **CCSAS Update** – DeeAnn Hebert provided an update on the status of activities. A Consortia Survey was distributed. The purpose is to assist prospective vendors in determining project scope, costs, schedules, architecture, infrastructure, and conversion opportunities and challenges when preparing responses to solicitation requests.

- **Consortia Monthly Status Report** – Evan Auberry reported that no comments were received on the proposed Consortia Monthly Status Report. Final version will be distributed to the Consortia Leads the week of January 8, 2001. The first Consortia Monthly Status Report will be due February 13, 2001.

- **NCP Billing Statement** – Elaine Moody asked if all consortia systems could send a billing statement to NCPs. All consortia leads indicated they have that ability.

3. PAG Versus TAC

Cheryl Hotaling discussed DCSS' participation in both the PAG and the FSD Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the overlap of the two forums. These are two forums where DCSS is discussing issues that affect automation, with overlap of topics occurring. However, because PAG minutes are released to all counties via LCSA letters, and consortia leads can also discuss PAG information with their member counties, DCSS will be reducing its participation in TAC meetings. DCSS will still participate in the upcoming February 2001 annual FSD training, but will not be participating in the monthly TAC meetings. Given this reduced participation, consortia leads need to ensure that appropriate managerial and technical staff participate in the monthly PAG meetings, as stated in the PAG Charter. .

4. DCSS Policies

Evan Auberry reminded participants the policy changes do not come directly from PAG meetings. Issues that may have policy change implications are discussed at PAG, and minutes are distributed to provide a "heads-up" on potential policy implications. However, the procedure for releasing policy changes is through CSS Letters only. Consortia and counties should wait for official notification via CSS letters prior to implementing any policy changes.

5. Enhancement and Maintenance and Operations Request Planning

Cheryl Hotaling and Edwina Young led a discussion on Enhancement and Maintenance and Operations (M & O) funding requests. This year, DCSS will process M & O and Enhancement requests at the same time rather than as two separate processes, as was done the previous year.

Enhancement requests should be of sufficient detail to facilitate evaluating requests. More detail is better. Mike Graham distributed an enhancement request from last year that provided good supporting detail. Counties can use this as a sample when preparing requests for this year.

With regards to types of enhancements, the federal government has made it clear that funding to improve functionality of interim systems will, most likely, **not** be provided even if there is a supporting business case. Their rationale being that funding would not be provided for systems that will eventually be replaced by the single statewide system. The State may provide 100% General Fund for some enhancements, but these will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Enhancement requests from legacy counties are not expected. There may be exceptions, but dramatically fewer enhancements are anticipated from previous years.

Given that, discussion ensued on the types of enhancement requests that might be submitted:

- Cal/WIN Interface
- Case Closure Regulations – must be the same for all consortia. Consortia with automatic closure after three years may want to review code and determine if programming changes need to be made.
- Complaint Resolution Process using standardized State forms. Some of this may require time tracking.
- Data Reliability – Clean-up efforts and reprogramming for CS 155, 156, 800 and 820 Reports.
- Performance Measures (Consortia may be able to leverage the work LA is doing in this effort).
- Report to Hearing Officer
- IVR

Additional funding for certain requests may be funded as Administration costs, e.g., imaging.

ACTION ITEM: DCSS to identify departmental and consortia personnel to work on the issue of county records imaging.

Attendees were reminded that if changes can be implemented with a relatively small level of effort, they should utilize existing M & O allocations. If substantial work is needed, then a non-recurring M&O request should be submitted, or, if appropriate, an enhancement request should be submitted.

6. DOJ Updates

Bruce Kaspari provided an update on Department of Justice (DOJ) efforts of interest to PAG attendees. A copy of the discussion items will be included with the LCSA letter releasing the minutes. The following additional items were also discussed:

- DMV SSN Verification – An issue was raised concerning how counties could access CLETS once the transition from the District Attorney's Office to the independent IV-D Agency was completed. DMV has a program called Direct Access which provides almost the same information provided by CLETS. It does not provide AKAs but does allow on-line viewing of SSNs. Counties must submit requests for this service. Electronic copies of the forms needed to request this service will be sent to the consortia leads. Consortia leads should forward to member counties requesting this service.
- Duplicate Locate Requests – As more counties convert from legacy to consortia systems, the number of duplicate SSN submissions is decreasing.

7. CalWIN Interfaces

Arlene Mendibles and John Boule provided an overview of the CalWIN project. CalWIN is one of the IV-A consortia systems comprising the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS). CalWIN has 18 member counties, and must interface with all six interim child support consortia. Detailed design sessions are scheduled for the week on January 8. Participation from all six interim child support systems will be required. This will also help consortia members

gauge the level of effort required to develop their CalWIN interfaces when preparing enhancement requests. Arlene Mendibles will provide a schedule of the CalWIN implementation schedule.

Post PAG Update: Below is the implementation schedule provided by Arlene:

PHASE	MONTH STARTING	MONTH ENDING	BEGINS IN PROJECT MONTH	DURATION (IN MONTHS)
Development of Initial Project Control Document (PCD)	2/00	3/00	1	1
Requirements Validation	4/00	7/00	2	3.5
General System Design	7/00	10/00	5	3.5
Detailed System Design	11/00	3/01	9	5
Code/Unit Test	4/01	9/01	14	6
System Test	10/01	2/02	20	5
User Acceptance Test	3/02	8/02	25	6
Pilot Test	9/02	2/03	31	6
/Placer	*9/02*	*2/03*	*31*	
Sacramento	*11/02*	*2/03*	*33*	
Consortium-wide Implementation	3/03	5/04	37	15
Yolo	*3/03*	*3/03*	*37*	
Santa Cruz	*3/03*	*3/03*	*37*	
Santa Clara	*4/03*	*4/03*	*38*	
Solano	*5/03*	*5/03*	*39*	
Contra Costa	*6/03*	*6/03*	*40*	
Sonoma	*7/03*	*7/03*	*41*	
San Mateo	*8/03*	*8/03*	*42*	
San Francisco	*9/03*	*9/03*	*43*	
Alameda	*10/03*	*10/03*	*44*	
Tulare	*11/03*	*11/03*	*45*	
Fresno	*12/03*	*12/03*	*46*	
Ventura	*1/04*	*1/04*	*47*	
Santa Barbara	*2/04*	*2/04*	*48*	
San Luis Obispo	*3/04*	*3/04*	*49*	
San Diego	*4/04*	*4/04*	*50*	
Orange	*5/04*	*5/04*	*51*	
Total Project	**2/00**	**5/04**		**51**

8. PAG Charter

No additional comments received after the last draft of the PAG Charter was distributed at the December PAG meeting. The PAG Charter is now formally adopted.

9. PAG Governance Structure

The PAG Governance Responsibilities and Activities document describing the primary responsibilities and corresponding activities of DCSS, PRISM, Interim Consortia System Leads, counties, and PAG was distributed for final review and comment. Comments are due to Kerri Price by January 18, 2001

10. Wrap-up

Evan Auberry announced that he will be leaving the PRISM Project for a position at the Department of Finance. His last day at PRISM will be January 12, 2001.

The next PAG meeting will be held on Thursday February 1, 2001, from 9:30 – 3:30. The location will be at DCSS, 11120 International Drive, Rancho Cordova.

11. Action Item Review

ACTION	PERFORMED BY	PROVIDED TO	BY WHEN
Identify Departmental and consortia representatives to work on imaging standards.	DCSS & Consortia Leads	Cheryl Hotaling*	January 18, 2001
Develop imaging standards	DCSS & Consortia Leads	Cheryl Hotaling	
Provide CalWIN Implementation Schedule	Arlene Mendibles	Evan Auberry	Completed

* Responses received from Christine Anderson, CASES Consortium – (415) 356-2740 (Christine_Anderson@informatixinc.com) and Paula Deen, BEST Consortium (510) 639-3071 (pbd@co.alameda.ca.us).